SIEGFRIED HESSE

44TH CONGRESS, 2d Session. } SENATE. { REPORT No. 689.

REPORT

OF THE

JOINT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

TO

INVESTIGATE CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

FEBRUARY 27, 1877.—Ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1877.

ERRATA, CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

P. 69, last line on the page, strike out "several hundred," and insert "a great many."

P. 13, 19 lines from the bottom, change "Louderbock" to "Louderback."

P. 69, 20 lines from the top, change "Tauist" to "Tauist," both before and after "The."

P. 80, 21 lines from the top, change "Trowbridge" to "Strobridge."

P. 133, 6 lines from the bottom, change "San Diego" to "Santiago," before "de Cuba."

P. 345, lines 3 and 4 from the bottom, change "commodore" to "comprador," in both lines.

P. 732, 7 lines from the bottom, change "Adexander" to "Alexander," before "Campbell."

P. 925, 23 lines from the top, change "so" to "who," at the beginning of the line; and at the end of the line, change "the" to "a."

P. 844, half way down the page, in the name of the witness "Frances Avery," change "Frances" to "Francis."

P. 843, 7 lines from the top, change "transaction" to "transactions."

P. 1137, 24 lines from the top, fill the blank before "sh" with "The Briti," so as to read, "The British colony," &c.

REPORT OF THE JOINT SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SARGENT, from the Joint Special Committee to Investigate Chinese Immigration, submitted the following

REPORT:

The joint special committee of the Senate and House of Representatives appointed to investigate the character, extent, and effect of Chinese immigration, report as follows:

On the 6th day of July, 1876, the Senate passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That a committee of three Senators be appointed to investigate the character, extent, and effect of Chinese immigration to this country, with power to visit the Pacific coast for that purpose, and to send for persons and papers, and to report at the next session of Congress.

On the 17th day of July, 1876, the House of Representatives passed the following resolution:

Whereas the Senate has passed a resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee of three Senators to visit the Pacific coast and report to Congress at its next session upon the character, extent, and effect of Chinese immigration into this country:

Resolved, That the Speaker is hereby authorized to appoint three members of this house to proceed to the Pacific coast, after the adjournment of Congress, to investigate conjointly with said Senate committee, or otherwise, the extent and effect of Chinese immigration into this country, with power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer, and to take evidence; said committee to report to Congress at its next session.

Subsequently, at the same session, by concurrent resolution, the said special committee of the two houses were authorized to act as a joint special committee for the purposes aforesaid, and with the powers conferred by the resolutions appointing them.

In conducting the investigation required by the resolutions the joint committee visited the Pacific coast and examined one hundred and thirty witnesses. The testimony so taken covers over twelve hundred pages of printed matter, and embraces the views of all classes of the community and every variety of interest. The committee found a great diversity of opinion, resulting from different standpoints of the witnesses who were examined.

In conducting this examination the committee divided their work so as to first hear persons opposed to the unlimited introduction of Chinese, and to this branch of the subject a limited time was given. They then heard the testimony of persons favorable to such introduction, and concluded by affording time for witnesses in rebuttal. Although the subject by this means was pretty fully covered, and the inquiry, perhaps, exhausted, the conclusions to be drawn from the mass of testimony may be different to different minds. In the opinion of the committee it may

be said that the resources of California and the Pacific coast have been more rapidly developed with the cheap and docile labor of Chinese than they would have been without this element. So far as material prosperity is concerned, it cannot be doubted that the Pacific coast has been a great gainer.

This is true, at any rate, of the capitalist classes. If the inquiry should stop there; if it should be satisfied by the certainty that money is made out of the present condition of things, and not look to the present or future moral or political welfare of our Pacific States, it must be conceded, at least, that many enterprising men find their profit in Chinese immigration, and the general resources of the Pacific are being rapidly developed by means of Chinese labor. Among others who testified were those who largely employ Chinese, or are interested in their transportation, and who find a profit therein. These testified that the results of Chinese immigration had been invariably beneficial in enhancing the material prosperity of the coast, but some were not entirely clear that there were not social and moral evils springing from this immigration, which in the future would counterbalance the advantages gained by the present rapid production of wealth.

Opposition to any move restricting the immigration of Chinese was also developed among religious teachers, who testified before the committee that the presence of Chinese among us imposes a duty and gives an opportunity of christianizing them. On the other hand the committee found that laboring men and artisans, perhaps without exception, were opposed to the influx of Chinese, on the ground that hard experience had shown that they are thereby thrown out of employment, and the means of decent livelihood are more difficult of acquisition. But the opposition to Chinese immigration was not confined to laboring-men and mechanics. In the testimony will be found that of lawyers, doctors, merchants, divines, judges, and others, in large numbers, speaking of their own observation and belief, that the apparent prosperity derived from the presence of Chinese is deceptive and unwholesome, ruinous to our laboring classes, promotive of caste, and dangerous to free institutions.

In the progress of their investigation the committee called before them the municipal authorities of San Francisco, including the executive, legislative, health, and police departments, to ascertain the numbers, habits, and modes of life of the Chinese in San Francisco. The number of adult Chinese residents in that city averages at present during a year about thirty-five thousand. The testimony shows that the Chinese live in filthy dwellings, upon poor food, crowded together in narrow quarters, disregarding health and fire ordinances, and that their vices are corrupting to the morals of the city, especially of the young.

Among the testimony will be found that of some twenty operatives-numbering nearly as many trades, in which details are given in relation, to different industrial pursuits which are either monopolized by the Chinese or are fast becoming so. This evidence shows that the Chinese have reduced wages to what would be starvation prices for white men and women, and engrossed so much of the labor in the various callings that there is a lack of employment for whites; and young men are growing up in idleness, while young women, willing to work, are compelled to resort to doubtful means of support. The hardships resulting from these causes bear with especial weight upon women.

It is also shown that this distinctive competition in some branches of labor operates as a continual menace, and inspires fears that the establishment of these ruinously low rates will extend to all employments

and degrade all white working-people to the abject condition of a servile class. From this cause, among others, has sprung up a bitterly hostile feeling toward the Chinese, which has exhibited itself sometimes in laws and ordinances of very doubtful propriety and in the abuse of individual Chinamen and sporadic cases of mob violence. The influence of the better class of society is thrown against all violence toward the Chinese, although those exercising that influence may be convinced that the presence of the Chinese in California is undesirable. As long as there is a reasonable hope that Congress will apply a remedy for what is considered a great and growing evil, violent measures against the Chinese can be restrained.

As the safety of republican institutions requires that the exercise of the franchise shall be only by those who have a love and appreciation for our institutions, and this rule excludes the great mass of the Chinese from the ballot as a necessary means to public safety, yet the application of the rule deprives them of the only adequate protection which can exist in a republic for the security of any distinctive large class of persons. An indigestible mass in the community, distinct in language, pagan in religion, inferior in mental and moral qualities, and all peculiarities, is an undesirable element in a republic, but becomes especially so if political power is placed in its hands.

The safety of the State demands that such power shall not be so placed. The safety of the class, however, seems to depend in a measure upon that power. There are, therefore, springing from this subject antagonistic considerations, the only way to reconcile which would seem to be that the laws should discourage the large influx of any class of population to whom the ballot cannot safely be confided.

To any one reading the testimony which we lay before the two houses it will become painfully evident that the Pacific coast must in time become either American or Mongolian. There is a vast hive from which Chinese immigrants may swarm, and circumstances may send them in enormous numbers to this country. These two forces, Mongolian and American, are already in active opposition. They do not amalgamate, and all conditions are opposed to any assimilation. The American race is progressive and in favor of a responsible representative government. The Mongolian race seems to have no desire for progress, and to have no conception of representative and free institutions. While conditions should be favorable to the growth and occupancy of our Pacific possessions by our own people, the Chinese have advantages which will put them far in advance in this race for possession. They can subsist where the American would starve. They can work for wages which will not furnish the barest necessities of life to an American. They make their way in California as they have in the islands of the sea, not by superior orce or virtue, or even industry, although they are, as a rule, industrious, but by revolting characteristics, and by dispensing with what have become necessities in modern civilization. To compete with them and expel them the American must come down to their level, or below them; must work so cheaply that the Chinese cannot compete with him, for in the contest for subsistence he that can subsist upon the least will last the longest.

It must not be understood that these views are unchallenged by a considerable and respectable class in California. Many persons of intelligence consider that this very cheapness of labor of the Chinese and the extreme docility of his habits is a strong consideration in his favor. More money can be made by employing him than can be by the employment of white men and women with the payment of adequate wages.

Admitting this, yet it would seem that an unlimited influx of Chinese might be a great future evil; that the population of the Pacific coast by a people of cognate language, religion, habits, and traditions would be better than its population by Asiatics; that its people should be like those of Iowa or Illinois rather than like those of Peking and Canton. When considerations relating to the future health of the body-politic were called to the attention of witnesses, scarcely any dissented from the idea that great numbers of a people of the average mental capacity of the Chinese, having no inclination to adopt this country as their permanent home, who come and return as pagans, having a total disregard for our Government and laws, and the servile disposition inherited from ages of benumbing despotism, were undesirable.

By the judges of the criminal courts of San Francisco it was shown that there is a great want of veracity among Chinese witnesses, who have little regard for the sanctity of an oath, and hence convictions are very difficult for offenses committed against each other, or against the public at large. The testimony seemed to be concurrent that the Chinese are non-assimilative with the whites; that they have made no progress, during the quarter of a century in which they have been resident on the Pacific coast, in assimilation with our people; that they still retain their peculiar costume and follow their original national habits in food and mode of life; that they have no social intercourse with the white population; that they work for wages which will not support white men and especially white families; that they have no families of their own in this country, or very few of them, and that by the small amount and poor quality of food which they consume, and their crowding together in close quarters, reducing individual expenses of rent, their having no families to support or educate, they are able to compete with white labor in all departments and exclude it from employment.

Testimony was further taken upon the question of any radical differences existing between the Asiatic and Caucasian races, and in the evidence will be found much valuable information upon this point peculiarly interesting to the ethnologist. The deduction from the testimony taken by the committee on this point would seem to be that there is not sufficient brain capacity in the Chinese race to furnish motive power for self-government. Upon the point of morals, there is no Aryan or European race which is not far superior to the Chinese as a class. Full and interesting details of Chinese morals and habits in their own country will be found in the testimony, fully warranting this assertion. That testimony comes from intelligent travelers, ship-captains, merchants, and others, and some of it is too revolting for miscellaneous reading. But it was proved satisfactorily that the Chinese merchants in San Francisco are honorable in their dealings with other merchants. The only testimony affecting the integrity of this comparatively small class was, that they evade, to a considerable extent, the United States revenue-laws.

There is no intermarriage between the Asiatics and the Caucasian race.

The presence of the Chinese discourages and retards white immigration to the Pacific States. This clearly appeared in evidence, and probably arises from their monopoly of farm and mechanical work through the low price of their labor, making subsistence difficult to procure by the poorer class of emigrants.

There was some conflict of testimony upon the question as to what is public opinion on the Pacific coast as to the desirability of the influx of Chinese; but it is fairly inferable from the evidence that, without

very considerable exceptions, public opinion there is that Chinese immigration is exceedingly pernicious; that the presence of that element, perpetually alien in feeling and ideas, is a great disadvantage to the community.

This opinion is shared by some of the religious teachers in California, and very interesting testimony of the deleterious effects of Chinese immigration upon the morals of the Pacific coast will be found given by some of these persons. It is very clearly in evidence that the number of the Chinese on the Pacific coast is rapidly increasing, not by births, for there are few of these, but by importations, so that the same uneducated class is supplied perpetually.

The Chinese do not come to make their home in this country; their only purpose is to acquire what would be a competence in China and return there to enjoy it. While there is a constant and increasing incoming tide there is a constant outflow also, less in volume, of persons who have worked out specified years of servitude and made money enough to live upon in China, and who sever their connection with this country.

It further appears from the evidence that the Chinese do not desire to become citizens of this country, and have no knowledge of or appreciation for our institutions. Very few of them learn to speak our language. They do not desire the ballot, and there is danger that if they had it their "head-men" would control the sale of it in quantities large enough to determine any election. That it would be destructive to the Pacific States to put the ballot in their hands was very generally believed by the witnesses. Their want of knowledge of our language and institutions would prevent an intelligent exercise of suffrage; while their number in California at the present time is so great that they could control any election if the ballot was put into their hands. The number of adult Chinese is, at the present time, as great as that of all the voters in the State, or nearly reaching that number, and they increase more rapidly than the other adult population of the State. To admit these vast numbers of aliens to citizenship and the ballot would practically destroy republican institutions upon the Pacific coast, for the Chinese have no comprehension of any form of government but despotism, and have not the words in their own language to describe intelligibly the principles of our representative system.

It was proved before the committee that Chinese women in California are bought and sold for prostitution, and are treated worse than dogs; that they are held in a most revolting condition of slavery. It was further shown that the Chinese have a *quasi* government among themselves independent of our laws, authorizing the punishment of offenders against Chinese customs, even to the taking of life. It was further shown that violent hostilities exist between Chinamen from different parts of China, who, coming together in California by accident or otherwise, engage in deadly feuds and riots, to the disturbance of the public peace. Large numbers of them, notwithstanding the difficulty of conviction, owing to the looseness of the Chinese oath, occupy the State's prison and jails.

They are cruel and indifferent to their sick, sometimes turning them out to die, and the corpses of dead Chinamen and women are sometimes found in the streets by the policemen, where they have been left by their associates at night. The climatic conditions of San Francisco are unfavorable to the prevalence of pestilence, but it was in testimony that the conditions existing in the Chinese quarter of this city transferred to New York, Saint Louis, Cincinnati, New Orleans, or other large

cities east of the Rocky Mountains, would make those cities uninhabitable. The Chinese quarter already extends over a considerable area in the heart of San Francisco, and is growing year by year. The progress is steady and constant, and the business portion of the city is already cut off by the Chinese quarter from a portion where are many of the most elegant residences.

Such Chinese quarters exist in all the cities and towns of the Pacific coast. The tide of Chinese immigration is gradually tending eastward, and before a quarter of a century the difficult question that now arises upon the Pacific coast will probably have to be met upon the banks of the Mississippi, and perhaps on the Ohio and Hudson. Many people of the Pacific coast believe that this influx of Chinese is a standing menace to republican institutions upon the Pacific, and the existence there of Christian civilization.

From all the facts that they have gathered bearing upon the matter, considering fairly the testimony for and against the Chinese, the committee believe that this opinion is well founded. They believe that free institutions founded upon free schools and intelligence can only be maintained where based on intelligent and adequately-paid labor. Adequate wages are needed to give self-respect to the laborer and the means of education to his children. Family-life is a great safeguard to our political institutions. Chinese immigration involves sordid wages, no public schools, and the absence of the family. We speak of the Chinese as they have exhibited themselves on the Pacific coast for twenty-five years past, and as they are there at the present time. They show few of the characteristics of a desirable population, and many to be deprecated by any patriot.

This problem is too important to be treated with indifference. Congress should solve it, having due regard to any rights already accrued under existing treaties and to humanity. But it must be solved, in the judgment of the committee, unless our Pacific possessions are to be ultimately given over to a race alien in all its tendencies, which will make of it practically provinces of China rather than States of the Union.

The committee recommend that measures be taken by the Executive looking toward a modification of the existing treaty with China, confining it to strictly commercial purposes; and that Congress legislate to restrain the great influx of Asiatics to this country. It is not believed that either of these measures would be looked upon with disfavor by the Chinese government. Whether this is so or not, a duty is owing to the Pacific States and territories which are suffering under a terrible scourge, but are patiently waiting for relief from Congress.

PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO,
Wednesday, October 18, 1876.

The joint committee of the two houses of Congress to investigate the Chinese question met this day pursuant to adjournment.

The following members of the committee were present:

Mr. Morton, (chairman,) Mr. Sargent, Mr. Piper, and Mr. Meade.

Absent, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Wilson.

The chairman called the committee to order and announced that there was a quorum present and the committee would proceed to business.

The rooms at the Palace Hotel known as A and B being used, were accepted as the place for all future meetings of the committee.

Mr. Piper stated, as there would be need of a secretary, he would move that Mr. Richard Lambert be designated as such officer.

Messrs. Piper and Meade were requested to confer with Mr. Lambert and to make such arrangements with him as to salary as would be satisfactory to him and the committee, the understanding being that the salary be paid exclusively out of the fund appropriated to the members of the committee on the part of the House.

On the question as to what course to pursue relative to summoning and examining of witnesses,

After debate it was

Ordered, That the representatives of the State senate, officers of the central and other anti-coolie clubs; officers or representatives of the municipality of San Francisco, also Messrs. F. A. Bee and B. S. Brooks, representing the Chinese six companies, and any officer of the said companies be requested to be present on Saturday at 10 o'clock a. m., when the committee will be ready to hear those who desire to be heard, the arguments to be confined to one hour each in length on either side of the question.

It was

Ordered further, That the following gentlemen are hereby respectfully requested to attend to-morrow at half past 10 o'clock a. m., namely:

The mayor, the chief of police, the health-officer, the committee of the California State senate, the presidents of the different anti-coolie clubs, and the representatives of the Chinese, for the purpose of making suggestions as to witnesses and as to the conduct of the investigation.

It was further ordered that at the sessions of the committee there will be allowed to be present the representatives of the press, one representative each of the State senate, of the municipality of the anti-coolie clubs, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Bee, and one officer from each of the Chinese companies.

On motion of Mr. Sargent, the committee adjourned until to-morrow at half past 2 o'clock.

PALACE HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO,
October 19, 1876.

The joint committee of Congress met to-day at 2.30 p. m., pursuant to adjournment.

The following members were present: Senators Morton (chairman) and Sargent, and Representatives Piper and Meade.

Absent: Senator Cooper and Representative Wilson.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

Senator Morton stated that the meeting was called for the purpose of hearing suggestions from parties interested in this investigation and deciding upon the mode of procedure in conducting the examination.

There were present Mayor Bryant and Hon. Frank M. Pixley, representing the people of San Francisco; Hon. Frank McCoppin and Hon. George H. Rogers, representing the State through the Senate investigating committee appointed at the last session of the State legislature; H. H. Ellis, chief of police; Dr. Meares, of the board of health; Cameron H. King, president of the Anti-Chinese Union; John D. Condon, president of the Ninth Ward Anti-Coolie Club; Joseph Monaghan, president Seventh Ward Anti-Coolie Club; M. Kelly, secretary of the United Brothers Anti-Coolie Club; and Col. F. A. Bee, representing the Chinese six companies.

Senator Morton read the following list of topics upon which the committee desires to be informed:

1. How many Chinese are there in this country?
2. What is their moral and physical condition?
3. Do they come here voluntarily, and by what means do they get here?
4. For what purpose do they come? With the intention of remaining and making the United States their home, or of returning to China when they have acquired a competence?
5. Do they become attached to our institutions and reconciled to live and die here?
6. What kind of labor do they perform?
7. What is their character as laborers?
8. Do they learn trades and work in factories?
9. What rate of wages do they receive?
10. How does their employment affect white labor?
11. Do they prevent the immigration of white labor to this coast from Europe and from the Eastern States?
12. What is the condition of their health and their habits of cleanliness and sanitary regulations?
13. From what parts of China do they come?
14. Do any sail directly from Chinese ports, or do they all come by way of Hong-Kong?
15. In what way do they live in this city?
16. How does their residence in localities affect the price of property?
17. How many have families?
18. How many Chinese women are there in this country, and what is their condition and character? Are they free, or are they bought and sold as slaves?
19. How many Chinese companies are there, and how are they organized?
20. Are they organized to make money, and in what way do they make it, or are they relief or benevolent associations?
21. What interest do the Chinese take in the politics or institutions

of the country, and how many of them have become citizens of the United States?

22. What was the condition of these people in China before coming here?

23. What is the population of China as far as can be ascertained, and the general condition, manners, customs, and institutions of the people?

24. What is their religion, and what progress have the missionaries made in their conversion to Christianity?

25. What is their education, and their character in making and keeping contracts?

26. The condition of commerce between the United States and China; how it has been or may be affected by Chinese immigration?

27. What power has a State to prevent the introduction of prostitutes or vagrants from foreign ports?

After some introductory remarks, Mayor Bryant submitted the following as the probable course of action the representatives of the municipality would pursue in conducting the testimony before the joint committee, viz:

We will offer,

1st. The testimony already taken by the senate committee of California;

2d. The testimony of the officers of the municipal government;

3d. Health department;

4th. Police department;

5th. Judges of criminal courts as to criminal jurisprudence;

6th. Statistics as to investigation, trade, and commerce;

7th. Evidence upon the labor question, the effect and influence that Chinese employment has upon the industrial interests of the State; and, finally,

8th. We shall ask the commission to personally visit and inspect the Chinese quarter, accompanied by city officials.

Colonel Bee offered the following as the list of persons whom he would call upon:

Mayor, law and police officers of the city.

Merchants, bankers, manufacturers, farmers, and contractors.

Officers of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company; officers of the Central Pacific Railroad.

Leading Chinamen who can speak English.

Physicians, missionaries, white workingmen.

Officers of the six Chinese companies.

Persons who have lived in China, and other gentlemen from other States or localities, as may be suggested from time to time.

Senator Sargent suggested that witnesses should come freely, of their own accord, without the necessity of issuing subpœnas to compel attendance.

Colonel Bee asked that a letter be addressed to Colonel Hollister, a resident of Santa Barbara, inviting him to be present and testify. The secretary was requested to extend the invitation.

Mayor Bryant and Hon. Frank M. Pixley announced that three statements would be made in opening, one from the city, one from the anti-coolie clubs, and one from the State.

Colonel Bee also announced that he would submit a statement on behalf of the Chinese.

After fixing the time for taking the testimony at 10 o'clock on Monday, the joint committee adjourned until Saturday morning at 10 o'clock, for the purpose of hearing statements.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 21, 1876.

The joint congressional committee met to-day, at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present—Senator Morton, chairman; Senators Cooper and Sargent, and Representatives Piper and Meade.

Absent—Representative Wilson.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

Mayor Bryant, on behalf of the municipal authorities, asked that invitations be extended to Hon. F. F. Low, E. B. Vreeland, Captain King, Chief of Police Ellis, Hon. Giles H. Gray, surveyor of the port, A. La Grange, statistical clerk in the custom-house, and Police Officers Smith, Bethel, Duffield, Clark, and Rogers, to appear before the committee and give information upon the Chinese question.

The secretary was instructed to issue the necessary invitations.

Statements were then made before the committee by Hon. Frank McCoppin, on behalf of the State; Hon. Frank M. Pixley, on behalf of the city; Cameron H. King, on behalf of the anti-coolie clubs, against the immigration of Chinese to this country.

Col. F. A. Bee and B. S. Brooks appeared and made statements in favor of the Chinese.

The committee then adjourned until Monday at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 23, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day, pursuant to adjournment, at 10 o'clock a. m.

Present—Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representatives Piper and Meade.

Absent—Representative Wilson.

Colonel Bee laid before the committee several books printed in Chinese and English.

The eleventh ward anti-coolie club sent a roll containing the full names of each member of that club.

Mr. Pixley, representing the municipality, called upon the Hon. F. F. Low, late United States minister to China, to testify. At the conclusion of Mr. Low's testimony the committee took a recess until 1.30 p. m.

The committee re-assembled at 1.30, Senator Sargent in the chair.

Mr. Pixley called Capt. T. H. King, who, after being sworn, testified before the committee.

At the conclusion of this testimony the committee adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 24, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present—Senator Sargent, in the chair, andSenator Cooper; Representatives Piper and Meade.

Mr. Pixley submitted a report from A. La Grange, statistical clerk in the custom-house, showing the relative imports and exports with China, which was received as an exhibit to accompany the report of the joint committee.

A communication was received from Chinese purporting to constitute the officers of the Chinese Young Men's Christian Association of San Francisco, requesting that the same privileges be accorded the Rev. O. W. Loomis and Rev. O. Gibson as are accorded other institutions who have representatives before the committee, as the representatives of this society, and for the purpose of interpreting the Chinese language.

Officer Clark and Chief of Police H. H. Ellis, E. B. Vreeland, Mayor

A. J. Bryant, and Judge D. Louderback, of the police court, were called, sworn, and examined before the committee.

The committee, Senator Cooper in the chair, then adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 25, 1876.

The committee met to-day at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present—Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper; Representatives Piper and Meade.

The following witnesses then appeared, were sworn, and examined:

Police Officers Michael A. Smith, George W. Duffield, and A. Bainbridge, and Supervisor F. A. Gibbs.

A recess was then taken until 2 o'clock. After the recess, Senator Sargent in the chair, Police Officers James R. Rogers and John G. Tobin were sworn and examined.

Mrs. S. Swift, secretary of the Women's Mining Bureau, was also sworn and examined, pursuant to a communication asking permission to be heard.

Hon. Alexander Badlam, city and county assessor, was then examined, after which the commission, at 4.45 p. m., adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 26, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day, pursuant to adjournment.

Present—Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper; Representatives Piper and Meade.

The following witnesses were then sworn and examined:

C. H. King, president anti-coolie union; Henry George, State inspector of gas-meters; Hon. M. C. Blake, municipal criminal judge; Ex-Governor Haight; John Millon, of San Mateo; William Vinter, of San José; Frank Muther and General A. M. Winn, president labor council.

The committee adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 27, 1876.

The committee met to-day, pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper; Representatives Piper and Meade.

The following witnesses appeared and testified:

Mr. F. Stein, Ernest C. Stock, W. G. Buchanan, Miss Maggie Hayes, C. S. Lancaster, Mrs. J. Humphreys, and John D. Congdon.

The committee then adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 28, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day, pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper; Representatives Meade and Piper.

Absent, Representative Wilson.

The following witnesses then appeared and testified:

J. Marshal, Eric Westine, Robert Gilespie, E. L. Cartage, Dennis McCarthy, Michael Hayes, Hon. Frank M. Pixley, Herman Silverberg, and Cornelius Mahoney.

Mr. Meade stated that he should start overland for the East to-morrow morning.

The joint committee then adjourned until the 9th of November, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 9, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day at 10 a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following gentlemen then appeared, were sworn, and testified:

Rev. Otis Gibson, Rev. O. Loomis, and George D. Roberts.

The committee then adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 10, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day at 10 a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senator Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following gentlemen then appeared, were sworn, and testified.

Rev. O. Loomis, John F. Swift, H. H. Bigelow, John Kirkpatrick, Mathew Blair, John Francis, and Alex. Badlam, (recalled.)

The committee then adjourned until to-morrow at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 11, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day at 10 a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following witnesses then appeared before the committee, were sworn, and testified, viz:

John A. Coryell, Joseph A. Coolidge, Rev. Otis Gibson, (recalled,) Solomon Heydenfeldt, C. V. S. Gibbs, J. P. Heynemann, and A. G. Sneath.

The committee then adjourned until Monday morning at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 13, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day at 10 a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following witnesses then appeared before the committee, were sworn, and testified, viz:

Vernon Seaman, Judge Peckham, Judge S. C. Hastings, J. L. Durkee, Donald McLennan, and Henry C. Beals.

The committee then adjourned until to morrow morning at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 14, 1876.

The joint committee met at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following gentlemen then appeared and testified, viz:

Jacob B. Shenk, Frederick E. Shearer, Dr. A. B. Stout, Wm. M. Dye, Chas. Crooker, and H. K. W. Clark.

The committee then adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 15, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day at 10 o'clock a. m., pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson. An invitation was received inviting the committee to attend a mass-meeting of anti-coolie clubs.

The following gentlemen then appeared and testified, viz:

W. S. Babcock, H. W. K. Clark, West Evans, James H. Strowbridge, Alexander Campbell, Edward J. Armstrong, A. G. Easterly, T. H. Hyatt, Judge Dwinelle, John Stewart Martin, and C. Briggs.

The committee then adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 16, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day, pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following gentlemen appeared and testified, viz:

W. W. Hollister, John Hall, Thomas Brown, M. Morganthau, Simon L. Jones, W. H. Jessup, John Horner, and W. N. Olmstead.

The joint committee then adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 17, 1876.

The joint committee met to-day, pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senators Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following gentlemen appeared and testified, viz: Francis Avery, F. W. Macondray, Frederick L. Castle, A. B. Stout, (recalled,) Hiram W. Rind, Henry Hart, Chas. Sontag, B. S. Brooks, George W. Anthony, and Mrs. Anna L. Smith.

A petition was presented by Senator Sargent, signed by fifty-nine working-girls of San Francisco, setting forth grievances at the presence of Chinese.

The joint committee, at the request of B. S. Brooks, esq., authorized the issuance of four subpœnas to compel the attendance of Wm. Hayes, Wm. H. McHenry, W. H. Patterson, and D. S. Douglass.

The joint committee then adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock a. m.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 18, 1876.

The joint committee met to day, pursuant to adjournment.

Present, Senator Morton, (chairman,) Sargent, and Cooper, and Representative Piper.

Absent, Representatives Meade and Wilson.

The following gentlemen appeared, were sworn and testified, viz: M. M. Estee, Delos Lake, Irving M. Scott, John McHenry, E. D. Wheeler, James P. Dameron, James Patterson, John Arndup, D. C. Woods, T. Gallego, John W. Dwinelle, District Attorney Jones, of Sacramento, Chas. H. Peterson, J. Russell, Chas. C. O'Donnell, Wm. Vale, Henry De Groot, Thos. Jackson, L. M. Foulke, J. G. Cadiz, Chas. D. Douglass, Jas. M. Bassett, Capt. Tucker, Patrick H. Humphreys, and Chas. Walcott Brooks.

At 12.15 Sunday morning the committee adjourned to meet in Washington.

RICHARD LAMBERT,
Secretary.

The Joint Committee of the two Houses of Congress on Chinese Immigration met on Saturday, October 21, 1876, in their rooms at the Palace Hotel, San Francisco, California.

There were present the committee, composed as follows: Senator Morton, (chairman,) Senators Sargent and Cooper, and Representatives Piper and Meade; also, Andrew J. Bryant, mayor of the city of San Francisco; Hon. Frank McCoppin, representing the senate of the State of California; Frank M. Pixley, esq., representing the municipality; and Cameron H. King, esq., who appeared on behalf of the anti-cooly clubs of the city.

F. A. Bee, esq., appeared before the committee as the attorney of the six Chinese companies, and B. S. Brooks, esq., appeared also on behalf of the Chinese.

Mr. McCoppin. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on the 3d of April, 1876, the senate of California adopted the following resolutions, which were offered by Mr. Haymond, of Sacramento, who was the chairman of the committee then appointed:

Be it resolved by the senate of the State of California, That a committee of five senators be appointed, with power to sit at any time or place within the State, and the said committee shall make inquiry:

1. As to the number of Chinese in this State and the effect their presence has upon the social and political condition of the State;

2. As to the probable result of Chinese immigration upon the country, if such immigration be not discouraged;

3. As to the means of exclusion, if such committtee should be of the opinion that the presence of the Chinese element in our midst is detrimental to the interests of the country;

4. As to such other matters as, in the judgment of the committee, have a bearing upon the question of Chinese immigration.

And be it further resolved, That said committee, on or before the first day of December, 1876, shall prepare a memorial to the Congress of the United States, which memorial must set out at length the facts in relation to the subject of this inquiry, and such conclusions as the committee may have arrived at as to the policy and means of excluding Chinese from the country.

And be it further resolved, That said committee is authorized and directed to have printed, at the State printing-office, a sufficient number of copies of such memorial, and of the testimony taken by said committee, to furnish copies thereof to the leading newspapers of the United States, five copies to each member of Congress, ten copies to the governor of each State, and to deposit two thousand copies with the secretary of state of California for general distribution.

And be it further resolved, That said committee shall, on or before the first Monday in December, 1876, furnish to the governor of the State of California two copies of said memorial, properly engrossed, and the governor, upon receipt thereof, be requested to transmit, through the proper channels, one of said copies to the Senate and the other to the House of Representatives of the United States.

And be it further resolved, That said committee have full power to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths and examine witnesses under oath, and that a majority of said committee shall constitute a quorum.

And be it further resolved, That said committee shall have power to employ a sergeant-at-arms, at a compensation not to exceed two hundred and fifty dollars, and a phonographic reporter, at a compensation not to exceed one thousand dollars, and that two thousand dollars of the contingent fund of the senate be set aside, out of which such compensation and the contingent and traveling expenses of the committee shall be paid upon the order of the chairman thereof.

And be it further resolved, That said committee report to the senate, at its next session, the proceedings had hereunder.

I regret that Mr. Haymond is not here to represent the committee. I had hoped up to the last moment that his convenience and health would admit of his coming, but inasmuch as there has been no meeting of the committee for some time, what I have to say must be understood as coming from me individually.

The committee created by the resolutions just read organized at the State capital on the 4th of April last, and thereafter met in almost daily session, both here and in Sacramento, until June 3 following, taking the testimony of all persons who it was thought could enlighten the public mind upon the grave question of Chinese immigration to these shores. A copy of that testimony, so far as it has been printed, I now beg leave to hand you, and wish it made a part of my statement. We find that China, whose people have been brought so near to us by steam communication, contains a population exceeding four hundred million souls, or more than one-third of the world's population. Mr. Williams, so long connected with the American embassy in China, tells us, in his work known as "The Middle Kingdom," (p. 209, vol. 1,) that even as long ago as 1812, when the last census was taken, the population of this remarkable country numbered more than three hundred and sixty-two millions, or two hundred and sixty-eight persons to a square mile. This dense mass of people is within four weeks' sail of this port, and the price of a passage is only $40, and from present indications I should judge that this people, if encouraged, will become the most migratory on the globe; for, notwithstanding the comparatively short time their ports have been open to free commerce, some of their people may be found to-day in every part of the civilized world.

It is true that, so far as we are informed, the Chinese government does not encourage the emigration of its people; but the pressure from within that crowded hive is so great, that they have to seek an outlet in foreign lands, and this coast, being the most accessible to them, is in danger of being overrun by this pagan horde, unless their coming be checked by legislation and a modification of existing treaties. Because of a want of that homogeneity which is an attribute of the Europeans, the Chinaman, under all circumstances and changes, retains his distinctive national traits, and when abroad lives in the hope of securing a competence and returning to the land of Confucius. Indeed, so much is he attached to that land, that he will only quit it with the understanding that in case of death his bones shall be sent back for sepulture; so that the Chinaman, though in this country, is not of it, and in this fact, it seems to me, lies one of the strongest and most insuperable objections to his coming here at all. Unlike the people of other nationalities, he seems to have no desire to acquire real property in America; for while the assessed value of all the property in this State exceeds $600,000,000, these people, though numerically one-sixth of the population, do not own to exceed $1,500,000 of this amount, and therefore pay less than one four-hundredth part of the revenue required to support the government of the State. Our present Chinese population is estimated at 116,000, of which number about 30,000 are domiciled in this city, and of these some five or six hundred only are females, mostly occupants of the forty to fifty Chinese houses of prostitution which are known to exist in San Francisco. It is in evidence that these unfortunates are brought here from China for immoral purposes, and actually sold into the most degrading and abominable slavery. It is also in evidence, and the statement remains uncontradicted, that there are fifty to sixty gambling-houses kept constantly open in the Chinese quarter. Coupling

these facts together, it will be seen that a pretty large proportion of the class called criminal in our city is found among these people.

Here we have a China town in the heart of an American city. There is nothing else like it upon this continent. It is as foreign as any quarter of Canton or Peking, and its inhabitants are governed by the "six companies" rather than by the municipality. That they are a very frugal people is undeniable; their wants are few and inexpensive. Hence it is that they can underwork people of European extraction, for the requirements of the latter are greater than those of the former. The American or European mechanic or laborer appreciates the decencies of life, and wants a home having separate apartments for himself and wife and children; but the Chinaman knows no such fine scruples. A portion of a shelf fifteen to thirty inches wide serves him for a bed, and a little rice suffices for his food. In a struggle for bread, for existence in fact, this man has an advantage over the American or European. We want these conditions changed, and through you, gentlemen, shall ask Congress and the executive branch of the Government to modify the existing laws and treaties between the two countries in such a way as will prevent the coming of these people in great numbers to our shores, to the exclusion of those of our own race who would otherwise come hither and occupy this fair land. And I feel well assured that when you shall have examined this question thoroughly, as I am sure you will do, there will then be found no serious differences of opinion between us of California and you of the East in regard to the evils to our society resulting from this Chinese immigration of which we complain, and against which we seek, through you and our other representatives, the protection of the Federal Government. The decisions of our courts excluding some of the most abandoned of these people from our State having been overruled by the Federal courts, we are powerless to protect ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit me to ask you a question. Do you ask for the total or partial exclusion of the Chinese?

Mr. MCCOPPIN. I would not ask for the total exclusion of these people, but I would limit their coming here to a very great extent. Probably it might be governed by the number of our people going to that country.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a poll-tax in this State, have you not?

Mr. MCCOPPIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do these Chinamen pay that poll-tax?

Mr. MCCOPPIN. Yes, sir; they pay their poll-tax.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further to state?

Mr. MCCOPPIN. No, sir.

Mr. PIXLEY. If I understand the scope of this investigation, a joint committee of the two houses of Congress is here for the purpose, as it were, of taking testimony, and reporting their conclusions to the Congress of the United States, in reference to the propriety of encouraging or restraining Chinese immigration from the Asiatic empire to this coast, and to this port of San Francisco. The committee as a chart of our deliberations has propounded twenty-seven interrogatories, which embrace in their scope very nearly the entire question as it has been presented. If I understand our position, we are here like as in a court, and we are required on the part of those who seek to oppose Chinese immigration to make a statement of our case, and what we expect to prove in that particular. For that purpose I have allowed me one hour's time, which I shall not probably transcend, and if I do, the politeness of Mr. McCoppin has extended to me the congressional rule, lend-

ing me his time, so that I am quite sure that I shall not exceed the two hours that have been by you so kindly appropriated to the State and to the municipal government. Mr. Cameron King, who will succeed me, represents more especially what is known as the Anti-Cooly Association, or the labor element of our community, that is most directly and most particularly and most seriously affected by Chinese immigration. The economic question, therefore, will fall more within the scope of his statement than mine, although I shall advert to it.

As to the first interrogatory, "How many Chinese are there in this country?" there is of course a wide difference of opinion, and there must necessarily be, from the fact that it is data that cannot be definitely ascertained. Mr. Charles Wolcott Brooks, an intelligent merchant of our city, a consul formerly to Japan and a traveler in China, has fixed the figure in our State at 67,000 people, the lowest of any estimate that is made. The Rev. Otis Gibson, a gentleman engaged in missionary labors, now in our city and for ten years a resident of China, has fixed in his opinion the number at 150,000 upon the coast. The six Chinese companies, undoubtedly the best evidence upon these figures, fix the number at 148,600. I am informed we will be able to prove by Langley, of our Directory, an estimate of nearly 200,000. The custom-house officials, who are required by law to keep the arrivals and departures from all ports and from the Chinese ports, estimate the arrivals over departures at 124,000, but they do not embrace the three years of 1848, 1849, and 1850–'51—three years, and three years of important Chinese immigration. It will be remembered by the Senator from California, (Mr. Sargent,) by our member of Congress, (Mr. Piper,) and by the old residents, that when California was admitted into the Union, on the 8th day of December, 1850, the Chinese formed a large and imposing feature of the celebration upon that occasion, and also upon the following Fourth of July celebration; and the prejudice not having at that time become so great as now, the people were rather encouraged in these demonstrations of their numbers and their peculiar displays. I should therefore fix, in my own opinion, and think we will be able to show to you by testimony, that the Chinese in this country, embracing the State and coast, number about from 150,000 to 175,000. In the city of San Francisco the estimate also varies, and varies from reasonable causes. San Francisco is the heart and hive and home of all the Chinese upon this coast. Our Chinese quarter, as it is called, is their place really of residence. If they go to a wash-house in the vicinity, to a suburban manufactory, to gardening near the town, or if to build railroads in San Bernardino or on the Colorado, or to reclaim tule lands in the interior, their departure thence is temporary and their return here is certain; therefore, the number in San Francisco depends upon seasons and the contract-labor market.

We think we shall be able to show that in the winter we have from 60,000 to 75,000 residents within the limits of our city, and in the summer, as at this season of the year, when labor is abundant, when the farmers are employing them, when streams are low, and the tule-labor is expensive, and railroad-work is being somewhat extensively prosecuted, there are about 30,000. The estimate of two intelligent police-officers, Duffield and Rogers, and of others, fixes the limit at the present time at about 30,000, and later in the year at from 65,000 to 70,000. This is what we suppose we will be able to maintain with reference to your first interrogatory.

In regard to your second interrogatory, "What is their moral and physical condition?" we shall depend very extensively upon the personal

observation that we have no doubt this commission will make in reference to these people themselves. Mr. William J. Shaw, a senator of our State, and an extensive traveler in the eastern nations, pronounces them as immoral to the very last degree. Their physicial condition is a matter rather of observation than comment. We may say, however, in reference to their moral condition, they are atheists and heathens. They believe in Confucius, without following his moral precepts. They worship their ancestors, without very practical philanthropy to their existing ones, and they worship the tablets of their ancestors which are raised in commemoration of their dead. Their system of marriage is polygamous. They marry one wife and she is the wife of honor. They take as many second wives and concubines as their means will command. Prostitution is a legitimized and recognized profession, as honored as any of the mere menial and lower professions in China, outranks that of the actor, and stands but second to that of the lawyer. As to their physical condition in the southern parts of the country, elephantiasis is common. Leprosy, the scourge of eastern nations, which wipes families from the face of the earth, is common among them, and is introduced here, notwithstanding the denial of my learned friend Mr. Brooks that any such thing exists. We have already shipped by our health-office and our supervisors some seventeen of them, and if it shall please this commission to look upon a few more, the police out of their hospitals and dens will be able to show you examples of the most fearful, loathsome, and terrible diseases with which civilization has been infected, and which of itself is a sufficient menace to justify you in keeping a family and race from the continent that might by any possibility introduce it into the Saxon or American blood. They murder their infant children who are females, to keep down the redundancy of their population. These are facts not to be so easily proved before you here, but they are the concurrent testimony of travelers found in all books and in all matters pertaining to and touching an accurate and exact description of Chinese morals and Chinese manners. The last book that I have seen upon the subject is "Social Life in China," I think by the Rev. Mr. Doolittle. In regard to an oath, we shall be able to show you by the police-officers, who are authority upon that subject; by the police-magistrates and judges of courts having jurisdiction in civil cases all over the city; by such men as Judge Lake, Judge Blake, and Judge Louderbock—the one who has presided and the other who now presides over our municipal criminal court—that they are utterly regardless of an oath. An oath conveys to them no sense of obligation to tell the truth. We have experimented and exploited in many directions to determine how to enforce the oath and how to perfect it; how to bind their conscience, or how to reach the truth. We have burnt little paper with characters upon it. We have brought roosters into our court and cut off their heads and sworn these pagans by their blood; we have burned red papers with Chinese characters imprinted thereon; we have sworn them upon our religious works, the Bible of both kinds, the Douayan and the St. James' version; we have placed their hands upon the cross and we have had them uplifted to the heaven where for them there is no God, and still we have been unable to obtain the truth, until the testimony of all our judges and all our professional men is that the Chinese conscience knows no such thing as an obligation to tell the truth. The wives which are bought, (as they are bought,) are hired for prostitution, so says the Rev. Mr. Loomis, who is authority upon that subject, as well as upon the fact that female children are killed in China. I might refer

to the page for the testimony of this fact, which we will be able to show, but I presume the committee will take my statement without questioning it. It is page 56 of what is known as the Chinese Immigration Testimony taken by this State. The testimony of Mr. Badlam, the assessor; of Mr. Louderback, our judge; of Dr. Toland and Dr. Shaw may also be brought to bear on the question of "what is their moral and physical condition." Their physical condition will also embrace what is the physical condition of the females who are among us. We have four thousand Chinese women within the borders of our State. We have two thousand Chinese women who are domiciled in the city of San Francisco plying their vocation of prostitution. The testimony, as we will show it to you in this examination, will fix the figure at about 1,200, and that within the past few months our city government has been making renewed efforts to enforce its municipal ordinances in the direction of abating many of the nuisances abounding in our town, of which prostitution is one, and many of the Chinese women have been driven from us to the interior region of the State. We have never yet succeeded in driving them out of the State. We only turn them over to our country, rural, mountain, and valley neighbors.

Dr. Toland's testimony will be found on page 103, taken under oath; and for fear that we may not be able to obtain the doctor's testimony before you—it is so important and he occupies so high a position in our community as a gentleman and professional man—that the committee will indulge me if I recall in a word or two his statement. Dr. Toland, sworn, says, in answer to the interrogatory about Chinese houses of prostitution and whether they are open to small boys, and whether boys are diseased:

I have seen boys eight and ten years old with diseases they told me they contracted in Jackson street. It is astonishing how soon they commence indulging in that passion. Some of the worst cases of syphilis I have ever seen in my life occur in children not more than ten or twelve years old.

* * * * * * *

You will find children from twelve to fifteen that are often diseased. In consequence of neglect they finally become the worst cases we have to treat.

* * * * * * *

A great many of these children get secondary syphilis, and it runs until it becomes almost incurable.

* * * * * * *

The disease is hereditary, and will be transmitted to the children.

* * * * * * *

It will fill our hospitals with invalids, and I think it would be a very great relief to the younger portion of the community to get rid of them.

In answer to the interrogatory "to what extent do these diseases come from Chinese prostitutes?" he answers:

I suppose nine-tenths. * * * I am satisfied, from my experience, that nearly all the boys in town who have venereal disease, contracted it in Chinatown. They have no difficulty there, for the prices are so low that they can go whenever they please. The women do not care how old the boys are, whether five years old or more, so long as they have money.

"This is a most frightful condition of things," adds the learned physician. The testimony of Dr. Shorb substantiates this testimony by saying:

The presence of Chinese women here has made prostitution excessively cheap, and it has given these boys an opportunity to gratify themselves at very slight cost.

And so on from page to page.

Senator SARGENT. Dr. Toland alludes to Jackson street. I suppose it is well known that that means the Chinese quarter.

Mr. PIXLEY. It is the Chinese quarter, the place where these people are located. Dr. Toland is at the present moment East, and we shall not be able to have him before the committee. He is the founder of what is known as Toland's Hospital. He presented it, a magnificent gift, to the University of the State of California, and is a resident of twenty-seven years, recognized as standing among the first of his profession in this city; not only first in point of professional reputation, but as a gentleman of truth and veracity. Therefore, gentlemen, in answer to your second interrogatory, "What is their moral and physical condition?" we say that their moral condition is as bad and degraded as four thousand years of heathenism can make it, and that their physical condition is as low as the practice of all the crimes that have been known since history was written can make it.

In reply to your third interrogatory, "Do they come here voluntarily, and by what means do they get here?" we answer, frankly, "Yes, they come here voluntarily, so far as the males are concerned. They come here, many of them, under contracts of labor, but those labor-contracts are voluntarily entered into, and they are, therefore, in that sense, free immigrants to our coast. As to the women, it will be in proof before you that many of them are free, but most of them are not. They are brought by fraud, by violence, and by compulsion. They are bought as tender infants from their mothers for purposes of pursuing their vocation. They are bought there in China for the purpose of extradition to send abroad." Right here I will advert to a point which naturally comes up. You ask, "Why do not our municipal ordinances regulate these things?" and as your concluding question seems to suggest, "Have we not the power to regulate and prevent Chinese prostitutes from coming to California, under the laws of Congress, and under the police and health regulations of the State?" I answer, "Yes, up to the time when Judge Field rendered a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, deciding that a sovereign State had no power to determine whether its people should be polluted and its morals in its society invaded by these Chinese." We thought we had that power up to that time, and had been contending for it in our State courts and in our city courts for the last twenty years. But the question is, "Why do we not prevent it?" In one particular I will answer, that when a Chinese ship comes laden with four hundred women indentured to prostitution under contracts in writing, and when the question is brought up as to whether prostitutes shall be permitted to land, we are met by the answer, "They are not prostitutes;" and they are not. They are pure virgins, brought here untouched and untainted, in order to command a better market than they would if they should bring a second-class quality, and that defeats the law.

The third interrogatory is, "Do they come here voluntarily, and by what means do they get here?" Very many of them undoubtedly come upon their own means. It requires but the little sum of forty dollars. Chinese labor commands in China from three to ten dollars per month. Those who have not the means to come by themselves; after the first came and made money, they returned money to aid their friends and relatives as all our European immigrants in the early times used to do. There are undoubtedly many instances where the Chinese six companies, or wealthy members of them, send to bring them here, and order that they may go upon their roll and become laborers, out of which they make money as middle men or agents. The Central Pacific Railroad demanded ten thousand of these laborers, and this demand was greater than the market afforded. Through the six companies they sent their

money to China, and brought them here, and that is the way in which they come.

Interrogatory 4. "For what purpose do they come? With the intention of remaining and making the United States their home, or returning to China when they have acquired a competence?" Our answer to "for what purpose do they come?" is embraced in the single word "money." They come for coin. They come from poverty, from destitution, from low wages, from bad government, from a redundant and overwhelming population to a free government, to liberty, protection, labor, remunerative wages, and the object of their coming is that they may obtain here by their wages money enough to return and enjoy their accumulation in the land of their birth. It is in testimony, or will be, that two or three or four hundred dollars is a competency; five hundred dollars is independence; a thousand dollars is a liberal fortune. Upon it they may exist, because the cost of living is confined to but a few pence or a few cents a day.

"Do they come with the intention of remaining and making the United States their home, or returning to China when they have acquired a competence?"

Mr. Shaw, in his testimony, page 23, says, "All Chinese contemplate returning." They must be buried in Celestial soil. Their superstition and their religion is that there is no approach to the heavenly or celestial realm except from the Celestial Kingdom. The spirits of those who are buried here wander in darkness throughout the ages, separated from their ancestors, which is a serious bereaval to them. Therefore, when they come to this country they intend to return, from superstitions and patriotic ideas; and it is so thoroughly ingrained into their history and superstition that they enter into a contract that if they die pending their contract their bodies shall be returned to China. When you see a burial passing through our streets; when you see the express wagon passing along our avenues burning Joss papers and throwing out upon either side of their street their little clippings of white and colored paper, they are taking their dead to the cemetery, not for burial, but for deposit until an accumulation is sufficient to justify the charter of the whole of a ship that shall carry them all back to the port from whence they came. Twenty-seven years have demonstrated the purpose of the Chinese in coming to this city, and, as I said, they come to make a stake and return. We have a law in our State of a most liberal character in reference to the exemption of property from execution. It is known as the homestead law. It gives to every head of a family, father or mother, or to every guardian or person who stands in the relation of guardian and supporter of those who are dependent upon them, a homestead to the extent of five thousand dollars. If any Chinese homestead in the State of California has ever been carved out under our law I have never heard of it. It is possible that it may be so, but I have never met in my practice such a thing as a Chinese homestead, or heard of it. They have bought some little property, not to exceed, I think, about $150,000 of real estate in the quarter in which they live. That I will refer to when we come to answer the interrogatory as to the effect of their residence upon real estate.

"Do they become attached to our institutions and reconciled to live and die here?" This is the fifth interrogatory. They have no love for our institutions. They have no knowledge of our institutions. There are many of them who are intelligent in trade, intelligent in the books of Confucius and the classics of the Chinese Empire; but I presume there is not one in this State who could answer intelligently what was

the form or scope or object of our constitutional government. There is, we believe, no single instance where a Chinaman has resolved upon becoming a permanent citizen. There are some like Billy Hoodlum, of Sacramento, who have drifted along from year to year, who came here in 1848 and have never yet been able to return; but the dream and hope of their returning is as strong with them as with the Parisian that he may eat his income on the boulevards of Paris. They take no step in the direction of citizenship, and, as I have said, they acquire no homes. Some few in some States I believe have made a declaratory statement of intention to become citizens of the United States. Of course, no one born not upon the soil has become a citizen, because the law inhibits it, but that there is anything like a desire among them to become citizens or to be interested in our administration of affairs, we believe there is no such thing. They have no love for our institutions, no regard for our laws, and do not exhibit even the curiosity of ordinarily intelligent travelers to understand our form of government. Their only interest in our law is to take advantage of it and in their self-interest to evade it.

Interrogatory 6. "What kind of labor do they perform?" Mr. King will dilate upon this at greater length than I shall. I will only say that they perform all kinds of light labor, and that particularly which requires no capital; and they are expert in that which requires dextrous manipulation of the fingers—as the assorting of wool, working in silks, the rolling of cigars, and such matters as that. They are imitative and quick to learn, and they have monopolized many of the branches of our industry. Laundry-work, cigar-making, slippers, sewing-machine labor, they have very nearly monopolized. They are largely employed as domestic servants and as office-boys. In assorting and repacking teas, in silk and woolen manufactories, in fruit-picking, in gardening, in harvesting, in building levees for the restoration of tule lands, in railroad-building, in placer-mining, in basket-peddling of vegetables and fruits, in fishing and peddling fish, are among the most noted of their industries, and from these industries that I have named they have nearly driven out the entire white labor. They do not, as a rule, work in underground mines, nor in tunnels, nor in heavy stone-work. They are rarely found in the forest; they are rarely used as teamsters, for heavy hauling; and, as a rule, they never perform any work that is both heavy and dangerous, or that is heavy or dangerous. To say what they do, one of the strongest points is what they do not do. They have introduced to our State not one single one of the peculiar industries of China. In our earlier and gushing period over the Chinese, we said to ourselves: "They will introduce here the culture of tea and rice, and the manufacture of silks; we shall have all their curious industries, and all their new productions." Not one acre of land has yet been devoted to the culture of rice; not one shrub to the production of tea; not one single industry has been introduced, so far as I am advised, that is peculiar to the Chinese people. Their character as laborers will also come within Mr. King's discussion more properly than within the division which I have chosen for myself.

"What is their character as laborers?" Many of them are most excellent and good laborers. It would be unwise for us to assume what is not recognized as a truth in relation to this fact. Many of the Chinese are very good laborers, indeed. They do not, as a rule, work as rapidly, nor do they perform their work as well, as white laborers—and this is especially true of those pursuits requiring skill. They are imitative, industrious, and patient. They are not as strong or as brave as the

white laborer. They cannot endure as hard labor. They are not conscientious in relation to their contractors. The individual servant who hires in domestic life will leave without notice, and the whole relation of employer and employé on the part of Chinese is simply and purely a question of selfishness and money-making, as it probably is to everybody else, in relation to employers. They are good farm-laborers; they are good railroad-builders; they are good levee-constructors, and many of them are excellent domestic servants. They fill the menial positions of the country well, and I remember once, in the earlier times, to have heard Senator Casserly in a speech say—it was when John Parrott was building, or shortly after he had built, his grand block at the corner of California and Sixth streets, out of blocks chiseled in China, marked, numbered, and sent here, and put up as the building now stands—that the danger of Chinese immigration was because they were good laborers. I thought it was a heresy at the time, but I have become convinced that Mr. Casserly was wiser than I, and that one of the dangers to our laboring population is because the Chinese do labor so well.

"Do they learn trades and work in factories?" I answer, yes; they learn trades whenever the opportunity presents itself. They are anxious to learn trades, and the history of one or two trades will illustrate why they are anxious to do so. In the early time the slipper manufactory was the best branch of the shoe business in California. Slippers were imported from France at a cost of three or four dollars, or three dollars and a half per dozen pairs. The importer could afford to pay six, seven, or eight dollars for a dozen, and the retailer was glad to obtain them at a dollar and a quarter a pair, which paid fifteen dollars upon an original cost of some four or five. A Frenchman conceived the idea of introducing the manufacture of slippers into San Francisco, and did it. Every Chinaman whom he employed in turn became a manufacturer. It required no capital. A single piece of sole leather and the remnant of a carpet was the stock in trade; and to-day the Chinaman has driven France from the field, and occupies the position in the slipper trade. The cigar manufactory went through the same process. Originally, the Germans had the cigar trade. In their zeal or over-zeal for profits, they introduced Chinese labor to their shops. They instructed Chinese cigar-manufacturers, and to-day the Chinaman controls the manufacture of cigars in the city of San Francisco. The same result has been partially accomplished in the shoe trade, especially in the making of coarse brogan shoes. And so in very many of the trades, they have either driven out the white people entirely, or they have driven their profits down to starvation points.

In response to question 9, "What rate of wages do they receive?" the Chinaman begins to work for what wages he can get. A domestic servant will go into your family upon his immediate arrival in San Francisco for three dollars a week. If the mistress of the house will teach him English, or if the benevolent maiden lady of his neighborhood will invite him to her class in Sunday-school until he can speak a little English, he will increase his wages; and as he learns to cook and learns to talk, he learns to demand a higher and better compensation for his labor, until he finally reaches the highest point that his labor will demand, from three dollars at first to eight dollars a week. Skilled labor receives, according to proficiency, from fifty cents to a dollar per day; railroad and tule laborers from sixty cents to $1.10 a day; farm hands, a dollar a day; fruit pickers, about one dollar; and these various people boarding themselves.

The tenth question is, "How does their employment affect white

labor?" and here comes the question, "How does their employment affect our white labor?" We answer, and this is the burden of our arraignment of this Chinese immigration; it is not our sympathy for the wealthy classes, it is our sympathy for the labor classes, upon which, whatever may be our feelings, depends really the whole superstructure of our Government. The true American hero is the man who takes his dinner out in his tin plate, works all day, six days in the week, and brings his wages home for his wife to expend in the maintenance and education of the family, in their clothing and in their protection. Chinese labor drives this class of people from the field. It drives them to starvation. It is a competition that they cannot undertake. The white race, owing to centuries of physical treatment, is incompetent to enter upon the race. The man who labors in our streets and city, and in our country, has been, as have his fathers for generations before him, fed on meat and bread. He demands meat and bread to maintain his physical strength and his existence. Meat and bread command more money than labor will pay for at Chinese rates in any place in America, and especially in California. The Chinaman from generations has been in the habit of living upon rice, tea, dried fish, and desiccated vegetables. The kind of food which will support the Chinaman can in San Francisco be purchased for ten cents a day, and the kind of food which is required to support an American or European laborer cannot be bought for several times that amount. The American laborer has other matters that he may not set aside. He has a wife. The Chinaman is an adult male who has no wife, no family, no child. Our white laborers are, as a rule, married, and fathers and heads of families, and according to our mode of civilization the poorest laborer with the poorest wife must occupy a room by himself for his bed and must have at least another room to cook and eat in. If he has a boy and a girl growing to ages of puberty, the boy must have a room for himself and the girl must have a room for herself, and both must be separate from the parents' bed. It is the ingrained decency of our civilization. It is as impossible to change it as it is to change us from the worship of the Christian God to the heathen tablet. Chinamen in a double room like this would throw a partition through the center, and build bunks on the side and lie down upon the floor. They would cook their tea and dried rice in a brazier not bigger than a spittoon. One hundred of them would live in this room, while the poorest Christian family of five in the State would think themselves crammed in double the space. In your minds you may drift off to see how this affects rents. Sixty thousand people live in six or seven blocks of this city. If 60,000 adult male laborers could take their place, we would have 60,000 Christian white working-men. According to the statistics, five people to every adult male laborer, we would have five times 60,000, which would be 300,000 additional white people to build over our peninsula, to extend our city, to extend our trade and our commerce to all the ramifications of our business. These Chinamen have no duties to perform to the State. They are not jurymen to determine between contests of life and property. They cannot be called out as the *posse comitatus* in the case of riots or breaches of the law, and in case of war or invasion they have no duty of a soldier to perform. They buy but little property and pay but a limited amount of taxes. They so live that they pay but little rents. The result of 4,000 years of experiment of a shrewd, intelligent, subtle, economical race is brought to bear upon the practical fact how they can come to California to make money and go home, and the practical result is to drive our kind of labor absolutely to starvation; and the public man who seeks to find any other solution for it or any mode to techni-

cally evade it as a result does it in defiance of the facts and in defiance of philosophy.

Interrogatory 11. Do they prevent the emigration of white labor to this coast from Europe and from the Eastern States? Just to the extent that white labor is intelligent in Europe and the Eastern States, just to that extent do they not come to California. This is a matter really of opinion, and to which evidence cannot be directly brought. We reason that European and eastern immigration comes from among the labor classes. That is the kind of immigration at all events that we want. We have enough traders, enough lawyers, enough professional men, enough bankers, enough capital, enough pawnbrokers already in this State. What we need is hard-working, industrious men and women. That is the kind of immigration we seek to cultivate and it is the class from which the immigrating class come. They come from among the labor classes. The first inducement for them to come from Europe to America is to find remunerative employment. Unless we can present this inducement, all others, such as climate, good government, chances of education, freedom in politics, and freedom to worship God, are stopped. To get work and wages is the first requisite. Unless these can be assured the emigrant will not dare to come.

If, then, our labor is monopolized by a class that can underbid the Eastern and European laborer; if it is monopolized by men who have no families, nor children, nor taxes, nor ambition of becoming citizens; who do not require family domiciles nor meat diet; who have no public duty to perform; can neither be jurors nor of the *posse comitatus* in time of peace nor soldiers in time of war—how can the Eastern or the European man of family, or hope of family, subject himself to the competition?

We know he cannot; and it is dishonest in us to invite the immigrant laborer till we have solved this Chinese problem by excluding him from the State.

We of California must give this coast up to Asia or we must reserve it for ourselves and our race. If our State of California is to become the skirmish-line upon which the white and yellow races are to contend for mastery, it should be determined now, in the early history of the State; if the battle between Paganism and Christianity—between heathenism and civilization—is to be fought out here and now, we ask the Congress of the United States to advise us of the fact.

Our answer, then, to interrogatory 11 is, that Chinese emigration does prevent white labor from coming to this coast, both from the Eastern States and from Europe.

The 12th interrogatory is: "What is the condition of their health and their habits of cleanliness and sanitary regulations?" Presuming that the interrogatory covers both grounds, that is to say, their habits of cleanliness in China and here, we have the testimony of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Walcott Brooks in about this language. Says Mr. Shaw:

> Peking, in my opinion, is one of the filthiest cities to be found.
> * * * * * * *
> The Chinese are not a cleanly people in China.

The Rev. Mr. Gibson says:

> The Chinese are not a cleanly people here.

Says Mr. Charles Walcott Brooks: "Chinese quarters are filthy here and filthy in China, and they are very much overcrowded." Officer Duffield will state in his testimony that the Chinese quarter is a filthy quarter, "dirtier and filthier than the Five Points were," which was supposed to have been the dirtiest place in America. As to their sani-

tary condition, we shall bring upon the stand Dr. Meares, one of our most competent physicians, who stands at the head of our health department here, to show what is the sanitary condition of the people as they exist in this city. I think we shall be able to show to you that the small-pox that is now for the second time raging in our city was brought here by Chinese emigrant-ships. The small-pox, as I understand it, is an institution of China as permanent as the Tartar dynasty, and as old. It is there not as an epidemic, but it is an ever-existing, present plague, and it is becoming so in the city of San Francisco. San Francisco has had no exemption from small-pox since it was first introduced by the Chinese, sometimes more severe, sometimes less severe, according to the different seasons; but with that breeding-pest of 30,000 to 60,000 Chinamen in the heart of our city, if it were not for our climate the small-pox would drive us into the sea.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they resort to vaccination?

Mr. PIXLEY. The Chinese resort to inoculation. Vaccination they do not believe in. They inoculate for the disease of small-pox by a preparation through the nose. Dr. Meares will correct me if I make a mistake. Thus they acquire the small-pox. They go to a village, as I understand it, and enough physicians will be sent there to divide the whole community and inoculate them all at the same time, or take them in quarters and sections so as to inoculate them. They are all sick then with the small-pox, but in a subordinate type, not a dangerous type.

Dr. MEARES. They inoculate as they formerly did in Europe. Inoculation is compulsory in China.

Mr. PIXLEY. It is an institution of the country. Here they will only be vaccinated by the enforcement of our health ordinance. In reference to this matter, the chief of police also will make a statement, so that you will have a general idea of our answer to that interrogatory.

The CHAIRMAN. What is their longevity in this country?

Mr. PIXLEY. I have never seen any table of longevity. I do not know. I will endeavor to examine that question if there are any authorities within my reach.

To the 13th interrogatory, "From what ports of China do they come?" we may answer that there are five or six ports. They come in small numbers from all these ports, but the great majority of them come from the city of Canton, the port of which is Hong-Kong, the English sailing-port. They are, therefore, mainly from Canton, through Hong-Kong.

Interrogatory 14. Do any sail directly from Chinese ports, or do they all come by way of Hong-Kong?—A. That I have just answered. The great bulk of our Chinese immigration comes from the vicinity of Canton through the English port of Hong-Kong.

The 15th interrogatory is, "In what way do they live in the city?"

Now, we hope and we expect that the honorable commissioners will visit our Chinese quarter and give it a thorough inspection; that they will visit and observe for themselves how these people live and how they die. The mayor and chief of police will extend to the honorable commission an invitation to visit the Chinese quarter, under the protection and guardianship of our police, who are familiar with all these purlieus, and we believe, gentlemen, that you will see such a spectacle of squalor, filth, disease, wretchedness, and crime as you never before witnessed, and, as we believe, exists in no other portion of the civilized world. You will recognize that it is a misfortune and a disgrace to our city that it should be permitted to exist. You will go down into underground tunnels. You will see that they pass from street to street by underground excavations. You will find them living down two or three

stories deep in the earth, under sidewalks, in rooms divided, as I understand it, in the garret, and on their roofs, and on their balconies. In what way do they live? You will be better convinced by personal observation, by seeing their sights, hearing their one-string fiddles, smelling their diverse smells, visiting their hospitals, and witnessing their sick, than by any evidence that we can produce to you except the evidence of photography. We hope to be able to lay before you a series of views which will illustrate somewhat the condition of these people in their homes. I should not have used the word "home," because the 17th interrogatory, as to how many have families, leads me to the assertion that there is no domestic life among the Chinese in California. Mr. Gibson, the clergyman who is engaged in proselyting these people, and who keeps a home for the reclamation of prostitutes and other oppressed people, says there are one hundred wives in California; but he calls a woman a wife who is reclaimed from a den of prostitution and married to some unfortunate victim who is willing to take her. Plurality of wives is common in China, and concubinage is common, says Mr. Gibson. The true fact is, that the men here who have wives are merchants and business men, wealthy men, and that they are nominal wives. They are not the wives of honor. They are not the wives as would be the first wife if they were in China, but they occupy that relation to them here that is common as Americans know as the mistress to the man. If there is one respectable Chinese family tested by the requirements of our civilization, the husband who has but one wife, or the wife who has but one husband, whose marriage-vows were made in love and fidelity before any authority or any altar that binds their conscience, who have a home in California, and who intend to remain in California and to preserve the marital relations until parted by death, we do not know of it. If Mr. Brooks, or Mr. Bee, the attorney of the six Chinese companies can find such a domicile we hope they may ask the commission to visit it. By "family" we do not mean the concubine for wife, nor husband whose wife of honor, according to the polygamist system of China, is left behind. We do not mean one of the Rev. Mr. Gibson's kind of families, where a rescued prostitute is dignified by the honorable title of wife for ten dollars paid for uniting the bands. Family! I think we shall be able to show, literally, that there is not a family, as we understand the honorable and sacred relation of the family tie, among the Chinese in the whole State, or on the entire coast.

Interrogatory 18. "How many Chinese women are there in this country, and what is their condition and character? Are they free, or are they bought and sold as slaves?" Our answer is that we shall prove that there are 4,000 Chinese women in the State. There are from 1,200 to 2,000 in the city, and they are all prostitutes or concubines, or second wives. This testimony we will prove by Governor Low, and we shall prove by him that they are shipped here against their will and sold by their parents for this thing in China. We shall show by Mr. Shaw, and by reference to his testimony, that prostitution in China is a profession, and not a disgrace. We shall show by the police that houses of prostitution hold their inmates here in bondage. We shall show that they are bought and sold, and transferred by bills of sale, like cattle, and as slaves were in the pre-rebellion time. We shall show that they command a market-price like any other human chattel which has ever been subjected to the market for the sale of service.

Their condition, then, being slavery, we answer that their character is indicated by their vocation. They are prostitutes of the most debased and abandoned kind. Their value is from three to nine hundred dol-

lars; the price being governed by the health, age, and comeliness of the chattel.

In these contracts which are made, provisions are introduced that in the event that the woman shall become leprous, or that she shall be destroyed by venereal disease, or that she shall become, in the language as interpreted to us, a "stone-woman," then the contract is made void. The necessity of introducing these clauses is proof before you of the existence of leprosy, of the existence of venereal diseases, and of the fact that they may become "stone-women," whatever that may mean. For that, I suppose, we may draw upon our imagination.

"How many Chinese companies are there, and how are they organized?" (This is the 19th interrogatory.) There are six Chinese companies, and I shall also answer to the 20th interrogatory: "Are they organized to make money, and in what way do they make it, or are they relief or benevolent associations?" I have found some difficulty in answering this question to my own satisfaction, but my opinion is that the Chinese six companies are the growth of our Chinese immigration, and the result of the peculiar circumstances attending the large influx of Chinese to our coast; that they were the natural growth of necessities that called them into existence. They are peculiar to California, and have no protection under our law, and no recognized authority or existence in China. They are voluntary organizations, without any recognition of law. They have features belonging both to relief and benevolent societies, and to business and money-making organizations. I think their growth came in this way: As from the different ports and localities of China the pioneer came to the coast, as he sent back for his relatives and friends and aided them by money, or induced them by his advice or by the statement of the El Dorado that he found to exist here, and the labor-bonanza that paid him so richly, he induced his neighbor and relative from the same village, the same family, and the same locality to come to California to partake with him of the benefits of this newly-discovered El Dorado. The second comers naturally would come consigned to their old neighbors, and the fact of vicinage and neighborhood would naturally bring them together, and out of it would come a natural result of association and of organization. When this necessity was found to exist, and when it was practically inaugurated by an organization, the benevolent feature was introduced; that is, they take these people; they provide for them when they have money to pay; they furnish them with labor when they are able to labor, and when they can find contracts for them. They sometimes make advances especially for food and material and tools to go into the mines, the tules, or elsewhere; they open an account with them; they contract their labor; they receive the pay from the original contractor and open an account with each Chinese cooly, if you please to call him that, although I do not use the word "cooly" very much in my arguments with reference to the Chinese. They open an account with them, charging them large interest for advances, charging percentage for acting as their agent, and finally when the debit and credit account is balanced and they are out of debt then the Chinaman is free. The association is a voluntary one, and being in this relation they arbitrate and settle difficulties among each other. Members of the same company naturally submit to the officer of their company the arbitrament of their difficulties, and if the members of one company are imposed upon or their rights infringed by the members of another, the natural result is to bring an adjustment between these two companies; and thus arbitraments and courts and settlements are brought about. I have no doubt that I shall be able also to prove in

addition to this that there are secret tribunals exercising a criminal and civil jurisdiction, an *imperium in imperio*, if that is the correct Latin; that they have tribunals and enforce penalties, even to the extent that property and life bear enforcement. We think we shall be able to show, by good testimony, that it is a common practice for them secretly to advertise the payment of money for the assassination of informers and enemies, and that this institution is so secret and so subtle and so close as to have defied the scrutiny of detective police or the investigation of the courts.

Senator SARGENT. Has there ever been any evidence to show that it was necessary to get the consent of the company to which the Chinaman belonged to enable him to procure passage back to China?

Mr. PIXLEY. Yes; and that comes in very properly as an incident. We shall be able to show that when a Chinaman is a creditor for money or a creditor for obligation he cannot leave the State of California except by the consent of the company to which he belongs; that if a member of the Se-Yap Company owes any other member of the Se-Yup Company, or owes to it as an association, he will receive no permit. An arrangement has been made between the associated six Chinese companies and the Steam Navigation Company, the Oriental line, that they will not pass them except upon obtaining a certificate that they are free on the books of the companies. That was the rule up to a short time ago, when Mr. Gibson, claiming to represent another class of Chinese that did not owe jurisdiction to the six companies, to wit, the members of his school and the converts to his religion, with Mr. Gallagher and others, I believe, went to the Chinese Steam Company and demanded that their certificate should pass equally with the certificate of a member of the Chinese six companies, and it was admitted; so that Mr. Gibson says in one place in his testimony that he was permitted to send away Chinese for $12, when without that permit they would be compelled to pay $100 for their passage, which was one of the inducements, by the way, of becoming members of the Christian Church.

As to "what was the condition of these people in China before coming here," we have the evidence of Governor Low and Mr. Shaw and others, travelers, which will be found spread out in these pages, but they really after all are so utterly incomplete and unsatisfactory as compared with better standards of information, such as Maunder's Treasury of Knowledge, Knight's Encyclopedia, the American Encyclopedia, and the various travelers and missionaries who have been abroad in China and have written books, Mr. Williams's book and others, which I presume are within the general reading of the gentlemen of the commission, that it seems almost impossible for us to introduce testimony upon this point. We may ask, in reply to the last interrogatory, which is a legal question, to file a brief upon it. Perhaps we may ask for the privilege of filing an essay in answer to the question as to what was the condition of the people in China before coming here.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that there are no similar organizations in China this year?

Mr. PIXLEY. No, sir; not as I understand. I have never been able to understand that there are, nor that these have any relation back to any organization. They have no branches, but they deal with individuals through what is called the hospital at Canton where all their emigrants go, and they are recognized as authority in relation to California matters. When this agitation was started to arrest the influx of Chinese to this State, many of these intelligent members of the Chinese

six companies agreed with intelligent Americans upon the necessity of preventing the Chinese from coming in the condition of public opinion at that time, and, as I understand, they telegraphed and communicated back to the hospital at Hong-Kong, and from that radiated the information in various places that they sought to send them. The result was that it did prevent, to a very large degree, the incoming of these Chinese. They not only did that, but they went further. They not only wrote and recommended them not to come, but they recommended to their consignors in China saying, "Do not send us any goods upon which there is more than a certain number of Chinese to come," as they feared, perhaps, that their goods would not be safe, or at all events it was a very effective mode, a practical mode, of preventing the Chinese from coming to the extent that they were coming then. And I may here remark, and will prove, that at that time they were coming at the rate of some three or four thousand a month; between five and six thousand came. Upon every ship that arrived there came from eight to twelve hundred. Special sailing-vessels were contracted for in Canton, specially in English, and two or three English propellers had opened up an emigrant trade. In other words, there seemed to be a new impetus given to Chinese immigration. In view of the fact that they were coming so rapidly and we hearing so much about those who were coming and the ships that were chartered, it gave us the alarm which resulted in that agitation of the question.

Senator SARGENT. Unless you think of it before you conclude, let me ask you if you ever had your attention called to the reports of Mr. Bailey, our consul at Hong-Kong? You speak of the large proportion of the Chinamen coming voluntarily, of their making contracts, &c. In his dispatches to the State Department he quite fully describes the method by which the coolies are obtained, and shows that pretty much all the horrors of the middle passage occur in that traffic as carried on. He speaks of the burning of ships, &c., on account of the despair of the coolies on board of them.

Mr. PIXLEY. Does that refer to the traffic between the port of Hong-Kong and the port of San Francisco, or with Callao, in Peru, South America?

Senator SARGENT. Generally. It is illustrating the method of the immigration of these Chinese to the different ports of the world.

Mr. PIXLEY. I am not familiar with that report.

Mr. MEADE. Who is this writer?

Senator SARGENT. Mr. Bailey, the American consul at Hong-Kong. His report is published in the dispatches of the State Department.

Mr. MEADE. In what year?

Senator SARGENT. About five or six years ago.

Mr. GIBSON. It does not refer to the importation of Chinese to San Francisco.

Senator SARGENT. He was the American consul, and was speaking of the manner in which coolies were obtained for foreign traffic.

Mr. GIBSON. No Chinese ever burned the vessels when coming this way.

Senator SARGENT. No ships were burned, perhaps, but Captain Joy spoke of having to fire over the heads of the men in order to quiet them; the testimony of which we have on our table.

Mr. PIXLEY. Captain Joy was an English ship-master, of long service in the line, and brought eight hundred and thirty Chinese to this port; and he stated under oath that, in his opinion, they were pirates and river-thieves from the vicinity of Canton; that on the first part of his pas-

sage, through fear of an *émeute*, he was compelled to arm his ship in anticipation of it, and upon his arrival at Japan he had to increase his force of sailors nearly double in order to bring them safely into our port. It is the most unmistakable and clear case of evidence where eight hundred and thirty criminals, thieves and pirates, have been poured into our city of San Francisco. It is a fact that if the same ship had come from Liverpool to Boston or New York loaded with the same character of thieves and criminals from Liverpool and London, they would have been quarantined and sent back, or, if landed, it would have been the cause of a declaration of war by the United States Government against the government of England. It would have been a just cause of war. If ships would be permitted to come from Callao or Dover or London or Liverpool, or from the Baltic or the Black or the Mediterranean or any other sea, loaded with four and five and six hundred prostitutes, to ply their vocation in the city of Boston, all Beacon Hill would have blazed with indignation, and Boston would declare war against the world, and she would be right. There is no city in the world which has submitted to the wrongs resulting from congressional legislation, neglect, and judicial weakness and wickedness as the city of San Francisco and the State of California have submitted upon this question of Chinese immigration.

What is the population of China as far as can be ascertained, and the general condition, manners, customs, and institutions of the people? The population of China is estimated by the Statesman's Year-Book, which is an American authority, at 405,213,152, and, later, at 450,000,000 in round numbers. The Encyclopedia of Charles Knight, an Edinburgh book, an English authority, fixes the number at 360,279,612. Maunder's Treasury of Knowledge, one of the most reliable compilations of English literature, fixes the number at 375,100,000. Mr. Shaw (and where he obtains his figures I do not know) fixes it at 400,000,000. Governor Low, our late minister to China, for some reason, puts it still lower—at 300,000,000. Charles Walcott Brooks puts the figure at 413,267,030. Mr. Doolittle, the author of Social Life of the Chinese, fixes the number at from 348,000,000 to 435,000,000.

The inquiry as to the general condition, manners, customs, and institutions of the people, I have stated as rather a matter consistent for argument and proof.

What is their religion, and what progress have the missionaries made in their conversion to Christianity?

Their religion is Buddhism. If anybody understands exactly what Buddhism is, I do not. They worship their ancestors, and they worship the tablets of their ancestors. The Chinese are superstitious. They burn paper and tapers around their dead. They feed their dead on roast pork and chickens, and rice, and milk, and tea. They believe that they can only go to the celestial realm from the Celestial Kingdom. They are an idolatrous people.

Senator SARGENT. What do you mean by tablets, worshiping the tablets of their ancestors?

Mr. PIXLEY. In the early history of the reign of Tien-tsien, which occurred, I believe, about the era of the birth of Christ, a prince was traveling upon the high road during a time of famine, and a faithful officer of his government cut off a piece of his own flesh and roasted it for his imperial master. Subsequently he fell wearied by the way-side, and the forest burned and he was destroyed. The prince upon finding it out erected a tablet in memory of the fact of his devotion to his prince, and that is one of the traditions by which tablets were introduced.

Mr. MEADE. Is it a tombstone?

Mr. PIXLEY. They are wooden tablets. The tablets are now from two or three inches to some feet in height. There are domestic tablets and there are individual tablets. They are a sort of rude carving on wood, which are found all over their houses and in domestic life, everywhere in their forests, intended to commemorate their dead ancestors. The tablet is a sort of memorial or reminder of the existence of these ancestors and their veneration and respect for them.

There is another tradition in regard to the origin of this custom. The love of parents and affection to the family is a very leading feature of the Chinese faith, or superstition, even. In the very early time a Chinaman was guilty of some rudeness, I think to his wife, perhaps to his mother-in-law, and afterward repenting, he made a little image of her, the departed one, and on one occasion when he was beating his wife she pricked the image and the image bled and shed tears as a sort of indignant protest against his treatment in the domestic and family relation. That is one of the traditions away back into the misty regions of the past of the origin of these tablets; but however it came, by whoever discovered, it is one of the leading features of worship in China.

As to what progress the missionaries have made in their conversion to Christianity, I am afraid I meet the consideration of this question with almost irreverent levity. Mr. Otis Gibson, on page 28 of this work before me, says that in the State of California there are a hundred converts to Christianity. The Rev. Mr. Loomis places his converts more modestly at sixty-seven, which is the result of seventeen years of very earnest and, I have no doubt, faithful labor in the cause of Christ. Leung Cook, a Chinaman, and one of the six companies now, only knows of one Chinaman convert, and believes he is in San José. That is on page 66 of the testimony which has been laid before this committee. Lee Ming Hown thinks Gibson has converted "about more than ten," which is a Chinese mode of expression for saying between ten and twenty. Mr. Louderback, who is the judge of our criminal court, thinks their Christianity does not amount to much in this country. Yung Ty, who is a Chinaman, does not know of one Christian Chinaman, and Sin How and Wong Ben give further testimony. Father Buchard, an intelligent Catholic father, a member of the Jesuit order, will state that the effort in China of his church, which is the most successful and proselyting, has been in a great degree a failure; that is, it has been unsatisfactory, to use his expression. Many are professed members of the Catholic Church; but, to use the expression of Father Spreckels to me on one occasion, he did not know but the Catholic Church came nearer to paganism than paganism to Catholicity in order to gather them nominally within the folds and to keep them within the realm of a possible salvation. In relation to their religion, it is not our religion. That is enough to say about it; because if ours is right theirs must necessarily be wrong.

Mr. BROOKS. What is our religion?

Mr. PIXLEY. Ours is a belief in the existence of a Divine Providence that holds in its hands the destinies of nations. The Divine Wisdom has said that He would divide the country and the world as the heritage of five great families; that to the blacks He would give Africa; to the whites He would give Europe; to the red man He would give America, and Asia He would give to the yellow races. He inspires us with the determination not only to have preserved our own inheritance but to have stolen from the red man America; and it is settled now that the Saxon, American or European group of families, the white race,

is to have the inheritance of Europe and of America and that the yellow races of China are to be confined to what God Almighty originally gave them; and as they are not a favorite people they are not to be permitted to steal from us what we robbed the American savage of. We are as incredulous of Christian Chinese as we are of virtuous Chinese women or Chinese families. We believe that no such evidence can be produced; and here I may say that we have the negative of this issue at all events. If Mr. Brooks and the Chinese six companies shall deem it important for the purposes of this investigation to show that a large number of them have been converted from the error of their ways, and that they have been snatched from the perils of paganism to the safety of our religious faith, it falls upon them to prove it, not us. But we believe that Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Bee and his clients, the six Chinese companies, and the clergymen who occupy the half-way relation between the Chinese and us, can produce evidence of the conversion of no single adult male Chinaman in California; and by evidence we mean such acts, to use a professional term, "works," as indicate a Christian life. In other words, I believe (and this I do not hold my associate responsible for) that the Chinese have no souls to save, and if they have, they are not worth the saving.

How has the condition of commerce between the United States and China been affected, or may it be affected, by Chinese emigration? We shall expect to be able to show that there are not to exceed four or five thousand Americans in the whole of China; that under this treaty we gain no advantages; that practically our travelers or traders are not permitted to go into the interior of China as free people, receiving there the protection of the law and the government as their people receive it here. We think we shall be able to show by the statistics of the custom-house that the balance of trade is all against us; that the money which we send there and the goods are not compensated by any adequate return. I have depended more especially upon my associate, Mr. Roach, to gather up certain statistics, and to have subpœnaed and brought before you the statistical clerk of the revenue department, to show the fact of the commercial relations. Then as to what the effect will be, is really matter of opinion and judgment, that you, gentlemen, are better calculated to judge of and decide upon than we are. The balance of trade, however, is against us. And then in answer to the question which is sometimes raised, would our interfering with emigration prevent commerce and trade with them, we say, no; that the Chinese government never wanted this treaty. It is a very nice question whether Mr. Burlingame did not make it on his own account, and whether it was ever really and in fact confirmed by the central and authoritative power of the Chinese Empire. If it was, it was in contravention of all their traditions; it was a new departure. They do not desire their Chinamen to emigrate, and they do not desire to emigrate now. They would very gladly and very willingly submit to any modification of the treaty which would limit the number of Chinese. Here I may be permitted to answer a question propounded by the chairman of the commission to Mr. McCoppin, saying, however, that it is my opinion and not the crystallization of public opinion so far as I know, that we do not expect, and have no right to expect, the absolute and positive inhibition of any Chinamen from coming to this country. Those men who have been here and who have been invited by our treaties, have rights; when they return to visit their country, they have a right to return here. If they purchase property, if they have engaged in commerce or trade or agriculture or business of any kind, they have a right to come back here and pursue

it. We cannot say that to the trader, if we do not want to alienate from us this vast and rich oriental commerce, that has built up nations and made great commercial States and rich emporiums. It may be politic and wise to admit the immigration of a certain class of these people in limited numbers. As suggested by our Senator from California, in the introduction of his bill before the Senate fixing the number that shall come upon ships, limiting them to certain numbers, and by general legislation, we should discourage and refuse to throw open this country with all its advantages and all its wealth and all its riches and all its opportunities for an unrestricted rivalry with the three or four or five hundred million of Asiatics. The condition of commerce between the United States and China, then, is a matter which will be considered more at length by others.

"What power has a State to prevent the introduction of prostitutes or vagrants from foreign parts?" The answer to this interrogatory involves the necessity of a law-brief. I think it would be well, perhaps, if the gentlemen of the commission would allow us to file a brief upon this subject. As to the power of a State in this respect, the history of our attempted legislation is very curious in this State. In the first place our municipal government of San Francisco has tried in all sorts of ways, in some very vain and foolish ones, to pass ordinances that would be calculated to restrain or restrict the Chinamen here, so as to relate back to their emigration and prevent their coming. Our supreme court has set aside quite a number of the decisions of our inferior courts. I recall to mind the case of Lin-Sing *vs.* Washburn, reported, I believe, in 20 Cal. Reports, the question involved being the right to tax Chinamen upon their arrival here and put upon them a *per capita* tax. The bench consisted of Judge Field, Judge Norton, and Judge Cope. At that time, having an official relation with the court, I had the position of maintaining the constitutionality of that law. Cope and Norton decided under the passenger-cases, or the deductions drawn from those cases, that we had no right to impose such a tax. Judge Field, at that time being the chief-justice of that bench, presented a minority decision as against the other two, dissenting from their opinion in a very full argument, to which we will refer at length when we shall submit our brief upon the legal questions involved in this discussion. The case came up recently as to whether we had a right to prevent Chinese prostitutes from landing. It was decided by our tribunals, Judge Morrison of our 4th district court, and by the State supreme court in favor of the power and of its exercise under the general authority of a sovereign State to control its own police and sanitary regulations. The supreme court, however, Justice Field, I believe, writing the opinion, at all events uniting in it, reversed that decision.

Senator SARGENT. Mr. Justice Miller wrote the opinion.

Mr. PIXLEY. Then Judge Miller wrote it, Judge Field assenting, but at all events the decision was reversed.

Mr. MEADE. In the New York case, the supreme court decided against the constitutionality of a *per capita* tax.

The CHAIRMAN. That was without regard to the character of the immigrants.

Mr. PIXLEY. I think the question here really turns upon the point of fact whether we could really prove that twenty-four women charged with being prostitutes were such.

Mr. BROOKS. The supreme court of the State sustained the opinion of Judge Morrison. Judge Field took a different view of the law. That

went to the Supreme Court of the United States and they sustained Judge Field.

Senator SARGENT. Mr. Justice Miller, in his opinion before the Supreme Court, takes the broadest ground, that no matter what the character of the immigrants may be, and no matter how revolting the consequences, the State has no power to prevent their coming to the United States; that that power resides in Congress, if it exists at all.

Mr. PIXLEY. Hence the necessity of congressional legislation to aid us in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. I should be glad, as one member of the committee, to have a brief on this question.

Mr. PIXLEY. There are some gentlemen of our profession, I think, who would be very willing to furnish a brief. I think it has been suggested to Senator Casserly, and he will supply us with a brief on this question. I have also spoken to another gentleman of the profession, who has leisure and learning, and feels interested with us, and we will endeavor to submit a paper upon this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you understand that there is any law or regulation in China forbidding the emigration of married women from that country?

Mr. PIXLEY. I understand there is. It is a matter I undertook to investigate some years ago, but, like all matters involving the investigation of Chinese laws, there is such a conflict of testimony that it is impossible to get anything correct. They have no printed code that we know anything about, but a gentleman by the name of Breck, who was consul at Swatow for a long series of years, and who seemed to be very intelligent on this subject, informed me of the existence of that law. He was quite positive that no wife would be permitted to leave the country, and I think it will trouble people here to prove that any wife of honor who was married there has ever been brought to this country. We know that boys go back from here, cooks and servants, and they bring back a wife. They send for women, and buy them or marry them and bring them, and they are their wives according to our law, but according to their code or their law I have never known of an instance where an adult Chinese resident of respectability brought to this country his first wife, or wife of honor.

We shall not endeavor to so marshal our evidence as to maintain but one side of this question. We do not undertake to say that the question has but one side. There are among honest, disinterested, and intelligent persons those holding diverse opinions upon this question. We shall not endeavor to restrict by any indirection a full examination of the subject-matter, and we shall not exclude from the witness-stand any intelligent observer whose judgment may differ from our own. We recognize in this commission the desire of the highest legislative body of our nation to obtain such facts as may enable it to enact wise laws governing our intercourse with Asiatic nations in reference to commerce and emigration. The testimony here taken should become a text-book upon the Chinese question.

Especially do we disclaim the ability to prove that California has not been largely advanced in its material interests by the presence of Chinese laborers among us. We admit that Chinese labor has contributed to the more speedy development of our material resources. We acknowledge the advantage it has been to certain industries, and that many individuals have become richer than they would except for the presence of the Chinese. We admit their convenience to us as domestic servants. We do not represent the Chinese as wanting in many of the essentials of good

citizens. The burden of our accusation against them is that they come in conflict with our labor interests; that they can never assimilate with us; that they are a perpetual, unchanging, and unchangeable alien element that can never become homogeneous; that their civilization is demoralizing and degrading to our people; that they degrade and dishonor labor; that they can never become citizens, and that an alien, degraded labor class, without desire of citizenship, without education, and without interest in the country it inhabits, is an element both demoralizing and dangerous to the community within which it exists.

We shall show that none but adult male laborers immigrate to California; that they come with the purpose of returning; that they do return; that they bear away with them from this country their earnings; that we are being supplied from an inexhaustible hive, leaving us, generation after generation, the same alien, indigestible mob of barbarians, whom we must instruct in our language and our arts that they may rob our laborers of their earnings. We claim that while the question is one of present importance, its future is pregnant with evil consequences. We are confronted with 400,000,000 of people, whom famine, civil war, or foreign invasion in their own land may drive to our coast in alarming numbers.

We maintain that it is but a selfish and short-sighted policy to allow this coast to be occupied by Chinese. Our broad territory will in the future be demanded as the home of our own people, and should be preserved as the heritage of the generations to come after us. We would leave our gold in its gravel-banks and quartz-mines as a safe deposit for the time when American miners will be glad to work cheaper than now; we would leave our tule-lands unreclaimed till their cultivation is demanded for the support and maintenance of white laborers. If the Central Pacific Railroad Company cannot afford from its vast national, State, and municipal subsidies to build roads to open up our valleys and bring to market their products without the small percentage of profit it can pinch from American laborers, we would suggest such legislation as would devolve the trust upon less exacting and less grasping men. Our manufactories can only find healthful development by the employment of white labor. If we stimulate them to unhealthy activity, we do it at the expense of eastern manufacturers and eastern laborers, whom we ought to regard as nearer to us in interest and sympathy than the Chinese.

Upon the religious question we shall admit, in advance of its discussion, that we have no views in common with that class of well-fed, well-salaried, and comfortable missionaries who, when enjoined by Gospel authority "to go forth from Boston to teach the Gospel in heathen lands," are endeavoring to outwit the divine Master by importing the heathen to California. Our religion is not broad enough nor our humanity sufficiently comprehensive to be willing to share our country, our civilization, our Government, and our future wealth and welfare with the heathen Chinese.

I am obliged to the honorable the commissioners for their polite attention to this somewhat prolonged statement.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the commission, thanking you, in the first place, for your courtesy which permits me the honor to appear as an attorney to represent the anti-Chinese associations of this city and the labor interests of this State, I shall trespass now but a few minutes upon your time, especially since the exhaustive address of Mr. Pixley has covered, as I think, the entire grounds which we wish to present. Of course, if the statements made by Mr. McCop-

pin and Mr. Pixley be fully established by the evidence, they must convince you of the dangers which now threaten the political, moral, physical, and financial welfare of the citizens of the Pacific coast from a continued and enormous influx of these Chinese.

In discussing the inexpediency of tolerating Chinese immigration, we shall endeavor to present it in its political, social, and economic relations to our Government and its citizens, being guided, of course, in the production of our testimony by the suggestions and interrogatories propounded by the chairman of this commission.

The contempt which the Chinese exhibit for the laws and institutions of our country, their inability and unwillingness to become citizens, their secret system of slavery existing in defiance of law, their refusal to adopt our manners and customs, or to obey our forms of judicial procedure, and the utter helplessness of the State government to prevent the introduction of their vagrants, criminals, and prostitutes will be laid before your committee, and constitute what I may term the political phase of this question.

The immoral and irreligious practices which the presence of such immense numbers of criminal, depraved, and pagan residents foster and encourage; the pernicious example set before our youth by this lewd, gambling, and lawless element; the crime and disease which they beget and engender will be developed also by the evidence, and may be said to form the moral phase of the question.

Representing, then, simply the labor interests of our State, it is unnecessary for me to advert either to the political or social aspect of the matter under consideration, but to confine myself to its relations with white labor.

We shall produce evidence here showing the amount of Chinese labor in the State, its character and kind, its employment and earnings, and its effect in all respects upon white labor and upon white immigration.

Mr. Pixley has indeed made such a complete and exhaustive statement of what it is proposed to establish on behalf of the people of the State, and related so clearly the effect of Chinese immigration on white labor generally, that I shall abandon my original intention to review this branch of the question at length, and will content myself with a concise recapitulation of the points made by him in relation to its effect upon our laboring interests and our working classes.

We shall prove the following facts:

1. That China, with a population of 450,000,000, is overcrowded; that the Chinese are forced, for that reason, to emigrate; and are not attracted to our shores merely because labor is better paid here than there.

2. That over 148,000 Chinese reside in our State; that the yearly excess of arrivals over departures has been, for the last year, certainly 18,000, and that the ratio of this number is annually increasing.

3. That the majority of Chinese males probably came here, as Mr. Pixley suggests, voluntarily, but are bound by servile-labor contracts for long terms of years, and while such contracts exist they are, to all intents and purposes, the absolute slaves of the contractors; for, although these contracts are void by our law, yet the superstition and fear of the Chinese bondsman for his master is so great as to prevent him from breaking his contract; that such fears are well grounded we shall show by evidence, and we shall establish, further, this fact, that death at the hands of a Chinese assassin has frequently been the fate of the Chinese slave who attempted to break his shackles and regain his freedom.

4. That the Chinese women are slaves, bought and sold for purposes

of prostitution. And under this head we shall introduce here in evidence Chinese contracts, bargain and sale contracts, of women for immoral purposes.

5. That the Chinese work for less wages than white men, and the price paid for Chinese labor will not support white labor; for it will be shown that the cost of living for an individual Chinaman is from fifteen to twenty cents per day; an amount insufficient to keep a white laborer from starvation. They live upon the cheapest food, often the very offal and filth from slaughter-houses, and frequently upon diseased meat. They pay no taxes, or comparatively none; have no families, and since from fifteen to twenty Chinese will occupy a room insufficient in size for the accommodation of a white family of four persons—husband, wife, and two small children—they pay no rents. Their living is thus so much cheaper in all respects than white labor, that they find it is impossible to compete with it. Thus we shall endeavor to show and prove that competition with Chinese labor is impossible, unless our white laboring class shall abandon their social habits, renounce their wives and children, and degrade themselves to the level of the Chinese. This applies to all trades and occupations.

6. While many of the Chinese are day-laborers, a large number learn trades and work in factories. They have monopolized the following occupations, and have almost entirely driven white labor therefrom. Among the different occupations we shall produce witnesses to represent each of the following trades: Cigar-making; box-making; sash, door, and blind manufacturing; boot and shoe making; slipper-making; bag-making; manufacturing clothing; manufacturing ladies' and children's underwear; mining; fishing; vegetable raising; fruit-picking; peddling of all kinds of fruit, vegetables, and fish; laundry business; and that about seven thousand Chinese domestic servants have excluded white women generally from such occupations as cooks, nurses, dish-washing, waiters, &c. And, finally, of course, that the cheap labor has driven the white labor from all such occupations as railroad building, leveeing, and kindred common-labor avocations.

7. That in all the avocations in which Chinese are employed white men are fully competent and qualified to conduct the business and perform the labor.

8. That there is an abundance of white labor to carry on the manufactories, trades, occupations, and business of this coast, without the employment of Chinese.

9. That poverty, distress, and want exist among our white laboring classes; that large numbers are willing and anxious to work, but cannot find employment because of Chinese competition.

10. That Chinese have no children, and neither encourage nor attend our public schools, nor contribute to the support of any of our public or private charitable or benevolent institutions.

11. That the Chinese in our State prison exceed in number those from any other foreign country; and that the cost of supporting Chinese prisoners in our State prison alone is far in excess of the amount of taxes that all the Chinese residents in our State pay.

12. That the Chinese trade among themselves, and buy but little from the white citizens. Their trade is entirely among their own people, and in a large number of cases they import directly their own goods, all that they eat, drink, and wear, from China. This is not confined alone to their merchants, but even individuals import in small quantities.

13. That the earnings of the Chinese are exported to China, causing a constant drain upon our coin, upon our wealth, and a constant flow of

the precious metals from the United States to China, without any return.

They do not add to the wealth of our country as other residents do; for while they contribute their labor and increase values, yet the amounts which they have received for that labor, their earnings, are exported to China.

Now, then, gentlemen, these are concisely the facts which we intend to prove, and all that we intend to prove, so far as the labor question is concerned; and if we establish these facts, we shall claim that if Chinese immigration continues increasing at its present ratio, white labor, through no fault of its own, must be driven from our State by a class which pay no taxes, build no homes, have no families, add nothing to the wealth of the land, entail expenses upon the community, spread loathsome diseases among our citizens, respect no laws, and acknowledge no God; who, filthy, vicious, ignorant, depraved, and criminal, are a standing menace to our free institutions, and an ever-threatening danger to our republican form of government.

I have simply, as I said in the first place, recapitulated the arguments of Mr. Pixley, so far as the people of the State are represented, on our behalf; and I shall not take up further the time of this commission.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, I will state in the outset that Mr. Brooks and myself have no political aspirations. Had we any political aspirations, we would not be here to-day. It would be a matter of folly for any gentleman in the state of public opinion which now exists in San Francisco—I do not say throughout the State—to be occupying the position which we occupy here to-day.

I have listened to the arguments of the gentlemen with no further degree of interest than I have listened to them for the past two years. It is a reiteration simply of what we all have heard. It is the same question which periodically rises here to agitate these people. It cuts no figure at certain times; it excites no interest at certain times. It is a subject which is purely local. As the Senator from California remarked the other day, it refers only to California.

My colleague will probably answer at length the arguments of Mr. Pixley and Mr. McCoppin; but I will say at the outset that a majority of the statements made by those gentlemen do not cast any particular honor or pride upon the State of California or the city of San Francisco. It will be shown on this investigation that this whole subject so far, up to the present time, has had only one side; that legislation has been one-sided; that the execution of the laws in this city has been one-sided. A law is passed to tax certain callings for the purpose only of enforcing it upon the Chinese. The poor Chinaman who visits the houses early in the morning with his vegetables is charged $10 tax to carry his vegetables. The white man who drives his wagon pays $2. The poor Chinaman who carries the clothes to his patrons—and they are very numerous—pays a heavy tax as a laundryman, $15—I think that was declared illegal by the courts—while the man who drives the laundry-wagon pays $2.50 only. This class of legislation has been going on in this country for twelve or fifteen years.

Mr. MCCOPPIN. Will the gentleman allow me to make one observation?

Mr. BEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCOPPIN. I should like to state to the committee that as a State senator in Sacramento at the last session of the legislature, I voted against those measures which were aimed at the Chinese—against all of them. Therefore I come here before the committee with no prejudice of that character at all.

Mr. BEE. I had intended, Mr. Chairman, to say a few words in compliment to my friend, Mr. McCoppin, whom I have known for a long series of years. I believe a better, kinder-hearted gentleman does not live. I believe that if any pressure was brought to guide any man in the legislature on this subject, the heaviest pressure had to be brought upon Senator McCoppin. He is a man among all men who denounces oppression in any shape. He has stood in the senate of this State and denounced all these measures. He has stood up there like a white man, regardless of the consequences, time and again, denouncing this species of legislation; and I honor him for it.

The creation of this commission by the Congress of the United States is received by the Chinese residents of California with pleasure as a good omen, and in their behalf I am requested to return to you their heartfelt thanks and appreciation of your consideration in permitting them to be represented before your honorable committee. They ask to be heard before you as the representatives of a great nation, which, for a century, has been the asylum and refuge of the poor, oppressed, and down-trodden of every nation on the globe, regardless of race or color.

The giant strides of this young empire opened up fresh fields for enterprise on the Pacific coast. Thousands of miles, across the trackless deserts, came thousands of hardy pioneers, under whose hands millions upon millions were added to the nation's wealth of gold. Closely following in their tracks came the farmer with his household goods and implements of toil, and, like magic, the golden grain covered the great valleys of California. The fame and wonders of this new El Dorado reached the remotest confines of civilized and semi-civilized countries. Hordes of immigrants poured in upon us from every clime. Australia landed its hundreds of convicts on our shores, freely and without protest. Our mines and rich soil were free to all. China, in due course of time, learned of this wonderful eastern country, and soon the Mongolian, or "moon-eyed Celestial," as we are wont to call him, ceased to be a curiosity in our midst, but, to the contrary, was pronounced a blessing. He filled a vacuum. He came to labor, and found ready employment. The 'cute Yankee was quick to discover that John Chinaman was a mere labor-machine, and utilized him accordingly.

Well do I remember when the question of a free or slave constitution was agitated in this State. The men from New England and the men south of Mason and Dixon's line stood shoulder to shoulder for a free constitution, and the only real fact that controlled and carried the election was, that China would furnish us cheap labor, and the supply only limited by the demand.

Legislation and congressional action were sought, as time rolled on, to frame nearer reciprocal and commercial relations between China and the United States, which culminated in the Burlingame treaty. I wish to say, by way of parenthesis, that I regret exceedingly that San Francisco should have so soon forgotten the magnificent reception given Mr. Burlingame on his return from negotiating this treaty. It was said in negotiating this treaty, and used as an argument, that a portion of the vast foreign commerce of the Orient was controlled by a few favored nations, while our more favorable geographical location entitled us to a large share of this trade. England early established a line of subsidized steamships, and at the time this treaty was negotiated controlled 90 per cent. of the whole commerce of the Orient. The number of our ships engaged in the tea-trade could be counted on your fingers. The American merchant bought the bulk of his teas in the English market. But what a change is going on! Our merchant marine is

making sad inroads on England's former supremacy in that quarter. Our magnificent steamships, thanks to a liberal government, have aided wonderfully in building up a large commerce with China and Japan. True to our go-aheadativeness, the people and the Government demanded the construction of the great national highway, the Pacific Railroad, not only to bind together our own territory, but to bring the Occident and Orient nearer together, and over this great highway transport the silks and teas of Asia to our own doors, inside of thirty days—an established fact to-day. England and France, alarmed at the advances made by the United States, constructed the Suez Canal, to checkmate, in a measure, American enterprise in those seas.

Well do I remember our present Senator, (Mr. Sargent,) a member of this committee, when he was in the national House of Representatives. I listened to his eloquence as he portrayed to members of Congress the immense advantages of opening up and constructing this transcontinental railway. He pictured, in his eloquent way, the immense advantage it would be to us, the great traffic which we would open. He showed by statistical information that of the whole commerce of the Orient, amounting to from $350,000,000 to $400,000,000, we had not 3 per cent.

He claimed, and justly, too, that it was an enterprise national in its character, and its benefits wide-spread. The North, South, East, and West would all alike reap its benefits. He pictured in glowing words the future of the empire of the West, the valley of the Mississippi, as the central mart of commerce of the world.

How prophetic his words! Look around you to-day and witness the great strides made in fulfillment of his predictions.

Those arguments were used not only by the Senator but by all the distinguished statesmen of the day. Go still further. Go back to the time of Tom Benton, and examine the congressional records, and you will see all those statesmen of his time advocating in strong terms a mode by which the United States would secure a portion of the trade of China. There was no one in Congress or out of Congress—whig, democrat, pro-slavery, barn-burner, or Tammany Hall politician, who at that time opposed any of these measures. A democratic Congress subsidized the Pacific Mail to the amount of $5,000,000. Now, after consummating these great achievements and becoming living witnesses to a growing trade and commerce, with a glorious future unfolding for the coming generation, will we, who are so directly interested; will the great empire of the States lying east of the Rocky Mountains submit to the demands of a few demagogues, the forced mouth-pieces of anti-cooly leagues, abrogate these treaty relations, and close our ports to trade and commerce with the Orient? I answer, no.

The facts in reference to the export and import trade will be brought to your attention in a manner that you may judge of its advantages not only to California but to the whole country.

And now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in these few words I have sketched to the committee the outlines or the pedigree of this so-called Chinese question. You are here as a court of inquiry. A demand has been made for the modification or the complete abrogation of our treaty relations with China. It is charged that the Chinese residents among us are like a cancer, gradually eating into our vitals, breeding disease, corrupting the morals of our youth, monopolizing the labor of the country, and bringing desolation throughout our fair land. It is openly advocated that it is far better to close the doors of trade and commerce, abrogate all treaty relations between the two countries, rather than endure or foster this so-called evil. If those charges are proved

true to your satisfaction, it would be well to inquire who sought this alliance? Was it the Chinese Empire? By no means. The Government of the United States fairly forced the present relations upon the government of China. First, to break down the exclusiveness of that government we send a fleet of war-ships, and obtain a few concessions. Later, we negotiate a treaty which opens up the whole country to the trade and commerce of our people.

It is under these solemn treaty obligations that the Chinese immigrant has been brought to our shores, opened up the riches of China to our merchant marine, dotted the ocean with our merchant ships, and maintained a line of steamships which is a pride to every American citizen. All these advantages we are willing to forego, and why? Because this great empire, of boundless extent, whose shores are washed by two oceans, three thousand miles apart, is invaded by 150,000 honest toilers. The great State of California, sufficient to support 10,000,000 people, is threatened with destruction because, during a period of 24 years, 150,000 Chinese have come here and by willing industry have contributed largely to her present standing and wealth.

Let us see under what circumstances he comes and how he is received in this free and enlightened republic—the land of the free and oppressed. I regret exceedingly, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, to bring to your attention scenes and acts which have transpired upon the streets of this city, which are a disgrace to any and all civilization. No country, no government, I undertake to say, on the face of God's footstool, has ever permitted the indignities to be cast upon any race of people that the government and municipality of San Francisco and the State of California have permitted upon this class of people. I want to picture to you in what manner we receive these people. I have seen, myself, one of the Pacific mail-steamships hauled into the dock here in this city, loaded, probably, with a thousand or fifteen hundred of these people. I have seen them loaded into express-wagons to be taken to the Chinese quarter. What I say has been seen by thousands of our citizens. I have seen them stoned from the time they passed out of the ship, rocks thrown at them, until they reached Kearney street. I have seen them leaning over the sides of the wagons with their scalps cut open. I have seen them stoned when going afoot from the steamships. No arrests were made; no police interfered. I do not recollect, within my knowledge, (I may be wrong in an instance or two) of ever an arrest being made when these street hoodlums and Arabs attacked these people on their landing here. It does not stop there. There are portions of this city, and I say it with shame, where none of these people dare frequent. There are portions of the city of San Francisco where these Chinamen dare not visit. If they do so, they go in large numbers, and they must have large numbers; because one of these hoodlums will drive fifty of them. That is not an exaggeration. I am speaking of those who first land here.

I say, and I say it with shame, that these people have no privileges. They do not seem to have extended to them the protection of the law in any particular. When a Chinaman lands upon this coast he seeks for work. He comes here as a laborer. He comes here for the purpose of bettering his condition. He comes here a law-abiding citizen. We shall show upon this investigation that the Chinese residents of this city and of the State of California compare favorably, and, I think, are the peers of any foreign population which comes here, in their appreciation of the laws and usages of the country. Everything has been done for a series of years to persecute and oppress these people. Acts have

been passed by the legislature, acts have been passed by this municipality, which are a disgrace to any civilized country. I cannot enumerate them all. There was the capitation tax; $20 was the first tax, but that only existed for a year or two. Next, they were taxed $5 a month for mining.

Senator SARGENT. Is not that a tax upon all foreign miners?

Mr. BEE. Yes, sir; I was coming to that. The first tax, in 1851 or 1852, was collected pretty generally upon all miners. The tax of $5 a month was levied also upon foreign miners, but as a general thing collected only and wholly from the Chinese. They have been taxed for landing, the sum of $10; they have been taxed in their endeavors to ship to their homes the bones of their dead. I mean this is class taxation. I mean, and I want it so understood by the committee, that these ordinances and these laws are general laws, but I claim that we shall show that they have been enforced only upon the Chinese population. As I stated in the outset, the Chinaman who carries his basket in the streets, is taxed $8 over what the man is taxed who drives his wagon. The Chinese laundryman has a tax of $15; the white laundryman has a nominal tax of $2. It is taxation in every occupation that it is possible to put them in.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed further I wish to read to the commission an address delivered by the six companies of Chinese last spring. In doing so, I wish to impress upon the commission one fact, that under all the circumstances which surround the Chinese who are now residents of California, they are as anxious to leave this country as the anti-cooly leagues are to have them leave it. They are just as desirous of getting back to their old home as those parties are to have them do so. There are two sides to this question, and I am only glad that this commission is here representing the Congress and the Government of the United States that they may hear both sides. I say here, gentlemen, that this is the first time in the history of this country that ever the Chinese have had an opportunity to represent their side of the case. Here is an address of the six companies, delivered to the citizens of the United States. It was just previous to a great excitement which we had here and upon the day, I think, on which a meeting was held here at Union hall in reference to this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date, Colonel Bee?

Mr. BEE. The date is April 5, 1876.

Senator SARGENT. Do you know who wrote the address?

Mr. BEE. I do not; I presume the Chinese wrote it. By way of parenthesis, I will call the Senator's attention to an address written to Governor Bigler, while he was governor of this State. A law was attempted to be enacted by the State legislature, putting a very heavy capitation tax upon Chinese coming here, and an open letter was addressed to the governor. It was one of the finest documents ever written. It is somewhere upon record. A copy was sent to William H. Seward, who, in return, paid a high compliment to the author. Inquiries were made to find out who wrote the document. Dr. McMeans said it was written by a Chinaman, who wrote it in his office and never erased a word after it was written; no correction was made. This address I merely glanced over. It is an address to the American public:

To the American public: The United States has been open to Chinese emigration for more than twenty years. Many Chinamen have come; few have returned. Why is this? Because among our Chinese people a few in California have acquired a fortune and returned home with joy. A desire to obtain a competency having arisen in the heart, our people have not shrunk from toil and trouble. They have expected to come here for one or two years and make a little fortune and return. Who among them ever thought of all these difficulties?

Expensive rents, expensive living. A day without work means a day without food. For this reason, though wages are low, yet they are compelled to labor and live in daily poverty, quite unable to return to their native land. Now this honorable country is discussing the importance of prohibiting the further emigration of the Chinese. This is very good, indeed. First, because it will relieve the American people of trouble and anxiety of mind; secondly, the Chinese will no longer be wanderers in a foreign land. Both parties will thus be benefited. But this result should be brought about in a reasonable manner. It is said that the six Chinese companies buy and import Chinamen into this country. How can such things be said? Our six companies have, year after year, sent letters discouraging our people from coming to this country, but the people have not believed us, and have continued to come. The necessary expenses of these poor new-comers is a constant drain upon the resources of those already settled here, so that the Chinese residents of this country are also opposed to this Chinese emigration. But the capitalists of this honorable country are constantly calling for Chinese cheap labor. The white laboring men of this country are very angry because the Chinese obtain employment which they claim belongs to white men alone, and so they hate the Chinamen, sometimes throw stones at them, sometimes strike them on the street, and constantly curse them. The Chinese people cannot return such treatment in the same kind, lest other nations, hearing of such things, should ridicule the laws of this honorable country as of no use.

To prohibit the Chinese from coming to this country is not a difficult task. Formerly his Imperial Majesty, our august Emperor, made a treaty of amity and friendship with the Government of this honorable country, opening the commercial relations and permitting free inter-communication between the people of the two countries. This treaty is in accordance with the law of all nations. And now, if the American people do not desire the Chinese to come here, why not go to the Emperor and ask a repeal of the treaty, or why not limit the number of immigrants on each steamer to a very few? Then more would return and fewer would come, and not ten years would elapse before not a trace of a Chinaman would be left in this great and honorable country. Would not that be well indeed? But let there be counsel and consideration. It cannot be said that Chinese labor impoverishes this country, and are not the customs paid by the Chinese a benefit to this country? Now let the Government of the United States propose to the government of China a repeal or change of the treaty, prohibiting the people of either country from crossing the ocean; then shall we Chinese forever remain at home and enjoy the happiness of fathers, mothers, wives, and children, and no longer remain strangers in a strange land. Then the white laborers of this country shall no longer be troubled by the competition of the Chinese, and our Chinese people no longer be subjected to the abuses and indignities now daily heaped upon them in the open streets of this so-called Christian land. If this can be accomplished, we Chinese will continually offer to the virtue of this honorable country our deepest gratitude and thanks.

SIX CHINESE COMPANIES.

That, Mr. Chairman, was the sentiment of the Chinese on the 5th day of April, 1876, and I pledge you my word and honor as a gentleman it is their sentiment to-day.

California, with its boundless extent—California, which now whitens every ocean with its grain-ships—California, which this year will produce 800,000 tons of wheat—California, which is fast becoming the granary of the world, demands labor; it demands cheap labor. It was said in 1852, "We have it; the hardy laborers of China will come here and help gather our crops." We occupy the same position in San Francisco and observe the same regulations here that my friend from New York, Mr. Mead, sees about him there. We see here thousands and thousands of white laborers collecting in this city. From my own experinece I speak, (I state without fear of contradiction, and we shall show it upon this investigation,) that if 5,000 laborers are wanted, or if 500 laborers are wanted, to move the crops of California, you could not supply from this city 200 of them. That we shall substantiate by testimony. I was in Sonoma County but a few weeks before the harvest commenced, and I said to some of my friends, "Try white labor." I was authorized to send them white men. I worked faithfully two weeks and got four men. Mr. King complains that they are engaged in the different manufactures. I will state to the committee an instance which happened under my own observation. Mr. Stowe is now dead; he organized the Visalia Consolidated Tobacco Company. The papers of this city will show standing advertisements for weeks, calling for

white men to engage in his business as cigar-makers. At the end of five weeks he secured two vagrants who were, he told me himself, not fit for the work; that while there were twelve hundred or fifteen hundred Chinese engaged in that business here, and men starving for want of work, only two white men could be got to go to Visalia. I cast no reflection upon the laboring class of this city, but I do say they are the agitators of this subject. I admit that they have a vote. I say it is chargeable to that worthless class of men who live upon 25 cents a day here. There is no country on God's footstool where a man can live as cheaply as in San Francisco, China not excepted. He can go into the street in the morning with 25 cents and he can get two dimes and a half for it. He can go into a saloon and get a good breakfast and a drink for 10 cents; he can take a fair lunch for 5 cents, and a good square meal for the other 10 cents in the afternoon, and no man will contradict this. They will not go into the country and labor. Who, then, moves your eight hundred thousand tons of wheat this year? This agitation is not confined to any political party; it partakes of no political complexion; it is self-interest. The county of Sonoma gave us more trouble during the war than South Carolina, because it was populated by a class of people from that region of country. It casts its thousand democratic majority regularly. Throughout the length and breadth of that county we raise our potatoes. There is a portion of this State where we take out a hill of potatoes and put in another for seed; we raise them the year round and have new potatoes the year round. Most of those people are democrats who raise potatoes; they belong to a nationality which is very fond of potatoes. It can be shown in this investigation that they employ twenty-five hundred Chinese, and they are there at work to-day digging those potatoes. I want to say to my friend, Mr. King, that it costs fifteen cents for white labor to sack a sack of potatoes. A Chinaman does it, sews them up, and puts the sacks in a pile for ten cents. Who is benefited by it? Who buys his potatoes here five cents a sack cheaper? It is the poor men, a large portion of whom represent these anti-cooly leagues. How is it that we supply Europe with wheat? How is it that we can compete with the Mediterranean?

How is it that we can compete with the granaries of the world? By Chinese cheap labor. Look at the Chinamen when your harvest first commences. They dot the fields from one end of the State to the other. Where would your white labor come from? Can you hire a man in this city for less than two dollars and a half a day? I say it cannot be done for less. I have been in public enterprises for twenty years. I have constructed railroads, built canals, roads, and telegraphs. You cannot hire on these streets to-day a white man to go into the country short of two dollars and a half a day. How is the farmer to move his crops and pay such wages? These are facts that cannot be controverted. I care nothing about the filth of Chinatown. I care nothing about the prostitutes who are brought here. Look at the stern facts as they exist. We do more farming than any State in the Union. We are now becoming the first wheat State in the Union. This class of laborers, these mud-sills, are at the bottom of our success, and I challenge contradiction. We have reclaimed a million acres and more of swamp, overflowed, and tule lands, where the Chinamen stand up to their waists in soft tule-marsh throwing up this dirt. This land produces its seventy-five bushels of wheat to the acre. He stops and throws his hand in front of him. Immense myriads of mosquitoes come upon him. The white man who bosses him has veil over veil upon his face. Where is the white man

who will go into that ditch and work? He is not here; you cannot find him. I challenge your labor-leagues, your eight-hour leagues, every other league, to meet the question fairly and squarely upon its merits. I say that this question is never agitated except upon the eve of an important election. I claim that the advantages of the Chinese to California surmount everything else. I do not care what argument my neighbor may use to get to Congress. I do not care how Mr. Davis attempts to show that he has always been opposed to Chinese immigration, nor do I care how strong Mr. Piper has always been against this immigration. There was a time in this State when every man tried to show that he was in favor of it. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Cooper, that it has affected his State somewhat. I met a very intelligent gentleman some years ago who was delegated, whether by the legislature of his State or not I do not know, to proceed to China and procure a large number of Chinese to work the soil of Tennessee. I found by reading the papers of Tennessee that they were all unanimous on the subject. They needed labor. The marts of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, with their tens of thousands of laborers, could have been visited. The Five Points in New York to-day is more densely populated, and, as we shall show upon this investigation, it is more a cess-pool of disease and filth than six Chinatowns of this city. A gentleman, an Eastern tourist, visiting this State, who has been in the Chinese quarters a dozen times, stated to me the other day that Chinatown is a Broadway in cleanliness in comparison with the Five Points district in New York. I think I have the report of physicians who have visited that portion of the city and reported upon it quite recently, which fully substantiates my information. I do not propose to answer in detail the sweeping charges and denunciation of Mr. Pixley, but will in a measure leave it to be supported by testimony if he can produce it. He charges that these people do not adopt our habits and ways; that they are slow to adopt our clothing and mode of living. Well, is that a crime? That they don't take kindly to whisky and politics ought to cover all other shortcomings. That he is frugal and saving and sends a little of his earnings to his family, is brought forward here as against the white laborer, who, on the contrary, spends his earnings freely and thus benefits the country.

I think in answer to this, that there is freedom enough left here, that if a Chinaman has given an equivalent for his earnings, he is at liberty to do with them as he thinks proper, and no one has a right to complain.

But he seems to forget that it was supposed that our treaty with China was to be reciprocal, they were to reap some advantages as well as the United States; are we to deny them this?

I admit what my friend, Mr. Pixley, says, that the balance of trade is against us. You cannot name a nation on the face of this earth but what the balance of trade with China is not against them. We import from China tea to the value of $16,000,000 annually. We probably send there of our own productions seven or eight millions. The balance must be met by drafts or cash. When this treaty was first made with China, as I said before, we could count all the American merchant marine engaged in the trade upon our fingers. We all recollect the Flying Cloud, Captain Cressy, and several others of those fast clippers, called the tea-ships. There were only four or five of them. I apprehend that we now have 400,000 tons engaged in Chinese trade. I think it exceeds that. We have been gradually building up a trade between the United States and China. I picked up the Commercial Herald, which is good authority on this coast in reference to the traffic with China in the last nine months.

I want to call the attention of the committee to a little of what we are doing. I think one of the interrogatories of the committee is, What does the trade between this country and China consist of? Here is a report of the "exports of leading articles of merchandise from this port, by sea, other than treasure, for the first nine months of 1876." To China, we have sent out of this city, exports to the value of $2,211,798. Now, what does it consist of? We are building up a market in China and Japan. The Chinese who come to this country learn to eat bread; they learn to eat a great many of the products of our soil; and hence they open a traffic with their own countrymen at home. The list commences with abalones—those are shells—ammunition, bags, beans, bêche be mer, beeswax, belting, blacking, borax, boots and shoes, bread, brooms, clocks, 3,153 cases of clocks. If you ask a Chinaman if he is a married man, he says no, but he has got a clock. They all want a clock. Fire-arms, fish, flour—142,140 barrels of flour; nuts and raisins, canned fruits, &c. Ginseng—any amount of ginseng. I think that affects Indiana a little; at least they have raised an immense quantity of ginseng in Ohio. Hay, hops, ivory, leather, agricultural implements, whale-oil, oil-cake meal, barley, potatoes—13,965 sacks of potatoes; quicksilver—17,643 flasks of quicksilver. You find no whisky here. California wine, 27 cases, &c. That list indicates what we have sent from California of our own products, amounting in value to $2,211,798. Japan also follows with about the same articles, but they have not the value attached. The steamer which left here yesterday took out a cargo to China, not included in the foregoing, amounting to $151,000.

I shall leave the principal replies to the arguments of these gentlemen to my colleague. I wish to call the attention of the committee before I sit down to one or two things. It is a matter of history that the Chinese Empire was a few years since an isolated region. There were no open ports of trade for us.

Senator SARGENT. I thought it strange there should be no whisky in the list of exports to China. I find quite a consignment of it.

Mr. BEE. It may be on the ship's account, for the crew.

Senator SARGENT. There is quite a great deal of it; too much for such a supposition.

Mr. BEE. We first succeeded with Commodore Perry, I think, in opening six ports. The Burlingame treaty opens the entire Chinese Empire. It is stated to the contrary in one of these star-chamber books, but it is, notwithstanding, the fact that the entire empire is opened to us, and we are called now one of the "favored nations." We are not only developing a large commerce with those people, but we are breaking down their exclusiveness, and our colleges are filling up with their young men. It becomes you, gentlemen, to be guided by the utmost caution in your decisions in reference to this matter. This country is young yet. California is only twenty-five years of age, and we have just celebrated our Centennial. Who knows what the next century will bring forth and develop between this great country lying across this ocean and the United States? In one college in Connecticut I think there are about sixty Chinese students. They are scattered all through the different colleges of the East. They have a superintendent, one of their own countrymen, who supervises their education here. We will show you the mission schools, where there are hundreds of converts to Christianity. Here is a field for those Christian men, the place for them to exercise their calling. It is stated that they have made more converts here in the last five years than have been made in China in the last twenty. As to how strong they are in the faith, I leave that to my

friend Mr. Pixley. I want to say one word in reference to cheap labor in California and the East. You will bear me out in the statement, gentlemen, I think, that in New York the wages of the house-servant is from $8 to $15 a month; $15 is high. In Indiana, $8 and $10 a month. Before the war $4 or $6 a month was considered good wages by this class of servants. A day-laborer on a farm in any of the Western States, during harvest, gets $30 a month. The balance of the year he gets $14 a month. You cannot hire a Chinaman for less than the same wages here. A Chinaman, as my friend states, is a mere machine. You can go down to this steamship wharf and take to your house a China boy not over twelve years of age. Let your wife start and go from the dining-room to the attic and show that Chinaman his daily labor and tell him what he has got to do; let her do that twice, and from that time on, even to baking biscuit and nursing the baby, that Chinaman will religiously follow his instructor and his instruction. Let him go to a neighbor's house to live, and he will do just as he was taught at the next door. As for ingenuity, they excel any nationality on the face of the earth. I will take this commission to Commercial street and Clay street, and show you as handsomely made lady's gaiter, French style, as ever was imported from Paris, and made by a Chinaman who has not served six months' apprenticeship. The man who sells you a cigar and tells you that it was not made from Chinese labor, nine times out of ten tells you that which is not so. They import Havana tobacco for that purpose and also bring it from Connecticut and Kentucky. They ship to American houses East, thousands and thousands of packages which are manufactured by Chinese labor. Go to our woolen mills. Ask the proprietor of a woolen mill how he is successful, how he can sell, through Stewart's agency in New York, fine woolen blankets for $7 in greenbacks and $7 in gold in California. Go to any of these manufacturers. Ask them how it is that they can manufacture this article where money is worth 1½ per cent. per month, as it is here. You all know that in Massachusetts, in New England, a manufacturing establishment which pays a dividend of 8 per cent. per annum, capitalists take that as ample compensation. Drive your Chinese labor from California and where is your capitalist that will risk his money in manufacturing? We shall show upon this investigation that ten years ago California shipped $40,000,000 a year East to buy what we did not produce. We shall show that to-day we do not send $20,000,000 of that amount East, owing to Chinese cheap labor. Why do Indiana, Iowa, and Wisconsin manufacture their agricultural implements? Why do they manufacture their cotton goods and woolen goods? Because it keeps the money in the State and develops local industries so they do not have to send it to New York, and Baltimore, and Boston to supply their wants.

Senator MORTON. What portion of the operatives in the factories here are Chinese?

Mr. BEE. I do not pretend to say what the proportion is in the different factories. The woolen mills employ, probably, a thousand Chinese, and have from eighty to a hundred white operatives; the shoemakers 20, 30, and sometimes 33 per cent.; about that ratio. In one of the woolen factories here, and I do not know but that in both of them, about half are Chinese. Some establishments have none at all, but the manufacturing interests generally, which have been successful, are carried on by Chinese labor. When it comes to other matters, in reference to crime and criminals among the Chinese, my friend (Mr. Brooks) will show you that it is not all on one side. He will show you that prosti-

tution here is confined to the French, the Germans, the Irish, and Americans, to a greater extent than to the Chinese. We shall show on this investigation that no one has been more anxious and willing to return to China these prostitutes than the Chinese themselves. Some have been forced to stay. I was on board of the Colorado when the Chinese sent back some 24 of them, and the legal fraternity of this city—and I do not know but that my friend (Mr. Pixley) was the attorney for them—endeavoring to get out a writ of *habeas corpus* to prevent their being sent back.

Mr. PIXLEY. I might as well say now—and I never had the opportunity before—that it has been very industriously circulated by the Chinese that I was the attorney in the *habeas corpus* case. No such fact exists in my professional history.

Mr. BEE. I will not state it as a fact, but I am glad to have given my friend an opportunity to deny it. I do state as a fact, however, which he nor his associates will deny, that a large portion of the people who are so willing to denounce Chinese labor, employ Chinamen, not only in their families, but in manufactories and upon their ranches.

Senator SARGENT. What was the class of persons who desired that the prostitutes should not be sent back to China? Who paid for the legal proceedings?

Mr. BEE. It was Chinese who did that, the men these women were consigned to probably; but I say the respectable portion of the Chinese—the six companies, the merchants—have done all in the power of men to stop the evil. They have addressed the mayor of this city, time and again, and the State authorities to render them assistance.

Senator SARGENT. It appeared from your remark as if the people of San Francisco tried to keep prostitutes here.

Mr. BEE. O, no.

Senator SARGENT. That is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. BEE. I will state to the commission—and I state it without fear of contradiction—from my experience of these men for twenty years, that that there is not a cooly within the confines of the State of California; there is not a Chinaman here who comes under a contract of servile labor. When I doubled Cape Horn and came out to this country, with thousands of others, nearly half the passengers on our ship came here under contract. We had one company from New York, one from Massachusetts, and one from Pennsylvania who were sent out. They were sent out to work, most of them agreeing to work for two years, transmitting one-half of their earnings to the parties who furnished the capital to bring them here. Chinamen come. If they have a little money they find a capitalist who furnishes the balance. They pay exorbitant rates of interest, some 4 to 8 per cent. a month, and they send back money as fast as they can earn it to liquidate the debt. They have done nothing; they infringe upon no law. They are instructed when they come here to pay due respect to all our usages and all our laws. They are a harmless, innocent class of people. There are thieves among them, of course; and in what nationality are there not? They have claimed, time and again, the protection of the laws of this great country. It is rarely ever extended to them. Right here I will relate an instance which recently came under my observation. Those poor people often come to me for advice. A few months ago a firm in this city—and I do not care about naming them—bought a large amount of tule land. They employed some fifteen hundred Chinese. Let me state how that employment is accomplished. You come to this city and want to contract for five hundred Chinamen. You go to one of the head-

men, and he enters into a contract with you—a contract which they always, without exception, religiously keep. (We shall show upon this investigation that when there is any breaking of a contract it is upon the part of the higher race.) That head-man receives the money and pays these Chinamen. This is done to prevent the recurrence of the very instance I am about to remark upon. These parties hired about fifteen hundred Chinamen to go and reclaim this land by a levee. They finished the work. On the completion of the work there was $10,000 due them. They came to this city to settle. The man, the capitalist in the contract, told them that he had given the check to his foreman, and that he had run off to New York. What redress had those Chinamen? Not the slightest in the world. I could stand here and detain you for an hour citing cases where these men have lost hundreds and hundreds of thousands of hard-earned money through the dishonesty of contractors.

Mr. PIXLEY. Was the foreman a Chinaman or a white man?

Mr. BEE. A white man; he can be seen daily on our streets. The man who owes them to-day is J. W. Pearson. That is only a single fact, only one of a thousand to which I could call your attention. While this excitement has been going on the Chinese have lost thousands of dollars. They discharge them and let them go without money, or scrip, or paper, or anything. If your examination here should in any manner tend or culminate in sending these men back, I say that the Navy of the United States would do an act of mercy and an act of justice to detail the ships of the Navy and to charter other ships and take these people back to their own country. I say it would be an act of mercy, and it would be an opportunity which these men would grasp at. They would crowd your ships, and I would really, myself, like to see the day, in order to note the effect on our industries. Mr. Pixley has said that they are not hardy laborers. I tell you they are men of iron. I have flumed rivers. I have built railroads. I have hung them over the sides of rocks where no white would trust himself, as the Pacific Railroad Company has done. They are hardy, industrious laborers. They have but few vices. They do not drink. I have not seen a drunken Chinaman in ten years. I do not believe that any gentleman in this room can say he is familiar with the sight of a drunken Chinaman. They ask only justice, and that they be made to pay only such taxes as are demanded of others. They are selected out and met at the time they land at the wharf here by the tax-collector. If you go down and see the 4-o'clock boats bring in the gangs of Chinamen, you will see the poll-tax collector. He will let me pass, he will let every white man pass, but he will make these Chinamen disgorge $4 poll-tax, and the operation is repeated when they leave town. They are becoming real estate owners. I do not know the amount of real estate they own in this city, but it is quite large. The gentleman said they do not pay any rents. I wish this committee would go to the bottom of this question. I should like to see this committee bring the men here who are the landlords of Chinamen, and you would see such a system of robbery as was never before laid before the world.

I want to read, in conclusion, an appeal made by the Chinese on the occasion of a great meeting here, on which certain leagues or persons were armed for the purpose, as it was said, of cleaning out the Chinese on that night; but thanks to the moderation of such men as Mr. McCoppin, and others, no violence took place. It was published in the Alta California of April 3, 1876, two days before the meeting. The letter

was addressed to Chief of Police Ellis, and copies were sent to Mayor Bryant and Governor Irwin:

SAN FRANCISCO, *April* 1, 1876.

H. H. ELLIS,
Chief of Police, City and County of San Francisco:

SIR: We wish to call your attention to the fact that at the present time frequent and unprovoked assaults are made upon our Chinese people while walking peacefully the streets of this city. The assaulting party is seldom arrested by your officers, but if a Chinaman resists the assault he is frequently arrested and punished by fine or by imprisonment.

Inflammatory and incendiary addresses against the Chinese, delivered on the public streets to the idle and irresponsible element of this great city, have already produced unprovoked and unpunished assaults upon some of our people, and we fear that if such things are permitted to go on unchecked a bloody riot against the Chinese may be the result.

This was openly threatened.

Regretting that the Chinese are so obnoxious to the citizens of this country, and quite willing to aid in seeking a repeal or modification of the existing treaty between China and the United States, yet being here under sacred treaty stipulations, we simply ask to be protected in our treaty rights.

Respectfully submitted.

YEONG WO CO.
MING YOUNG CO.
HONG CHOW CO.
HOP WO CO.
YIN WO CO.
SAM YAP CO.

I now read another communication, addressed to the mayor of this city, sent him on the very day this meeting was held, calling upon him for aid. They were very much frightened. I went through the Chinese quarters at the time, and not a Chinaman was to be seen where thousands are seen on the sidewalks to-day. To none of these communications was the slightest answer given. Not the slightest assurance was given them that they would be protected:

To A. J. BRYANT,
Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco:

SIR: We, the undersigned, presidents of the Chinese six companies of this city, desire, most respectfully, to call your attention to the fact (which may not have escaped your notice) that wide-spread rumors are abroad all over this city to the effect that a riotous attack upon the Chinese is about to take place. It is widely reported that to-night, while the more respectable class of citizens are peacefully devising means to prohibit further Chinese emigration, another class, mostly of foreign birth, will commence riotous proceedings against the Chinese who are already here. We notice that anti-Chinese societies are being formed in every ward of the city and in many towns of the State. Denunciatory and incendiary addresses against the Chinese, publicly made upon the streets of the city to large crowds of idle and excitable people, have already produced acts of violence, and unprovoked and, we are sorry to say it, unpunished assaults upon our countrymen. We have noticed that for two or three weeks past the city papers have failed to observe the violent assaults made upon the Chinamen; or, if they have observed them, they have neglected to notice them in their columns. We have also noticed that the daily press of the city is constantly warning the people to abstain from riotous proceedings against the Chinese, which we think would hardly be done without some cause existed to fear that such proceedings are intended. All these things are causing the Chinese people great anxiety. And in the immediate dangers which seem to threaten us, as well as to threaten the peace and good name of this city, we appeal to your honor, the mayor and chief magistrate of this municipality, to protect us to the full extent of your power in all our peaceful treaty-rights against all unlawful violence and all riotous proceedings now threatening us. We would deprecate the results of mob violence, for we not only value our property and cherish our lives, which now seem to be in jeopardy, but we should also regret to have the good name of this great and honorable country tarnished by the riotous proceedings of her own citizens. Our countrymen are better acquainted with peaceful vocations than with scenes of strife, yet many of them have lived long enough in this country to learn that self-defense is the common right of all men; and should a riotous attack be made upon the Chinese quarters, we have no power, even if we had the disposition, to restrain our countrymen from defending themselves to the last extremity, and selling their lives as dearly as possible. But we trust and believe that it is in your honor's power and in accordance with your high sense

of justice to prevent these threatened evils. That we may do all in our power, as good citizens, to preserve peace and avert a riot, we most respectfully submit these statements and make this earnest appeal to your honor.

Respectfully submitted.

LEE MING HOW, Sam Yup Co.
SAW YUN CHONG, Kong Chow Co.
CHAN LUNG KOK, Wing Yung Co.
LEE CHEONG CHIP, Hop Wo Co.
LEE CHU KWAN, Young Wo Co.
CHAN KONG CHEW, Yan Wo Co.

SAN FRANCISCO, *April* 5, 1875.

Mr. PIXLEY. I wish to correct a statement of fact. His honor the mayor did send down to the various companies, and they came to his office, and thorough and perfect arrangement, through the police, was made for their protection and the preservation of order.

Mr. BEE. That was on the 9th.

Mr. PIXLEY. It was the entire time. At this great meeting the first and leading resolution of the meeting was that the Chinese should not be interfered with and should be protected in their rights, and they never have been interfered with.

Mr. BEE. Previous to that meeting the excitement was intense. Leading citizens went to the mayor and urged to have these people protected.

Mr. PIXLEY. They were protected.

Mr. BEE. Yes, under a pressure. I wish to say one word in conclusion in reference to the cubic-air ordinance and the queue ordinance. I am told by these Chinese gentlemen (and you will meet many of them and say they are gentlemen) that the wearing of the queue is, in their country, a badge of respect. It designates them as being men who understand and follow the teachings of their prophets, Confucius and Mencius. It is understood that the queue represents them as being of that nationality and of that religion, and to deprive them of it is a lasting and burning disgrace. I am told that no explanation will be taken; that if a Chinaman goes back to China with the loss of his queue, he is eternally disgraced in the eyes of his neighbors; that his wife and his family will not recognize him. Now a policeman visits what they call a Chinese den, a lodging-house. He will arrest them. He will tramp forty of them to the jail. They are arrested for the most trivial offense, and this infamous ordinance, which is a disgrace to any civilization, brings every Chinaman under the scissors. His queue is taken from his head; his hair is cut within two inches of his scalp. But the law is general. If a white man happened to be arrested with a queue, his queue would go too; but there are none of our race arrested under this ordinance. I ask, are such things just? Are such things to be tolerated in a country like this?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there an ordinance prescribing the cutting off of the queue as a punishment?

Mr. BEE. Yes, sir; it is a penalty for being arrested, before he is tried. It is not done when he is convicted; but if he is arrested and brought to prison, his queue is cut off. Another thing: a Chinaman never is arrested without being convicted, as we shall show.

Mr. MCCOPPIN. It is a general law, prescribing that criminals after conviction shall have their hair cut.

Mr. PIXLEY. The same law exists in almost every city.

Senator SARGENT. It is the regulation of every State prison, only it affects the Chinaman because he happens to have a queue, I understand. It is a regulation, just as we put a prison-dress on a convict.

Mr. PIXLEY. Would not the same Chinaman have his hair cut off in Cincinnati or Albany?

Mr. BEE. No; not for sleeping in a small room or carrying a basket on the sidewalk.

Mr. PIXLEY. It would be done in every city. It is an ordinance in every prison that the hair shall be cut two inches from the head, but no white man's hair is longer than that, and consequently it does not operate on him at all.

Mr. BEE. There was no secret about it at the time that it was aimed against the Chinamen, and it is enforced now only on them.

Mr. PIXLEY. We are only controverting your statement that the queue is cut off previous to conviction.

Mr. BEE. I understand that. They always get convicted. As to the polygamy part of Mr. Pixley's address, I can only say that it does not come from him with very good grace to charge these people with it.

Mr. PIXLEY. I have but one wife.

Mr. BEE. It does not come from Mr. Pixley with good grace when in the midst of this continent we have a polygamous institution in defiance of law and in defiance of civilization.

Mr. PIXLEY. I did not create it.

Mr. BEE. In answer to your argument I point to that in behalf of the Chinese. I state, furthermore, as a matter of fact, that no ship ever arrived in this port with 400 Chinese women. I state, furthermore, that no tule-lands could be reclaimed without Chinese labor. I state, furthermore, that Mr. Shaw's testimony amounts to nothing, as he was a tourist traveling through portions of China, and had no opportunity to form a clear opinion of the manners and customs of the people.

Mr. Pixley places great stress upon his argument that the 10,000 Chinese domestic servants in this city crowd out and displace the same number of poor white girls.

It is quite significant that our well-to-do citizens employ this number of Chinese in their families; it is a direct denial of his statement made here that our people were of one accord in opposition to the Chinese.

Surely he does the domestic drudgery of 75,000 of our population, and you will notice that men of both political parties utilize his services in all and every calling. If there is any calling in which he is a direct divine blessing, it is that of a domestic servant; he is the balance-wheel which protects the mistress and housewife from imposition, and relieves her of the idea that servant and mistress are on an equality.

He holds the balance of power against Bridget, as he does against trades-unions, and is hated and persecuted by both alike.

I am much gratified that the committee have listened to me so patiently. I was requested last evening by the Chinese merchants to say to the commission that they cordially invite them to Chinatown; that they would show you all there is in it—these underground passages, the cellars. They will show you where, under this cubic-air ordinance, men are arrested, often forty of them at a time, for being in a room which has less than 500 feet of cubic air and put in jail where they have not 200 feet. They will aid you to investigate everything, and leave nothing undone. I say to Senator Sargent, who so ably represents this coast in the Senate of the United States, that he will find facts presented before this investigation is through which will convince him, truthful, honest, upright as his reputation is for fair dealing, that he has exaggerated this subject—that his information has not come from a good source. He will find that a portion of the people here have been carried away by public opinion, by excitement, to a great extent. I am in hopes,

Senator, that such will be the case. If you look into the facts as I find they exist, I know you will change your mind.

Senator SARGENT. Before you take your seat, I should like to direct your attention to one consideration. In this letter of the Chinese of April 5, last, they speak of their willingness to have Chinese immigration stopped, &c., and you yourself have argued the desirability of even having them sent back by detailing the Navy or some other means.

Mr. BEE. I said it would be a blessing to the Chinese to go unless they receive the protection of our laws.

Senator SARGENT. You are aware that the only result of the operation of this committee would be to recommend to Congress legislation tending in that direction.

Mr. BEE. Exactly.

Senator SARGENT. Please tell me why the Chinese employ attorneys to come here and show the undesirability of doing that thing.

Mr. BEE. I am not here for that purpose, and I presume Mr. Brooks is not. We are here to show and controvert the charges against them, and expose the wrongs perpetrated upon them.

Senator SARGENT. It makes no difference for what reason their going back is facilitated, provided it is done in a humane way; and if it is so desirable that they should go back, and our legislation tends in that direction, why come here and oppose it?

Mr. BEE. I am not here to oppose it. Some of the gentlemen on the other side say they do not want them transported back. There is no unanimity among them on this subject at all.

Senator SARGENT. I was only looking at it as it might affect the Chinese themselves. If they are so desirous of going back, why oppose the measures that tend to that result?

Mr. BEE. It has arrived to this—that their treatment here is such that they have become sick, disappointed, and disgusted, and I am here to show that they are a persecuted people.

Senator SARGENT. I suppose it is true—I infer from your remarks that you think yourself—that there is a very serious discontent pervading all classes of the community against the presence of Chinese in our midst. Of course, I suppose you are an exception, and there are a great many others, perhaps; but that is true, is it not?

Mr. BEE. I will not admit that. It is confined to a small portion of the people here, and to a particular class and creed.

Senator SARGENT. Do you not think that the prevailing sentiment in this city is opposed to the Chinese?

Mr. BEE. I do not, and we shall show on the investigation that those who are not opposed to them are composed of the best class of citizens the State can produce.

Senator SARGENT. There are intelligent citizens who are perfectly satisfied with the present condition of things, but I ask you if the prevailing sentiment of the people generally is not opposed to it, and if there is not much discontent on account of it?

Mr. BEE. It is not wide-spread, neither is it the prevailing sentiment. I wish to read an extract from article 2 of the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union, a section of which you will find in all their by laws:

> Its objects are to protect the people of the United States from the degrading influences of Chinese labor in any form; to discourage and stop any further Chinese immigration; to compel the Chinese living in the United States to withdraw from the country.

Mr. Pixley does not take that ground, and I do not understand that all of these gentlemen do. They do not want them to go away. But I do assert that the article I have just read is to be found in the articles

of association of every anti-cooly league in this city. They demand the expatriation of every Chinaman on this coast.

And they go still further; they authorize and send threatening letters, officially signed, warning our people to discharge their Chinese employés, or suffer the consequences; we will produce them before this commission.

I will detain you no longer, but pledge myself that we will produce testimony to substantiate all the main facts of my argument.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: I do not appear here as the attorney of the Six Companies. I do not know them. I never spoke to one of them in my life. But I take an entirely different view of this subject from the gentlemen on the other side. I look at it from an entirely different stand-point, and I claim to represent the interest and the opinion of the people of the State of California, and the interest of the Government of the United States. At the time that this movement took place here, I was in Washington Territory, and I only knew of what was taking place here from reports in the newspapers. I read the reports in the papers. I saw the names of the promoters of the movement, and those who assisted at it. To my mind, that sort of thing has no force of argument whatever. I know very well the views entertained by that class of people. They have held the same views since the dawn of civilization, and I suppose there will be the same class of people entertaining the same views until the crack of doom. If such arguments had been listened to, and if such views had prevailed, all the elements of progress, of wealth, and of comfort to the people of the present century, which is brighter than all that has preceded it in its great progress—its telegraphs, its railroads, its steam-engines, its printing-machine, the cotton-gin, would never have existed at all. They have opposed them from the beginning. There is not an improvement in manufacturing but will come at once in competition with labor. There is not a steam-engine but does the work of hundreds of men. You might as well transport your goods upon the backs of men. You might as well do all your plowing with the old Egyptian plow, and harvest with the cradle and the scythe. It is proposed in the papers to call a public meeting, and have a procession of men with torches and banners and transparencies and music; that is an argument intended to be offered to the committee. Such arrangements amount to nothing, and I apprehend will have no influence with the committee. A lighted hall, a band of music, and eloquent speeches announced to be addressed to the passions and prejudices of the ignorant and narrow-minded, will at any time assemble a crowd imposing in numbers and vociferous in applause.

I do not sympathize at all with the view of the subject which has been presented on the other side. The very people who raise all this clamor, who fill the halls, pass resolutions, and elect delegates, would never have been in this country if their views had prevailed. It seems strange to me that one class of emigrants should be permitted to rise against another class of emigrants because they come in competition with them. I deny the right of any foreigner who comes to this country to do that. We permit them to come here. They come here by virtue of our laws. No foreigner has *a right as a foreigner* simply to come into this country, and to establish himself and become an owner of the soil. It is *our law* which gives him that right. I have no sort of sympathy for the argument made by an Irishman, a German, or a foreigner of any nation, who has come here and been naturalized and been made a citizen and allowed to hold land, when he talks about *our* land being land for the white man, and says that this yellow-colored man comes in competition with the

white man. It is nothing to me if he does. I do not think it concerns the nation or humanity, or the world at large, that the yellow man's labor comes in competition with the black man's, the red man's, or the labor of any other man. I do not subscribe to the creed of my friend on the other side. I believe these men *have* souls. I believe in the common humanity and brotherhood of all men. I do not claim any rights whatever as against a red man, or a black man, or a yellow man. If he can compete with me on a fair footing, let him compete. If he diminishes my earnings, I have no right to complain. He has as good a right to earn a living on God's foot-stool as I.

The questions suggested by the committee do not seem to me to go deep enough. Mr. Pixley said that they seem to cover the whole subject, and they do cover the whole subject of their argument, but they do not go to the bottom of the matter; they are not wide enough in their scope; they only touch the surface.

I have lived here from the beginning of the American occupation. I came here in 1849 with my family, and with my family I have resided here ever since. I have seen San Francisco grow up from a few tents and adobe houses to a great commercial city. I have seen this State grow up. I love the city and love the State. I love it as any man loves his native land. I love her prosperity. Everything that touches it interests me. It is for that reason that when I was at the East and read the memorial which was presented to the Congress of the United States by the representative of these emigrants, demanding legislation for them, my indignation was excited, and I wrote a reply to it, which I sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate. In that paper I answered each of the charges which was made against these people. I did that at no man's solicitation. I did it simply as a Californian and as a man.

The Almighty has blessed us beyond all other people. He has placed in our hands the means of prosperity and happiness greater than any other people ever had. I feel as if we were throwing away this great prosperity, as if we were casting back in the face of the Almighty the gifts which he presented to us; that we are throwing back upon Him His bounty with scorn and seeking to destroy the foundations of the prosperity of our State and its great and glorious future.

It is therefore that I take my stand here, not for the Chinaman, but for the State of California and her people, and ask that they may be heard.

They do not march in these torch-light processions; they never go to these mass-meetings. During the day they are at their counters and about their business, following their trades, working upon their farms. At night they are at home with their families; but if you pass through these streets, day or night, you will see thousands of idle people, people who, if you offer them work, will ask you all sorts of conditions: "Where is it; how is it; what is it; when is it; shall I have this; shall I have that; shall I have the other thing." They dictate terms to you, and these must be just so and so; otherwise they will stay as they are. They walk along these streets, and if there is an excavation for a building being made they will throng the sidewalks, and if there is a dog-fight more of them gather together than would gather to hear my friend Mr. Piper. That is the class of men who throng your mass-meetings and pass resolutions and dictate the future of this State.

I hope the committee will look into the bottom of this question and see what is to be the effect of the measures proposed. I hope they will direct their own eyes in the matter and not allow anybody to say to them "Look at this and see that. This is so and so, and that is so and so."

I would remark that all that is bad, all that is noxious, about this thing is the creature of our own legislation, our own neglect, and our own mismanagement.

When a stream of water overflows its banks and becomes a flood, it is a terrible engine of destruction; but when it runs its natural course and is used and utilized, what can be more beneficent? The Chinese element is an element of prosperity, of future greatness, of wealth, but you can make an evil of it, as you can of anything. When you look at this matter, I think you will see that all that is noxious about it comes from ourselves, and not from the Chinese.

When we first came here we had no industry but the washing of the placers for loose gold, the accumulation of ages. Long ago *this* source of wealth was practically exhausted, that is to say, it ceased to be remunerative to white labor, and was abandoned. That labor is now carried on only by Chinamen, who get enough from it to subsist, working over the old placers which the white men had abandoned. I say this was practically exhausted years ago; and if that had been all of California, it would have been the end of the State. The people who came here to dig gold would have gone back; the State would have been deserted, or would have fallen back again into its old condition of pastoral simplicity--horns, hides, and cattle. But it so happened that somebody discovered we could raise grain, and then we went to work cultivating the land for wheat.

You know to what point wheat-culture can be carried. Our system of cultivation, as everybody knows, is exhaustive. We add nothing to the land; we take all from it; and I need not tell you, gentlemen, what the effect is. There is no part of the United States where we *have not* raised wheat. There is but a small part of the old United States where we can raise wheat now. We have only kept up the culture *here* by opening new lands. The old lands, little by little, become exhausted; and at the present cost of production and price of export, those lands will not pay when cultivated. There is a point beyond which you cannot carry this production. New lands cannot be brought in forever. When you have exhausted the supply of new lands, and their product has ceased to equal the cost, what, then, is California going to do? what, then, is to become of our great and glorious State?

Senator SARGENT. Is it not one objection to the employment of Chinese labor, that it makes easy the cultivation of new lands, and the wearing out of the old? Would it not be better to have more diversified farming, requiring less Chinese labor?

Mr. BROOKS. On the contrary, when the emigrants came here from the East, they denuded the land they occupied of timber, so that you may now go from one end to the other of that land without scarcely seeing a tree. I do not charge this upon the emigrants directly. I lay it more to the General Government, because, until 1853, we had no laws under which a white man could get a home. We were sojourners in the land, and we went over it, skinning it and cutting off the trees, which we would otherwise not have done.

Chinamen have no influence upon the mode of cultivation. They have little to do with cultivation. They are only used as auxiliaries. On every ranch there is a Chinese cook; for every gang of men there is a Chinese cook; at every wayside inn the cook is Chinese, and the servants are Chinese, but the farmers are mostly white men.

SENATOR SARGENT. I understood Mr. Bee to say that you could not gather the grain if it were not for Chinese labor.

Mr. BROOKS. I think many Chinese are employed in gathering grain.

Senator SARGENT. Then you see my point, that this Chinese labor is not helping us, but exhausting our lands, and thereby impoverishing the State.

Mr. BROOKS. You might draw that argument from it, but I cannot see how the effect of Chinese labor, in taking the grain off or plowing the land, results in that way.

Senator SARGENT. It makes it easier to carry on the present system. With a little higher-priced labor they would have to go to some other kind of farming.

Mr. BROOKS. The point is this: We must introduce new industries; and we must pursue a course which will introduce them. We can introduce them by these people, but not by the policy which we have been pursuing.

I was about calling your attention to the formation of the State in ranges of mountain parallel with the coast, with intervening valleys. These valleys in their natural state are only fit for pasturage. No matter how rich they are, unless you can get the wheat to market, to the coast, you cannot afford to raise it; there is no use in raising it. When I came down from Washington Territory, overland, I passed for many miles with scarcely seeing a house, except the wayside inn we stopped at, which was a mere stage-house, with perhaps not a house within ten miles of it. I would ask, "Is not this land fertile? Can you not raise wheat here?" The reply would be, "Yes; its fertility is great; we do raise wheat for our own use; but there is no further use in raising wheat; we cannot get it to market; we cannot sell it."

Until the land can be profitably used for the cultivation of grain, and until the grain can be got out to market, it is not open to the settlement of white families. As pasture-land, this land will support about one white man to the thousand acres, and the herdsman who follows the cattle has no family, and is a simple Bedouin. As agricultural land, this same land would support a hundred people to the 1,000 acres, and these not nomads, but families in homesteads, with villages, schools, and temples of the living God, whom the Chinamen and the Americans, some of them, worship. The effect of the railroads which the Chinese have built is to convert these valleys from simple pasture-lands into farm-lands, to open them for white people.

Following the building of the railroads down the San Joaquin Valley and Salinas Plains, there came an influx of white people from the west, and our opponents said, "We do not want Chinamen now." Why do they not want them? Because the Chinamen had built railroads down the valleys, and had established homes for the white men; and these railroads all the time bring in new lands, so that the exhaustion does not come so fast.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to say that the rich wheat-lands of this State are already exhausted or being exhausted?

Mr. BROOKS. I think that a great portion of them are exhausted. There are about 5,000,000 acres under cultivation, as near as I can calculate it, in the State. There are about 5,000,000 acres more in a natural state which can be used in the same way. Now, the Chinamen have not only made homes and furnished employment for white men, but they have given a living, the bread and butter, to 500,000 white men. That is the effect of the hundred thousand Chinamen here. I do not stand here to plead for these hundred thousand Chinamen. I stand here to plead for the interest of these 500,000 white men and women and chil-

dren, and I will plead for them against their own wishes, if necessary. But I do not agree with my friend, Senator Sargent, on that proposition. I believe if a poll of the State were taken on this question to day it would be overwhelmingly against his proposition and in favor of the immigration of Chinese. I have taken some little pains to inform myself upon this matter. It has got to be a sort of a hobby with me. Whenever I meet a man I ask him what he thinks about the Chinese question. But the two political parties are divided almost equally here, and every year when an election comes around, if anybody has an ax to grind, people can band together in a labor-union or any other association and dictate terms to any candidate. There are just enough of such people to carry the elections one way or the other; and however conscientious a man may be, he scruples to sacrifice the interests of his party on such a question. Thus both candidates will pledge themselves to vote in favor of an eight-hour law, although both candidates really believe that such a law is the worst possible thing for the laboring-man. Yet if the candidate does not pledge himself for it, the whole labor-union will go against his party. If the question should be distinctly presented to the people of the State, "Shall we stop the importation of Chinese labor?" I think they would say at once, "No." I believe there would be an almost unanimous cry in the negative.

I asked a former surveyor-general in this State to estimate the increase in the value of the property of this State created by Chinese labor in building railroads and in reclaiming tule-lands alone, and the amount he gave me is $289,700,000. That is the wealth which a hundred thousand Chinamen have added to California. It is wealth owned, held, and enjoyed by white men and not by Chinamen. The Chinamen do not carry it away with them; they could not, even if they wished to do so.

I do not regard the wandering herdsmen as any better than Indians. They add nothing to the wealth of the people at all, or to its society, its religion, or morality; but when the Chinaman has cleared away the land, and let these white families in, then we have society. Then we have a state. They build the canals for irrigation, and the whole valley becomes a garden, an orchard, filled with white men and women and children. They build the levees and reclaim the marsh-lands, perfectly matchless in fertility. The tule-lands reclaimed are inexhaustible. There is to be our great wealth. They are not little swamps; they are millions of acres. But when they have reclaimed these lands they move off, and white men take their places. It becomes fit for the residence of white men, an white men live there. They have made manufacturing possible. They have built up the manufactories; but when the manufactory is fairly on its feet and going, little by little the Mongolian is crowded out, and a white man takes his place, until, at present, in the manufacturing interests of this State, not one-fourth of the people are Chinese.

They go all over the land to make it habitable and do the work which the white man will not do; where white women decline to go as servants, they go. You cannot get an Irish Catholic woman to go into the country as a servant. She will not go out of the sound of the bells; and all through the country you must either have Chinese servants or none. There is no choice about it. When you go all through this country and ask them whether they will part with their Chinese servants, they say, "No, we cannot live without them." Many men have spoken to me, wishing me Godspeed, and said they must desert the country without Chinese labor.

These men will come before you; I shall bring witnesses before you from all parts of the State, who stand high in the opinion of their fellow-

citizens, and they will tell you that they cannot do without this labor, and that the State cannot do without it. It is not a question whether we are benefiting the Chinese, and whether they want to stay or go. If I had my will about it I would fence them in and not let them go, but that I acknowledge their right to go where they please. They pick the fruit and they pack the fruit. This is going to be one of the great interests of this State, and one that we must rely upon, and which I am glad to see is developing splendidly.

The CHAIRMAN. Allow me to ask you, Mr. Brooks, what is the sentiment, as you understand it, of the farmers of California on this question?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not believe there is a farmer in this State who would consent to part with them. I shall call farmers before you, the largest in the State, to tell you their experience and their wishes on the subject. I mean by farmers, the owners of the land which is cultivated; men who cultivate land themselves. If you mean the farm-laborers, these men in the street here, who have been spoken about, I do not know their opinion, neither do I care much for it. I wish we were rid of them; it is a bad class. There are plenty of good white hard-working laboring men in this country. I meet them all over in traveling. They find no fault with the Chinamen, and they do not wish to get rid of them; but of this idle class that throng the street here, I must say, if you could sweep them all out of the country we would be better without them. If you take their sentiment, I apprehend it would be adverse to the Chinese, or anybody else, willing to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

We have in this State a vast expanse of territory. A railroad in one continuous line stretches one thousand miles from one end of the State to another. It is an immense territory; it is an empire. We have 100,000,000 acres of land in the State. Now of all these 100,000,000 acres of land there are only about 5,500,000 of it cultivated. Of this vast territory, I think that nearly the whole of it is capable of being cultivated—capable of being made productive. There are under cultivation 5,500,000 acres. There are capable of cultivation in its natural state 5,000,000 acres more, I will say. There is of swamp-land and overflowed land and tule-land, land requiring to be reclaimed, 5,000,000 acres, and that is worth more, four times more, than all the land that is cultivated in the State. Then there are lands that may be cultivated by irrigation, 25,000,000 acres, land which, without the irrigation, is worthless to produce crops. It is fertile enough, but it does not get rain enough, and it is of a sandy nature. With irrigation it produces a large crop, and a great part of it with very little irrigation. The great mass of the land in the San Joaquin Valley is of that character. It is sandy, and the rain-fall there is light, but with two irrigations in the course of the crop it will every year produce a crop. Without those two irrigations it is every year a failure.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to be understood as saying that the anti-Chinese sentiment in this State is confined chiefly to the idle and floating population?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir; and more than that—to the foreign population—to the Irish. I have tried, gentlemen, to procure a list of the members of every anti-coolie club in this city. I have sent a man for that purpose to demand a list. The lists were made out, but upon consultation with one member of the committee, as I was informed, they refused to give them to me; but I got one, and here it is, (producing a paper.)

If you will read the list of names there you will find out that nearly

every one of them is an Irishman, and I have no doubt you will find the same if you will take the other lists. I hope you will bring the secretaries before you and make them produce their lists, and I will prove by the poll-lists of the city that they are not native-born Americans, and that they do not represent the American sentiment.

Senator SARGENT. Do you mean to say that the foreigners or Irishmen of this city are a worthless and idle class of people, and are not employed in our founderies?

Mr. BROOKS. If I had meant to have said it I should have said so. I do not wish to be so understood. I do not think so, and I do not mean to say so.

Senator SARGENT. You say these men are opposed to Chinese immigration, and would be better off if they were swept out of the State.

Mr. BROOKS. Oh, no; the people here of whom I spoke, when I said we would be better off if that class of men were swept out of the State, are mostly Americans; men who idle along the street.

The generality of the Irish population, and the foreign born, are industrious, hard-working people.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to say that those Americans in this city, who entertain sentiments opposed to the Chinese, are generally the idle and the floating population?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes, sir; I mean to say that if any Americans entertain such opinion, they are of that class; and the industrious, hard-working American people of the State entertain no such opinions. I think there are a great many of the Irish immigrants who entertain no such opinions; but there is a class of prejudiced Irish—the same class that burned the hospitals in New York; who opposed the damned Dutch when they came here; who were opposed to negro labor, and who filled the Molly Maguire societies in Pennsylvania. That class of people are the rabid anti-coolies here. They form these societies, and talk about exterminating the Chinese. Some of these societies are secret societies and you cannot even get to their constitution. If you look at this constitution of the central society, you will see that it is not one that ought to be favored. It is one, I think, that might be punished as a conspiracy.

I would be very glad indeed to take the list of officers and the vice-presidents of that meeting and catechise them, and show to the committee just who they are, what sort of opinions they represent; I would show that they are of that class. In this element there enters a great deal of religious prejudice. It is the "*pagan Chinee*" who enters a great deal indeed into their prejudices, and you will find that they are generally of that class. That there are some Americans who join with them in these gatherings is very true. There are some Americans who desire political preferment, and the votes of these people are useful. To expect in such a society or movement as that to find no Americans, would be to expect to find all Americans saints. I do not expect it, and I presume no member of the committee does.

I have said that there were 25,000,000 acres in this State capable of cultivation. Then, outside of this, there are 10,000,000 acres capable of cultivation by new industries, such as the raising of the mulberry, the production of silk, teas, coffees, cotton, and rice. In fact everything that is produced in China, and everything that grows on the earth's surface can be produced in California. I say that these things can be produced on 10,000,000 acres of land, outside of these valleys, by the assistance of this labor.

Then there are, I estimate, about 20,000,000 acres yet covered with

forest. In another part of the State, bordering on the coast, there are still very extensive forests, and it is so along the mountain-chains in the southern part of the State. But a great portion has already been denuded of forest, and I calculate that there are 15,000,000 acres more which can be replenished with forest-trees. Out of all these 101,000,000 acres in the State, I do not think there are to exceed 15,000,000 acres of absolutely worthless land, and even that may have some value for mineral purposes. In all this mass of land there are 50,000,000 acres at least which we can make useful to us, we can convert to utility, and produce wealth by the help of Chinese labor. There is nothing that grows on the whole earth's surface that we cannot make grow in the State of California.

I shall show by testimony before you that the Chinese have added vastly to the wealth of the State, that they opened homes for half a million of white people—five times their own number—and that there is ample scope in the future for them to go on doing the same thing; that we have only utilized some 5,000,000 acres of this vast domain, and that there are some 50,000,000 acres more which we can yet utilize; but we must introduce new industries.

There is another thing to be taken into consideration, and my friend Mr. Pixley has alluded to it, and properly. I wish to say that in a great deal Mr. Pixley has said I entirely agree. We can command the whole trade of the ancient East and the commerce of 500,000,000 of people. I put the population of China about where he does, at 400,000,000; but then there is Japan and other countries bordering on China, making altogether about 500,000,000. Trade with a people of that magnitude is something worth looking after, and it is a trade that has always dominated the world. From the time that Joseph's brethren sold him to a company of eastern merchants the nations that have had the eastern trade have been the mistress of the world. Phœnicia, Spain, Holland, England, whichever has it, is mistress.

Mr. PIXLEY. You assume that we are trying to drive out the Chinese?

Mr. BROOKS. That is the effect of the policy that you advocate.

Mr. PIXLEY. No; it is to restrain and regulate, and keep them within proper bounds. We have not undertaken to show that we want to drive the Chinamen out of the country.

Mr. BROOKS. I desire, gentlemen, to read to you an extract, or rather the translation of an extract, from an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, by R. Radan, of July 15th, 1876, from a very learned and exhaustive article on the subject of a trans-Asiatic railway. In the course of the article the writer says this of the Chinese people:

"One thoroughly informed concerning the extreme Orient, M. le Count Kleczkouski, has presented, in a recent work upon the commercial future of China, some reflections which deserve in a high degree to attract the attention of serious men. * * * China," says M. le Kleczkouski, "has more than 1,000 leagues of coast admirably watered by an immense net-work of rivers, streams, and canals. She produces all kinds of cereals, grains, rice, teas, silks, wools, cottons, flax, hemp, sugar, indigo, tobacco. The mountains and plains are crammed with coal and all sorts of minerals. As a retainer of specie she is perhaps the richest country of the world. It suffices, to convince one of this, to compute the sums which during the last thirty years the West has paid to her.

"Consider, now, the admirable industry of that people, the patience and the indefatigable tenacity of the Chinese workmen, their sobriety, their frugality, their respect for authority, their love of order and of

peace, and above all their contentment in ill-fortune as well as in success, their gaiety in the midst of labor. Bear in mind that the aptitude of Chinese for commerce surpasses even that of the Anglo-Saxon, and that to that aptitude there is joined a scrupulous probity, and you will comprehend that which is contained of force and of power in that nation of 400,000,000 souls.

"Those who judge the Chinese from the samples which they have seen in the ports and upon the shore, who accuse them of indolence, of poltroonery, of bad faith, and who, for these fine reasons, disdain the relations which they might establish with that people, have seen no more than the surface. To speak only of the pretended bad faith of the Celestials, the merchants who live in China know that among no other people are verbal promises kept with such rigor. In what other country," asks M. de Kleczkouski, "can they, as they did in China, even in 1852, trust to men who possess nothing in the world, 500,000 or 600,000 francs in silver or in drafts, for the purpose of going into the interior of the province to buy, from village to village, from hamlet to hamlet, spices, sugars, teas, or silks? Numerous examples are met with there of suicides, having no other cause than the impossibility of paying up at the approach of the new year (an epoch at which all accounts ought to be absolutely liquidated) debts contracted only by parol.

"That commercial probity is sometimes carried even to heroism, as is shown by an incident which occurred at Canton in 1856, at the eve of the burning of the foreign factories. The viceroy, Yé, issued an edict condemning to the punishment of death every native convicted of holding the least intercourse with the barbarians who were then at war with China. The French and the English hastened to quit their counting-houses. One night a Swiss merchant, (the residents of that nation were then under the protection of the French flag) making preparations for departure, beheld entering one of his Chinese customers, who, assisted by many coolies, brought to him some millions of dollars in ingots of silver, which he owed him. As the European expressed to him his surprise at such temerity, at such a moment, 'I did not wish,' answered the Chinaman, 'that I could be thought capable of having availed myself of the evil of circumstances to avoid paying my debt.' Such traits suffice to reduce to their true value the accusations launched against that race by superficial travelers." (R. Radau, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15, 1876.)

Yet Shaw undertakes, from just passing through China, to tell you about their morals and their religion. He does not know anything more about their religion than Pixley does.

Mr. PIXLEY. I think it is Paley who says there is no answer to a sneer.

Mr. BROOKS. I would not say that of Mr. Pixley, only he talked about "*our religion;*" and when I asked him what *our* faith was, he explained it to you. If he does not get any nearer to the Christian religion than that, I ask you if he is likely to get nearer the Chinese religion and morality. When he comes to *testify*, it is all right; but when he gets on his horse—his Pegasus—this is the way he goes off. Here is a sample of it. In talking about San Francisco, Mr. Pixley said, February 8, 1873:

"California was originally settled by gamblers, and this early passion has continued to the present day, till we may almost say to-day that our population is composed of gamblers!"

[That is the way he talks about us.]

"We have some few patient toilers content to work industriously,

[some few,] but the great proportion of our business is still to gamble. * * * In the face of all this demoralization, it is no cause for surprise that our boys and girls [our boys and girls, not those of the Chinaman] do not grow up the models of virtue and propriety. * * * We furnish billiard-rooms, whisky-saloons, dance-cellars, melodeons, and brothels all over town, and affect to be surprised that they produce such fatal results."

That is his picture of California. Now, I should like to know what anybody would suppose we were upon reading that. Would he not think we were a great deal worse than Mr. Shaw pictures China? You have been here but a few days, but surely you have seen miles and miles of dwelling-houses filled with white families. You have seen churches everywhere, and upon Sunday you will see thousands and thousands of people crowding to them reverently to worship God. How does your own experience agree with that picture? If he does not get any nearer the truth in regard to China, I prefer to take somebody else for my teacher.

Mr. PIXLEY. Mr. Brooks quotes me as some people quote the Bible, by taking extracts and leaving out the context.

Mr. BROOKS. I have read your language just as it appears.

Mr. PIXLEY. I take it for granted the language is correct. By gambling, I referred to our California and mining stocks; and if you will read the rest you will find that it is an intelligent *exposé* of the condition of things in our State.

Mr. BROOKS. If I had the whole speech here I would read it. That is all I have ever seen of it, and that sickened me.

I do not think it necessary for me to go through all the charges which were made, in detail, here. We intend to introduce testimony on all these subjects. But the great difficulty is that there is a little thread of truth somewhere in them. I do not think the Chinamen are all angels, and I do not think everything about them is lovely. There are a great many things about every foreign people which I dislike. I have my American prejudices, but that would not cause me to do them injustice. I ride every day in the street-cars with these Chinamen, and more of them ride in the street-cars, I believe, than of any other foreign people. They are great patrons of the street-cars. I have never found out why people so mean and stingy and economical can spend more money for riding in the street-cars than the entire remainder of the foreign population. If you will get into these omnibus railroad-cars, you will find them continually crowding it. Nobody cares about it. I would a great deal rather sit beside a clean Chinaman than a dirty white man. It is a matter of taste, however.

Take six blocks of land and crowd it with Chinamen. I will not say as many as Mr. Pixley said, because there he is again; but I will say 20,000, 15,000, or 10,000 people crowded into that space, and if the city takes no steps at all to cleanse it, the place will inevitably be dirty. But take a Chinaman. He washes himself from head to foot every day. That is his custom. There are no people on earth so clean personally as Chinamen. Look at their clothes. You meet them all the time; you see them on our streets; look at them, and compare them with any other laboring class and see who is clean. It is said that they pay no tax. I say that they pay more than their percentage. They pay $100,000 taxes in this city. I would take one-half or a quarter of what they contribute to the treasury, and I would make Chinatown as clean as this room is, as clean as any place can be. Take, say, 20,000 people and put them into a place like that—traveling people, people who are not

permanently located, have no interest in the place at all—and furnish them no means of getting rid of their dirt, the place will inevitably be dirty. It has been said that they crowd our almshouses. That was one of the charges made against them. I asked the keeper of the almshouse here to report to me on this question, and this is his report:

ALMSHOUSE.—Number of inmates admitted from May 1, 1870, to September 20, 1876, 3,263, of which there were Chinamen——

How many?

Six.

Six Chinamen! That is the way they crowd our almshouses in this State.

Senator SARGENT. Have you any statistics of the hospitals?

Mr. BROOKS. I have them not here; but have called for them and intend to present them. I shall present statistics—figures that will not lie.

Senator SARGENT. I think there are not many in the almshouse, but that the hospital records will show very many.

Mr. PIXLEY. The hospital and prisons.

Mr. BROOKS. The statistics of the hospital do not show anything like the proportion of Chinese to white men.

Senator SARGENT. They show a great many.

Mr. BROOKS. Some are taken out and carried to the hospitals against their will; few go voluntarily. It is said they will not respect our law. The whole number of cases brought in the district courts in this city was 66,683; and I venture to say that you cannot find in that number one hundred actions brought against Chinamen to compel the performance of a contract or to punish its breach. It has been said before you and before our State senate that the Chinese quarter is a mass of vice and crime sweltering there together. You see a mass of industrious Chinese laborers all around who have to live somewhere. Do they not live there? It is said that this is a terrible criminal element, but what is the state of our city? Here is a city of 250,000 inhabitants—a big city, and a commercial city. Every one knows that in a port vice congregates; and yet this whole city is kept in order by one hundred and fifty policemen.

After having heard some of the accounts of this terrible cess-pool, you would think, of course, it requires at least five hundred policemen to take care of it,; but this whole city has but one hundred and fifty policemen. Yet they make more arrests than any other one hundred and fifty policemen, probably, in the world. I say, and I do not believe anybody will deny it who will inquire into the matter, that there is no city in the world of its size where property and life are as safe as in San Francisco. I think the statistics will show it. If you take the police report you will find that the arrests in the year are 20,180. That is pretty good for one hundred and fifty policemen. Out of that number of arrests 7,643 are for drunkenness. More than one-third are for drunkenness, and not one of these is a Chinaman. I do not think any man ever saw a drunken Chinaman on our streets. I do not myself remember ever to have seen one during my entire residence in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the prevalence of the use of opium among them, and what are its effects?

Mr. BROOKS. I am informed by those who have employed them, and who will testify before you, that not one out of twenty uses opium at all; and for one to be addicted to the use of opium so as to affect him physically, there is not one per cent. Opium, when used in excess, has the same effect, physically, a good deal, as liquor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it produce violence?

Mr. BROOKS. Not at all. It stupefies, but it renders the body less capable of labor. You never see a Chinaman wallowing in the gutter or staggering along the street, or sleeping it out on the sidewalks, or getting into rows and disorders on the streets. If he smokes opium, he takes a little whiff in his store; and there are dens where they smoke opium to intoxication.

Senator SARGENT. You say they do not have rows among themselves; but sometimes very deadly ones have occurred.

Mr. BROOKS. I mean they do not get into rows in the street from smoking opium as drunken men do. I before disavowed for the Chinese the condition of angels. They certainly fight, and fight light good ones. The idea that a Chinaman is a coward is simply ridiculous. A Chinaman always stands his ground if he has half a chance, and sometimes among themselves they fight like the very devil. There are sometimes among these Chinamen the bloodiest rows I ever heard of; and I have no doubt with proper officers, and with proper discipline, they would make excellent soldiers. They are perfectly obedient and orderly when disciplined. As to fear, I never saw one who had a chance who would not stand his ground. I have seen plenty of them.

Assaults, 2,374.

I do not think many of these are Chinamen.

Obscene language, 1,418.

I do not believe one of these are Chinamen; there might have been one or two. The first part of the English language which a foreigner learns is that part of it; he learns to swear in English.

It is said they produce danger from fire; but I have no recollection of one single building destroyed by fire in that quarter; and I shall cause testimony to be brought before you on this subject.

It is said that their life here is productive of disease. Here again the statistics will determine the question. It can be told whether more diseases emanate from that quarter than from other quarters of the city. I venture to state that there are other quarters in the city which are clean and open to the air that originate more disease than is originated there. You will always smell the smoke of opium; and to foreign noses it is strange, and to some even agreeable. They have many viands which we do not use, and the odor of these is not agreeable to us. The smell of their varnish is not agreeable. You smell all those things when you go among them, compounded and run together, like the perfumes of Cologne. Whether you, with your uneducated nostrils, will be able to analyze and separate this smell, I do not know; but I myself believe the smoke of opium is a disinfectant. I believe a candid and fair report on this subject will show that less disease originates there, and that of those who are sick more of them get well. Dr. Meares has been making an inspection of that place. He announced, in the first place, in the papers, that the same proportion died of Chinese sick that there died of white people; and when it is considered, as he charged, that the Chinese kept their small-pox patients there in Chinatown, in this crammed, crowded place, you would wonder that the whole of them do not die like rotten sheep. He got the police and went through the quarters, opening every door, and adding an additional stink to Chinatown. What did he find? After some days' labor he could not find any small-pox patients in Chinatown, and he got two or three in a Chinese wash-house outside (as the newspapers said) and brought them in; and then toward the close of his investigation he scared up a dozen con-

valescents. That was not a bad showing for Chinatown. Just consider this matter. Suppose you had a sick brother in your house, and you felt perfectly confident that you could cure him; the city physician comes along and says, "You must not have that man there; I will take him out to the hospital;" and you felt that if they took him there he would die. Would you not feel very much as if the man was murdered? I have no doubt that is the way the Chinamen feel about that. They have their own ideas about sanitary matters and medical matters, and they do not agree with ours; and ours, unfortunately, do not agree with the past medical knowledge a few years back. We are changing continually; and I have no doubt we could learn from them. We vaccinate, and vaccination runs out. They inoculate, and they have a perfect faith in their power to control the disease, whether it is contracted naturally or by inoculation. The deaths from small-pox among the Chinese in these crowded holes are not greater than the deaths from small-pox in the hospitals, with all the aid of nursing, air, diet, and everything.

Then you have heard something about this cubic air law, which was passed to compel the Chinese to be taken out of their own dormitories and put them in pestiferous cells of the city prison—an underground hole which would be a disgrace and a shame to any community. I wish you would look at that place. It is in the basement of the city hall, entirely underground. Into the narrow quarters of that place you cram more Chinamen than are sleeping in less than 500 cubic feet of air in all Chinatown. In regard to this matter, I do not think any respectable medical authority will say that any disease ever originates from sleeping in less than 500 cubic feet of air, and I never heard of a law being enforced against any one but a Chinaman. This pregnant fact appears from the statistics of the State.

In regard to the State's prison of this State, Dr. Taliaferra, who is the physician of the State's prison, says, in one part of his report, that they are confined in cells—mind you, cells of stone with a little opening on one side only, and a square hole in the door-way—where they have *less than* 150 *cubic feet of air to the man.* All those who are confined in the cells in the State's prison are confined to that quantity of air. In another part of his same report he says, "I am happy to report to you that *not a single case of disease has originated in the prison.*" What on earth is the use of oppressing these people—taking them by the dozen and putting them in prison and making them pay ten dollars apiece, for simply sleeping in the place where they choose to sleep, which hurts nobody?

Instead of diverting this labor to our own use, there has been a succession of legislation against them from the beginning down to this day. At the very first we commenced legislating against them. Half of the revenue of the State was raised out of the Chinese miners. That continued until the Federal Government put a stop to it and declared it unconstitutional. I believe the State supreme court declared it unconstitutional. From that time down, they have gone on oppressing them. I wish to indorse all that has been said by my colleague about Mr. McCoppin. He has always stood by law, and in favor of equality and equal rights before the law, and against irregular legislation. The legislation was aimed at the Chinese, but the legislature was ashamed to avow it. There was legislation against the foreign miner generally, but it was enforced only against the Chinese. There was legislation against houses of prostitution generally, but it was enforced only against the Chinese. The 500 cubic feet of air law was against all persons, but it was enforced only against the Chinese. The ordinance to cut off the

hair was in terms applied to all, but intended for nothing on earth but to touch the Chinese in their religion—in their tenderest feelings. I will not go through all the topics of legislation. The laundry ordinance was of the same kind; the basket ordinance was of the same kind. There has been this continued legislation against the Chinese. Then, when some of them had been here a number of years, thinking they might safely do it, they went to get naturalized, and there was a general movement in that direction, because the idea got abroad that they might be naturalized. You know very well that some of our people applied immediately and urgently to Congress, and at the last session you amended the act so as to exclude them from naturalization. You ask, "Do these people have homesteads?" How can they have homesteads? How can a Chinaman have a homestead? Can he be naturalized?

Senator SARGENT. That has no relation to the United States homestead law.

Mr. BROOKS. Unless he is a citizen he cannot take up the land.

Senator SARGENT. That is not the kind of homestead the State law refers to. The lands may be taken by anybody, and he will be protected to the extent of $5,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Would any white man on earth go to a country when treated in that way? Would he buy a homestead and bring there his wife and family? Is that the way we are to get the China trade? Is that the way we are to have these people domiciled among us? When you look at the history of these people from the beginning down to this day, it is a wonder that they even stay here, and it is no wonder at all that they do not bring their families here.

I will not detain the committee longer than to say that on all these points we shall call witnesses, and the committee will find that they are among the best people in the State of California, and those most competent to know the merits of this question.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 23, 1876.

Mr. PIXLEY. We desire, if the commission please, to say that the scope of the argument taken by the friends of the Chinese is broader than we assumed it to be, or ever laid it down to be. We have never asked, nor has public opinion gone in the direction of asking, to exclude the Chinese who are now among us from all the rights which they have acquired under the treaty and under the law. Nor has public opinion gone so far as to exclude any Chinese from coming, but it is more correctly chartered out and represented by the idea of Senator Sargent set forth in his speeches in the Senate of the United States, and Mr. Piper, a member of the Committee on Commerce in the House of Representatives, that Chinese immigration shall be so placed within the power of Congress that it may be regulated and restrained. The present agitation has arisen in view of the presence of 400,000,000 of people across this ocean standing face to face with only 40,000,000 people on this side, and the practical fact that it costs less money to come from Hong-Kong to San Francisco than from Chicago or Omaha to San Francisco. This excitement and agitation, which was not excessive but natural, came up in the presence of a new influx of immigration that was bringing at the rate of three, four, and five thousand a month. In the presence of that agitation the great public meeting was held on the 5th of April. In answer to the general charge that this representation of our side is the Irish and the Catholic, the low and the irresponsible, the poor, the idle, and the worthless, I called your attention to the fact that that meeting

was presided over by the governor of this commonwealth, the lieutenant-governor acting as vice-president, the mayor of the city government calling the meeting to order and acting also as vice president, and fifty or sixty of the most reputable gentlemen of our leading professions, the bar, the clergy, and the medical profession, bankers, merchants, and business-men, loaning their names, writing their own petition, so that we might not make the mistake to give their authority as an indorsement of their feeling in regard to this thing in the community. Then we referred to the attitude of the two great national parties here to show that it is not a matter of political opinion but a matter of most universal feeling, and stated the fact that all the press united upon this question for the first and only time in the history of this State.

The character of the question we shall prove. At this meeting, thus presided over, the second resolution passed was as follows:

Resolved, That the people of California, in their perfect loyalty to the Government and the law, recognize their duty to the Chinese now among us, promising them protection and all their rights, and a guarantee of all the privileges to which they are entitled under existing laws.

We recognize the duty upon ourselves as citizens to protect these people who have come among us by virtue of our treaties, and are here by our invitation as it were.

Then, again, we shall ask the commission to remember that at the very time this prejudice was supposed to be so strong and public excitement so great, the Chinese companies assented to the idea that it was to their injury and ours that this large immigration should encouraged, and they did do what they could in the way of writing and telegraphing and uniting with us, and have contributed to arrest and stay that immigration. Now, the attorney of the six companies, occupying, I believe, avowedly that position, and in the presence of three or four of the most influential Chinese who are of the six companies, states that they would hail with pleasure the opportunity for those who are here to return, recognizing the general idea that they should be inhibited from coming in numbers. Keeping, as I will, steadily in mind the fact that this commission is here for the purpose of obtaining such information as shall lead to intelligent legislation upon this question, we may avoid delaying the commission by going into questions that are extrinsic and not to the issue of this case, confining ourselves to the general idea that legislation is not directed to the point of excluding them from our coast, nor to return from the coast those who are already here and who are respectable, decent citizens. As to our treatment of the Chinese and their being stoned and bruised, the commission will find it to be a most gross exaggeration, and one which does our people rank and cruel injustice. There never has been a Chinaman killed, I believe, in the history of our State in anything like an *émeute* or anything like a riot. There have been no riots between Chinese and others. At the time when this great meeting was held and when their attorney was patrolling the lowest places of the Chinese quarters where the Chinese congregate, the whole influence of the press, the better public opinion throughout the community, the sentiment of the orator at that meeting, was that there should be no violence lest it should prejudice our side of the question and raise up for them a sympathy which would be deserved if we treated them badly, and that they did not deserve in the present attitude. We point with pride to the fact that in all the long history of this antagonism between, if you please to call it so, our poorer white classes and this invading laboring-class, there really has been no wrong perpetrated

upon them except that which comes from what is better termed annoyances generally by irresponsible boys.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to say a few words?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEE. I wish to present the following books for the examination of the commission, for they will cut some figure in this investigation. [Producing books.] They are known as "the four books," the Chinese classics. They represent in their schools the same as the first, second, third and fourth readers in our common schools. It is a translation recently made of a work which has been in existence for over two thousand years. You can judge of the work by a glance at the margin. You commence at the back and read in a contrary direction as all books are read in Chinese.

Mr. PIXLEY. Do all these volumes form the same work?

Mr. BEE. They are all the same work, four volumes. I wish to say in reply to Mr. Pixley that we pledged ourselves to substantiate the charges we made in our argument the other day, and we hope to do so. We shall show to the committee that there has been no exaggeration in reference to the outrages perpetrated upon these people.

Mr. PIXLEY. I do not want to get up a discussion at this point.

Mr. BEE. We propose to prove pretty much all our assertions. It was a very easy matter to call a public meeting at the time the meeting was called at Union Hall. At that time no citizen dared to refuse the use of his name as vice-president.

FREDERICK F. LOW, sworn and examined:

Mr. PIXLEY. Without going through all the usual preliminary formalities, I will state that Governor Low was formerly a member of Congress from this State, collector of the port of San Francisco, subsequently governor, and later minister to China, where he resided for—how many years?

The WITNESS. I was there about three years and a half.

Mr. PIXLEY. He returned to this city about two years ago.

The WITNESS. I returned to the city three years ago. I returned in the autumn of 1873.

Mr. PIXLEY. And he is now the manager of the Anglo-California Bank. (To the witness.) Have you seen and read the interrogatories which have been propounded by this commission touching the investigation of the Chinese question?—A. I saw them in the newspapers a few days ago, but I could not now state what they are unless they were placed before me.

Q. From your observation of the Chinese when occupying your official position, and your knowledge of the State of California and its citizens since 1849, will you give to the commission your opinion as to the desirableness of Chinese immigration and its influence upon the progress, prosperity, and welfare of our State?—A. That is a very broad question, Mr. Chairman, and it would be difficult for any man, within the purview of evidence, to state his opinions without, perhaps, being misunderstood. Taking our system of government in its broad sense, of course I am of the opinion that the immigration of any people who cannot assimilate, amalgamate, and become part and parcel of this Government and of its people is a disadvantage *per se*. It is the same with the negro, with the Mongolian, with the Malay, or any race that is practically incapable of amalgamation with the Anglo-Saxon race; but to prevent such immigration, with the world lessened in size, as it is practically, by railroads, telegraphs, and steam-communication, and with the intelligence that is diffused throughout the world, is practically impossible, unless

we would go back to the darker ages of China and isolate ourselves, and build up a great wall, perhaps, to keep the people from coming from the North, and blockade our ports to keep people from coming in from the East and West.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have we not laws by which we limit the number of any kind of passengers who come here in vessels from Europe, providing that so much space shall be allotted?—A. I believe so.

Q. Are not those laws usually enforced practically?—A. I think so.

Q. Could not those laws be extended to the influx of an extremely undesirable people?—A. I know no reason why they may not.

Q. Then can we not do it otherwise than by building a Chinese wall and blockading our ports?—A. Possibly.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Did you hear our statement generally, that the object sought by our people is not to prevent, but to regulate Chinese immigration?—A. I merely stated the broad principles which underlie the answer to your question as to the influence of the immigration of Chinese into the United States.

Q. From what part of China do these emigrants mostly come?—A. Permit me to state that nearly all the evidence which I can give (and perhaps I know as much about it as almost any witness you would be likely to call before you, and the same is true of any other witness) will be not personal knowledge, but impressions gathered from what knowledge I have been able to obtain. I do not know, as a matter of fact, where the Chinamen come from, but I have sufficient knowledge to permit me to swear that, according to my best knowledge and belief, they practically all come from the province of Kwang-tung, in China; that is, they are natives of that province, which is the most southern province in China, of which Canton is the capital. Canton is the anglicised word of that name. The name of the city of Canton was formerly Kwang-tung. I believe that practically all of these passengers emigrate from the port of Hong-Kong to San Francisco.

Q. Hong-Kong is an English port?—A. It is an English port.

Q. And an independent port?—A. It is not an independent port. It is a colony, a free port.

Q. I mean to say independent of the Chinese?—A. Entirely so, as much as Liverpool. The island of Hong-Kong was ceded to Great Britain, and it is hers in fee and in fact. She established a colony there, called by a name which never figures anywhere in public, the colony of Victoria.

Q. If you know, state, please, what is the class of people who emigrate from this province of Kwang-tung, and under what conditions they come to California. First, their males; second, their females.—A. Judging by the Chinese that I see here, and from what I know, practically, all the male emigrants are what may be denominated laborers. There are a few merchants, but they are few as compared with the whole.

Q. What do you understand by the term "coolie?"—A. "Coolie," in China, is simply "laborer." As applied to immigration, it has become a synonym for contract labor. For instance, in China I hire house servants, cooks, and hostlers; and then there is a certain quantity of general work, such as cleaning lamps, making fires, and bringing water, which is a lower class of labor, and we denominate those as coolies, such as water-coolie, fire-coolie, lamp-coolie. Therefore, in China coolie means simply the common ungraded class of labor; but when applied

to emigration it has become associated with those who have gone to Havana, to Peru, and to other places, under contract. When we speak of coolie-emigration, it is generally accepted and received as contract labor, hired in China to serve for a certain number of years out of the country.

Q. What is the general wages of that, the lowest class of unskilled labor, in the province of which you speak?—A. I should say that from three to five dollars per month, or its equivalent, would be a fair statement of the wages.

Q. What is the condition of the female immigrants to our port?—A. I know nothing of them except from public report.

Q. From such opinions as you have gathered here and there in reference to them?—A. There may be some wives of merchants who come, but I infer that by far the larger portion, perhaps nine-tenths, or nineteen-twentieths, are prostitutes, or women brought here for the purpose of prostitution.

Q. Is the business of prostitution regarded in their circle of society as legitimate or otherwise?—A. You speak of their circle. What do you mean?

Q. I mean among themselves; not among the women, but among the cooly class.

A. Prostitution in China is regarded with more aversion and disgust by respectable Chinese than it is, if possible, by Americans or Europeans, and a prostitute is more of a pariah in Chinese society than among Americans. But with the common class of laborers who come here, undoubtedly there is a looser opinion in regard to it; and without being able to form any very correct judgment, I should say that it is not looked upon with that severity which it is by the officials and the better classes at home.

Q. Do you not infer that prostitution is a recognized profession there, in fact outranking that of cooper, barber, and other lower pursuits?—A. No; it may be considered at the bottom. I can best illustrate to the committee, perhaps, the favor in which prostitution is held by stating that after a graduate shall have passed his examinations which will entitle him to official position, he has to bring affirmative testimony before he takes office that none of his family, for so many removes, has ever been guilty of being a public prostitute. Unless he can bring affirmative testimony to that effect, he cannot occupy the position, although he may have passed through all the examinations which fit him for it.

Q. Those examinations are in the classics?—A. Yes.

Q. The works of Confucius and Mencius?—A. Yes.

Q. You stated in your examination before the Senate committee that the average wages of a common laborer were from ten to twenty cents a day?—A. I do not recollect. I only saw that pamphlet last night; I was never able to get hold of it before.

Mr. BEE. It may be as well to object right here to calling attention to testimony which has been published.

The WITNESS. My answer is the same. I will say from three to five dollars a month.

Senator SARGENT, (acting chairman.) It is hardly a question of objection or non-objection. The parties do not appear here as lawyers. So far as they volunteer to assist the committee, we shall be glad to have their assistance, but we trust it will not be considered that this is such an examination and cross-examination that the time of the committee is to be taken up by arguments on the admissibility of evidence.

Mr. BEE. I merely made the objection because the gentlemen ask to have that testimony, as a whole, laid before the committee.

The WITNESS. My testimony before I never saw until last evening, when some one handed me a copy of that pamphlet, and I cannot say how correctly it is reported.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) As to the marital relation, is the custom of China polygamous or otherwise? Explain what you understand it to be in China.—A. I understand the custom of marriage in China to be that the parents of children, both male and female, betroth their children with such advantageous arrangements as may be; and that children, whether boys or girls, have no part or lot in the matter of their betrothal. Parents attend to all that, and when the children arrive at a proper age they are married. After a man is married and has one wife, I understand it to be quite in keeping and not repugnant to the law—perhaps it has grown up from long custom—that he be allowed to take subsequent wives, and that is more in the nature of purchase than of betrothal. If a poor man has an extra number of daughters that he is unable to betroth regularly, and some married man fancies one of them, and says, "I will give you so many taels, and take good care of your daughter," he takes her and she becomes a second, third, or fourth wife. She goes into the same household; is subordinate to the first wife; and the children of all are legitimate.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are they married? Is there a ceremony of marriage for a second or third wife?—A. I do not think there is. I think that comes merely from the custom and his announcing that this is his second, third, or fourth wife, as the case may be.

Q. Does the taking of a second or third wife affect the respectability of a man in society?—A. Not at all. On the contrary, when the Emperor himself—the young Emperor—was married in the spring of 1873, when I was there, they not only gave him an Empress, but they also gave him four additional ones at the same time. That was done by public decree, and of course whatever the Emperor does must be respectable when done by anybody else.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. As to the children born, males and females, what is the estimate in which the female infant or child is held in the more redundant portion of China?—A. It is considered an imperative duty upon every one to have a son to perpetuate the name and to raise a family, which comes partly from the Confucian religion and partly from the Buddhist, and is a mixture of all, that they may have lineal descendants to pay respect to the graves and remains of the deceased when they are gone. A boy is much more desirable than a girl, and with the poorer classes the fact of having a surplus of girls is considered a burden. You cannot always get rid of them, cannot always betroth them, and it is not quite respectable for a girl to grow up to be an old maid. She needs a husband; and it is chiefly through economic motives, perhaps, and partly from the traditions that have been handed down, that the poorer class regard the increase in female children as a burden upon the family.

Q. Do they take any means to destroy the female children?—A. It is said that in the thickly-populated districts, that is about cities, and where the morals of a certain class of people are low, there is very little hesitation in destroying female children at early birth, and it has a sort of semi-official sanction. There is no law to sanction it, as I understand it.

Q. Is there a law to punish it?—A. I suppose there is a law to punish

it, but like many laws in our country, I think it has grown into disuse. Is that true, Mr. Gibson?

Mr. GIBSON. They sometimes issue proclamations and punish it in some parts of the country.

The WITNESS. There is a law against it, but as a rule it is not enforced.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) Do you not understand that one of the leading features of their faith is that females have no souls, no part in the future?—A. I do not so understand it.

Q. I believe it is a controverted point among writers?—A. I never have so understood it.

Q. What is the religion of the Chinese?—A. That is a pretty hard question to answer. The religion, if it may be called a religion, of all China is the teachings of Confucius; but in point of fact I suppose that will only be regarded as a code of morals by any thinker on the subject. It does not extend beyond this world.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Does it teach a future state?—A. In a hazy way, not definitely. But then they have engrafted on to that the Buddhist faith and the Tanist. The Tanist can hardly be considered a distinct religion in China. The Buddhist has been attached to and interwoven with the Confucian, which has made a curious conglomeration. The Buddhist faith I suppose in its original purity does not in its forms and ceremonies vary very much from Catholicism.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. As to its general essentials of belief?—A. Yes; there is such a striking similarity that I cannot but believe that one is derived from the other.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do the Buddhists teach the immortality of the soul?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And a future state of reward and punishment?—A. Instead of teaching the future state of rewards and punishments they teach the principle of the transmigration of souls, and that if a person does not live a purely honest life he is not fit for perfect bliss; therefore he will be transformed into something better.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. That is the doctrine of metempsychosis?—A. Yes. I was going on to say that my understanding of the Buddhist religion is that if a person does not live a purely honest life, when he dies he is not fit to enter into a state of perfect bliss or elysium, but he is transformed into something that is better, some better man; and he is allowed to go on through another course, where he may make improvement. If he progresses, he is again transformed into a still better person and makes further progress until he arrives at a perfect state of being, when he enters into elysium. If he does worse, he is transformed into something worse, and goes down into brutes, animals, serpents, &c. Nirvana is the state of elysium usually arrived at by the Buddhist. Buddha was originally to the Buddhist what Christ was to the early Christians; he was a perfect man. They have their saints and apostles, nuns and sisters of charity, and the rules of their religion provide strictly for celibacy of priests and a vegetable diet, the same as the Catholic. Indeed the similarity is so striking that Abbé Huc, who made his tour through China several hundred years ago, in a book descriptive of what he saw, could

not explain it in any other way than that the Buddhist religion was the invention of the devil to throw doubt and discredit upon the true faith; that it was invented so as to be so near like the Catholic as to throw doubt and discredit upon the true faith. I have no doubt that the idols which they worship now are merely symbols of perfect men, martyrs, saints, &c., that once existed. But without a written history to hand it down they have lost sight of the original story.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do the Buddhists teach one supreme being?—A. They teach Heaven in a general way, a state of bliss, and an overruling spirit or conglomeration of spirits, not a living and true God, not an individual and personal God.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. From whence did Buddhism come to China?—A. It came from India.

Q. And what is its age in India?—A. I could not pretend to tell you from memory.

Q. Long anterior to the birth of Christ?—A. O, yes.

Q. Going back into the prehistoric age?—A. From my reading I infer that the symbols of catholicism were taken bodily from Buddhism. But if you ask a Chinaman if he is a Buddhist, he will tell you no. Every one of them will deny it. It is not a popular faith. They will tell you Confucius was the great man.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have you read the Code of Confucius?—A. I have read the Chinese classics, which is a compilation of the teachings of Confucius and Mencius.

Q. It is a moral code?—A. It is a moral code. I think it is fully equal to——

Q. Plato and Aristotle?—A. Yes; and I will include Moses, too.

Q. Or to the Roman philosophers?—A. Yes. There is one material difference; the teachings of Confucius are rather negative instead of positive. He will tell you what you must not do; you must not do this, and that, and the other. For instance, he has got the golden rule exactly reversed. Do not unto others that which you would not they should do unto you. It is just reversed; and so you can trace the same similarity all the way through.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. When, as you remember, was the era of Confucius?—A. Confucius was a contemporary of Socrates, if I recollect aright; about 500 years before Christ.

Q. Then the golden rule originates with Confucius, unless he borrowed it from Buddha?—A. When you get beyond that you are in speculation. That is not testimony.

Mr. PIXLEY. That does not refer to the emigration of Chinese to California. Perhaps we have gone far enough in that direction.

The WITNESS. I refer you to the Rev. Mr. Gibson upon that point.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What are the general habits of the Chinese at home in regard to industry and labor?—A. They are the most industrious people I ever saw.

Q. Have they any idle classes there?—A. If they have I never saw them, except the officials. The official class, of course, eschew labor.

Q. I speak of physical labor, manual labor.—A. In all other classes labor is respectable, and all classes are expected to labor. There is a gulf between the official and the non-official class.

Q. Have they laws punishing vagrancy or idleness?—A. I do not know that there are any laws, but the officials make a law unto themselves, I fancy—the small officials. A man would be taken up for begging if he was able to work.

Q. What do you understand to be the purpose of Chinese immigrants to our shores? What do they come for?—A. I suppose the same as we all come here for, to make money.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is that all you came for?—A. That was my original intention, but I have changed my mind since that time.

Q. This is the question, and simple language reaches it at once. Do the Chinese come here to make a home, to become citizens, to take part in our institutions, as you did, and as you now do?—A. I fancy not; my former remark was badinage.

Q. But this is grave testimony.—A. When I came to California I did not come for any such purpose.

Q. What do emigrants from the other States and from Europe come here for?—A. I presume they come to settle.

Q. To make homes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do the Chinese come for any such purpose?—A. I presume they do not. Practically, I do not know the inside of a Chinaman's heart.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You believe that they come here to make money and obtain labor?—A. Yes, sir; that is the long and short of it.

Q. Do they come here for the purpose of making this their home and living here, as immigrants from Europe, or to make money and return to China?—A. From my knowledge of these people, they all come here to make what money they can, and with no idea of remaining.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do any of them establish homes and families as a permanency here?—A. There may be some isolated cases, but I do not know.

Q. The rule, of course, is different?—A. The rule would be against any such supposition.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do they come by any pressure of the government of China?—A. So far as I know, they do not.

Q. Do you know of the government of China sending out or expatriating idle or venal classes to our country in any way?—A. No, sir; such a thing is never known in China. I believe there are cases, and I knew of one case myself of an official who was expatriated to a part of their own possessions, that is, the northern possessions, away up north in Mongolia, but to foreign countries never. There was never such a thing known, I understand.

Q. Do you understand that the government of China favors or discountenances this immigration to our shores? What is their feeling about it?—A. I think they are perfectly passive on the subject.

Q. Indifferent?—A. Indifferent.

Q. With what favor do you understand their government would receive a proposition on our part to limit this immigration or to cut it off entirely?—A. I could not form an opinion.

Q. Would they receive it offensively?—A. It is mere speculation, but I should say they would improve the opportunity to try and limit us in China to a similar degree.

Q. To cut off our intercourse?—A. Yes; that would be the natural outcome of it.

Q. Do the rights of Americans in China under the treaty practically in operation correspond to the rights of Chinese in America?—A. In a way we have a great many more rights in China.

Q. Can Americans travel with safety through all parts of the Chinese Empire?—A. Let me explain what is but imperfectly understood. When all civilized governments, England, and in fact all European governments, and the United States, commenced making treaties with pagan nations, they acted upon the idea that the laws and customs of pagan nations were so barbarous and so unsuited to our civilization that we could not safely put our citizens and subjects under the control of those governments and subject them to their laws. Therefore, we made an anomalous condition of affairs both in China, Turkey, Egypt, and Siam, and Japan as well, by providing in the treaties with those countries that certain ports should be opened for trade; that at those points we would establish consulates; and that the laws of the United States, of Great Britain, of France, and of all countries having treaties with those countries should go with their people to those places, and that the laws should be administered by our consuls, who should be invested with judicial authority. When Mr. Cushing made his treaty in 1845, I think the first treaty, such a provision was inserted, and a bill draughted by Mr. Cushing, and explained by him, when he was Attorney-General, is really the basis of our law in China. When an American in China, at the ports or anywhere, commits an offense against the laws and customs and dignity of the Chinese, or a personal offense against the Chinese, instead of taking him before a Chinese court, the Chinaman has to go and make a complaint to our consul, and our consul tries him.

Q. Do you mean to say that Americans in China are not subject to the criminal code, to Chinese laws, but to American laws?—A. In everything, civil and criminal, they are subject to the American laws.

Q. Therefore, an American offending in any part of the Chinese empire would be subject to American and not Chinese authority?—A. The only thing the Chinese can do is to arrest him and take him to the nearest port, and turn him over to the consul. Therefore, when we say that the Chinese have an undue advantage of us, it is not quite an accurate statement of fact. This is one reason why China cannot be opened up to foreigners as this country is opened up to the Chinese. I may state that in discussion with the Chinese government I frequently said to them, "Why do you not open up your country, and let foreigners come here and go and trade and do what they choose? What is the use of keeping these lines of demarkation drawn? The Chinese and all other people come to our country; they go where they choose, and they trade and traffic and perform labor, and there is no harm comes from it; the Government is just as well off; it does not affect us." The prince replied: "When the Chinese go to your country they put themselves under your laws, and if they offend against your laws or your customs, you punish them. When you come here you bring your law-book under your arms, and when you commit an offense against the Chinese you say, 'We do not know you. We cannot touch you; we can only go to your consuls and ask redress. If your people will come here and put yourselves under our laws, you may come here to-morrow and go where you choose and do what you choose."

Q. Do you understand that an American going to China at the open ports has a right to go to any part of the empire and engage in any business he chooses?—A. No, sir; that is not quite an accurate statement of the fact. We can only engage in permanent business at the ports opened to trade designated by treaty. But he has a right to travel for purposes of pleasure or business anywhere inland by obtaining a passport from his consul or minister.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is he safe in so traveling?—A. With the exception of some of the extreme western provinces, where they know little of treaties, see nothing of foreigners, he is practically safe. In the provinces of Kwei-Chow, Tsze-Chuen, and Yun-nan it would be unsafe.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The established place of business must be at the port?—A. Yes sir.

Q. But he may conduct that business through the interior?—A. He may travel through the interior. For instance, if he wants to buy tea, he may go into the interior and engage Chinese to furnish him with tea, to see the mode of packing tea, or any such arrangement as that; but he cannot go to a non-open place and establish himself in permanent business.

Q. Suppose he should engage in the manufacture of an article at an open port, would he be allowed to travel himself and sell his manufacture all over the empire?—A. That is a pretty violent sort of a presumption. I should say that he would find some trouble in doing that.

Q. I mean under the law, as a matter of treaty, would he have such a right?—A. Yes; as a peddler he would under the treaty, because the treaty says he may travel for pleasure or for purposes of trade, and that would come within the scope and meaning of it.

Q. You spoke about the prince saying to you that if Americans would put themselves under Chinese law the whole country would be thrown open to them?—A. He said, "I will make an equality with you." This exterritoriality is a festering sore there, and must always continue to be, as you can readily conceive. It is a constant source of irritation to the official class, because a foreigner is better than the Chinese, in the eye of himself, at any rate. You can very well imagine how it would be in this country if any foreigner should come here and snap his fingers at the municipality, and upon recourse to the mayor the only thing he could do would be to send a policeman and arrest him, and turn him over to his consul to be tried. You can very well imagine that it would be a source of irritation.

Q. Of course we would not submit to anything of that kind. Do you understand that if Americans were placed under the operation of and subject to Chinese laws any American could trust himself in that empire?—A. No, sir; I could not advise the Government to take such a step. That has been a mooted question in Japan for two or three years. The Japanese have been very anxious to remodel their treaties so as to do away with this exterritoriality clause.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The Chinese are much more cruel in their punishments than the American courts, are they not?—A. Necessarily.

Q. Those cruelties inflicted upon American citizens would be unbearable, I suppose?—A. The mode of conducting their trials and the punish-

ments are cruel and barbarous, of course. It is perhaps no more barbarous than ours were in the 12th and 13th centuries; about the same.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What do you estimate the population of China to be?—A. It is a wild guess.

Q. From three to five hundred millions?—A. Mr. Williams, in his Middle Kingdom, took a census of 1812, or somewhere thereabout, and he figured it at about 412,000,000; but as we see more and get further into the interior, and can form an approximate guess, all persons whose judgment is worth anything concur in saying that it is largely overestimated. There is no one now who pretends to put it at over 300,000,000; but that is simply an estimate. There has been no accurate census taken recently.

Q. What is the probable number of Chinese now upon our coast, embracing the Pacific States?—A. You have statistics which will give better information than I can give.

Q. In your opinion, is it desirable that Chinese immigration should be encouraged or restricted, with a view to the material, moral, and general interests of our coast? Not that it should be prevented, but should it be encouraged or should it be limited?—A. That is a mere matter of opinion, of course. I think that the well-being of the whole coast would be promoted by limiting it. I think on the broad principle, as I stated, that it is undesirable to have an unlimited quantity of an alien people who cannot assimilate, who cannot with safety to ourselves be allowed to become citizens, in a republican form of government.

Q. As a matter of law can these people become citizens?—A. Under the present naturalization laws, I should say no.

Q. As a matter of fact do they assimilate with our people?—A. No; they are of a different civilization.

Q. In what costume do they dress; as a rule, of course?—A. Mongrel. They wear our boots and pantaloons, a hat, and their own coat. That usually is the costume.

Q. That is, the lower laboring classes usually wear our boots and pantaloons, and a hat?—A. Yes, a soft hat.

Q. Do you know whether, as a rule, they import most of their dress, particularly the better class of their costume?—A. That would depend upon whether they could import it cheaper than they could get it manufactured here.

Q. You have been collector of the port, and you have inspected their commerce somewhat?—A. I could not tell much in the time I held that office, twelve years ago, about the commerce of to-day.

Q. You have observed, I suppose, whether as a rule they do not import their costume?—A. I should think that a very large proportion of the clothes worn by all Chinese in this State is the manufacture of this country.

Q. You speak of the laboring class?—A. That is practically the whole class. A few of the better class may import coats and shoes of Chinese manufacture, but the laboring class very soon drop into wearing our costume.

Q. What are the substantial articles of consumption among them?—A. I do not know.

Q. Rice?—A. They consume a good deal of rice.

Q. Tea?—A. I do not live with Chinamen; I cannot tell.

Senator SARGENT. I suppose that will be readily proven by some other witness.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) What is the balance of trade with China? Is it for or against us?—A. When you say "us" do you mean this port, or do you mean the United States?

Q. No, I mean this port, or at least I will ask that question first.—A. You would have to get the statistics of the custom-house. I could not tell.

Q. How is the drift of bullion and exchange?—A. Bullion is going to China, but then a great deal of that goes on foreign account. For instance, we ship largely of bullion, for which settlement is made in London.

Q. But it is all for China nevertheless?—A. The bullion is for China, but it may be in the settlement of English accounts, not ours. It does not follow because we ship bullion that that is a settling of our balance of trade.

Q. You answered the general question, that you thought the unlimited immigration of Chinese ought to be discouraged?—A. Yes.

Q. Is your opinion based upon any other than the political feature, or how would you answer the question if it was confined as affecting the material interests of the coast and of the nation?—A. I should say that perhaps up to the present time Chinese labor has been of material advantage to the State, looking at it in dollars and cents, by reason of our isolation. The laboring classes of the eastern States and of Europe could not get here; they had not the means; the inconvenience and expense of getting here was so great they could not come; but with the completion of the railroad, and with the surging of the tide westward, coming by easy steps, from this time forward there would probably be sufficient labor to replace Chinese that will go home. The State would not suffer in its material interest if Chinese immigration should practically cease or become very much lessened. The unlimited importation of Chinese and settling them in colonies, as they do here, undoubtedly in its competition with free labor does harm; but I think that the harm up to the present time has been exaggerated. I think the Chinese labor that we have here now is necessary, practically. I doubt very much if the crop of this State could be harvested this year if it were not for the Chinese; but on economical, ethnological, and political grounds, I should be in favor of adopting some feasible and proper means for limiting the number, so that they may not materially increase.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What was the rate of Chinese immigration, say from 1849 to 1860; was it large or small?—A. It fluctuated with different years, with the demand for labor.

Q. Taking those eleven years?—A. The statistics are here, if you will allow me to look at the table. I cannot carry those things in my head. (Examining a table.) In 1852 there were 20,000, and in 1853 there were 4,000. I do not remember any reason for such a falling off. Then in 1854 there were 16,000 arrivals; and then from 1855 up to 1868 it seems to have run along at the rate of three, four, five, five, three, seven, eight, eight, six, two, three, two, four, and eleven thousand; and the emigration from here in 1868 was a third of the amount of arrivals. In 1869 the arrivals were 14,000, and in 1870 but 10,000.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. It seems that in 1852 the immigration was larger than any year since?—A. Yes, over 20,000. In 1875 it was 18,000.

Q. It nearly reached the same figure again in 1875, being over 18,000?—A. Yes. In glancing at these figures, I should say that the

number remaining is perhaps overestimated a great deal on account of deaths and emigration from here to the Territories, and others that are scattered abroad. A good many have gone down to the Sandwich Islands from here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was the Chinese population of this State as great in proportion to the white population between 1850 and 1860 as it is now?—A. I should say so.

Q. State whether in your opinion the proportion of Chinese population to the white population of this State has increased since 1860.—A. It did not increase until about 1868. In 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, if I recollect aright, and up to 1875, it is from 12,000 to 18,000. Am I correct?

Senator SARGENT. It fell off in 1871 and 1872. The first of these years it was 5,000, and the second year 9,000.

The WITNESS. Along in 1860 they formerly went into the mines, but, as the late Mr. Douglas would have stated it, I suppose the "unfriendly legislation" in regard to foreign miners, and the decline in the production of the old worn-out mines, rendered their compensation rather precarious, so that the immigration fell off. I noticed that in 1865 there were only 3,095, and in 1866, 2,242. The impulse in 1867, 1868, and 1869 I have always conceived to have been given by the building of the Pacific Railroad, the company being very anxious for laborers. A great many were brought here directly and indirectly by the efforts of the railroad people to get laborers. Then in 1871 the immigration fell off to 5,000, and in 1872 to 9,770; and the departures in those two years more than half the number of those who came. Then in 1873 they run up to 17,000, in 1874 to 16,000, and in 1875 to 18,000.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How do you account for that? What cause has operated the last two or three years to bring them here?—A. I cannot conceive. I cannot give any reasonable explanation.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you think that the demand for labor in this State or on this coast has had anything to do with the increase of this immigration?—A. I think it had in those years. I know practically, of my own knowledge, that laborers were imported for work on that road.

Q. If the demand for labor should diminish here, do you believe that would have the effect of diminishing this immigration?—A. O, yes. The supply will not come unless there is a profitable demand for it. If I recollect rightly, along in 1867, 1868, and 1869, there was quite an excitement started in the South for Chinese labor, and they organized all sorts of emigration schemes. I know I was approached on the subject.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. That was the year of Koopmanschap, was it not?—A. Yes; the year of Koopmanschap. They were going to bring over any quantity of coolies to supplant the negroes on the plantations, and some experiments were tried, I think with very ill results.

Q. I understood it to be a failure?—A. They did not pay the Chinamen; that was the cause of the failure, and the Chinamen quit.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In order to find a reason, if possible, for this increase of Chinese immigration during the past three or four years, let me direct your at-

tention to this consideration, that we have been reclaiming tule-lands, which has made a larger demand for Chinese labor, and that railroad-building in this State during the last few years has again taken an impetus. For instance, the railroad which has just reached Los Angeles, and some lateral roads, have been built. The question is whether that would account for it.—A. I have no doubt that that accounts for it partially; and that the Chinese merchants here and those having an eye to business speculate on all these probabilities of labor as well or better than we can.

Q That partially accounts for it. I should like to ask you if you are aware of the fact that the Chinese are finding their way into eastern cities and along the lines of railroads, that New York has its Donovan alley, something like Dupont street, and that this makes an outlet for them in the East, so that this is getting to be, in a certain degree, a national question instead of a local one?—A. I am not familiar enough with the East to give you any opinion upon the subject.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you know the number of Chinese who were employed in the flush times of the Pacific Railroad?—A. No.

Q. Was it not about 10,000 laborers?—A. You can ascertain the number. It serves no useful purpose for me to guess at the number.

Q. With reference to the question whether the importation of Chinese affects the immigration of white laborers from the East, what would have been the effect if the Central Pacific Railroad Company, out of the subsidy from the General Government and their general means, had imported 10,000 white laborors from Eastern States to build their road? What would have been the ultimate and substantial effect on the State as compared with the result of importing 10,000 Chinese laborers and using them upon the road?—A. Such speculations are useless.

Q. Speculations, judging from your observation of building roads in other countries, and the extending of roads westward? To be allowed to put a leading question, I will ask if the introduction of 10,000 white European laborers to work upon the Pacific Railroad, when it was completed would not have left us 10,000 industrious laboring people to have become the heads of families and the cultivators of the soil, and to have had generally to establish industries as a natural thing?—A. Undoubtedly a majority of them would have remained.

Q. And the profit of this labor which was made by 10,000 Chinamen was returned to China, was it not?—A. Yes, the profit of it; I suppose the bulk of it found its way back there.

Q. Would not the profit of white labor have remained here?—A. Yes, it would have remained here or gone to Ireland.

Q. And if it had gone to Ireland, to bring back other immigrants probably?—A. Probably.

Q. You have heard the argument made that the Central Pacific could not have been built except by Chinese labor?—A. I heard you make it once.

Q. I do not remember that.—A. I think I heard you make that statement in a speech.

Q. I do not think you ever did.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I will ask the governor what proportion of the labor in constructing these railroads has been performed by Chinese?—A. I should think on the Central Pacific Railroad, from my knowledge of it, four-fifths of

the labor for the grading perhaps was performed by Chinese. That is from here to Ogden.

Q. In regard to the public works in the State, of every description, what proportion of them have been constructed by Chinese labor?—A. When you speak of public works, we have very few public works.

Q. I suppose railroads include the most of them?—A. Railroads include the most of them.

Q. You have irrigating canals, ditches, &c.?—A. We have; but I have not been on the ground, and it is very difficult to judge from hearsay testimony.

Q. I am of course asking your general opinion.—A. For making levees and digging ditches, and that sort of work, I think much the larger proportion of it is performed by Chinese, because it is useful labor and can be commanded in any quantity easily at any time.

Q. In the reclaiming of the swamp-lands, the tule-lands?—A. In the building of levees much the larger proportion is done by Chinese, for two reasons: first, the labor is cheaper; and, secondly, it is an unhealthy sort of work, because it is in malarious districts, and the Chinese seem to be constituted something like the negro; they are not affected by the malaria as the Anglo-Saxons are.

Q. If Chinese had not come here, could white labor have been readily procured to construct these works you speak of?—A. It would have taken a much longer time. It would have been delayed. They could not have got the labor.

Q. Would it have increased the expense?—A. Very much. If it will not be irrelevant, I will state that I was one of the commissioners when the Pacific Railroad was in the course of construction on this side of the Sierra. I had occasion to go upon the road to examine and report upon its construction prior to putting on the superstructure, and while they were grading. I was on the road when they introduced Chinese labor. They first started with white labor and they came to a stand-still. They could not get enough to prosecute the work. They had a foreman whose name I do not now recollect, but he was a smart, pushing Irishman. Mr. Crocker told me, not once, but half a dozen times, that he suggested to this foreman that they must come to Chinese. He said, "I will not boss Chinese. I will not be responsible for the work done on the road by Chinese labor;" because you compute a certain number of men, and there is a responsibility in producing a certain amount of work with them. They were offering them, if I recollect rightly, $45 a month and board to white labor. That would be more than a dollar and a half a day, twenty-six working-days in a month. (Strobridge was the superintendent's name.) The thing came practically to a stand-still, and finally Strobridge consented that they should put on enough Chinamen to fill the dump carts, and that a Chinaman should hold a drill, while white men should drive the horses and strike the drills. He would not permit a Chinaman to strike. He said they did not know how. They started in in that way. I made frequent visits up on the road. I saw the progress that was being made in the employment of Chinese, and talked with Strobridge about it. In less than six months I think they had Chinese doing everything; not only filling the carts, but driving the horses, and Strobridge told me that, taken altogether, the Chinese did 80 per cent. as much work as the whites. They paid the Chinese $31 a month, and they boarded themselves. To the white laborers they professed to pay, and did pay, $45 a month and board, which amounted, they considered, to two dollars a day.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. With what kind of labor was the Union Pacific Railroad constructed?—A. With white labor chiefly, and some negroes.

Senator SARGENT. I guess not negroes.

The WITNESS. It was so reported at the time.

Senator SARGENT. It was white labor.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) They did not employ Chinese?—A. There were no Chinese over there.

Q. And they built the road from Omaha to Ogden?—A. But see the labor-market they had to draw from.

Q. Was that labor-market from which the Union Pacific drew its labor inexhaustible?—A. Yes; if inducement in the way of wages was offered.

Q. Then the difference in getting white labor and Chinese labor was the difference in the cost of bringing an emigrant to the Central Pacific road from the East or bringing him from China?—A. Those are questions which I cannot answer, of course.

Q. So that it was a pure question of dollars and cents?—A. A question of economy—of getting them in sufficient quantities and getting them steady.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose that instead of paying $45 they had paid $50? I myself was paying $65 at that time.—A. Crocker said there was not sufficient labor in the country; that he could not get it.

Q. Was not that rather an excuse for employing Chinamen at a lower rate?—A. I suppose they would not at that time have felt justified in paying $65 per month.

Q. They would have been able to have divided less millions among themselves if they had paid it for white labor. They would not have built grand palaces on all the prominent hills of this city if they had given the white laborers of this State a fair opportunity to earn the money, instead of sending to China to bring an undesirable population here?—A. I am only stating the fact; you can draw your own inferences.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. One of the impulses to get Chinese labor was so they could do the work quickly? They were then in competition with the Union Pacific for constructing the road?—A. They wanted a large army of laborers.

Q. And if they had not constructed the road to Ogden the Union Pacific would have constructed their road farther than that point?—A. Yes.

Q. So that practically the question of constructing the road would have been this, that the Union Pacific would have had more miles westward than now?—A. The white labor was not to be had. They took the labor they could get.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Could not white labor have been brought by way of Panama here sufficient to have met all their demands?—A. That is speculation.

Q. As a fact?—A. You can judge of it, as can this committee. My testimony on that point would not be worth a straw.

Q. Is it not the fact that white labor could have been brought from the East by Panama?—A. I take it for granted that it could, if sufficient inducement had been offered.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What was the cost of passage of a laborer by steamer during times of competition from the port of New York to the port of San Francisco?—A. In times of competition it may have been very low.

Q. What was the lowest?

Senator SARGENT. Steerage passage, $25.

Mr. PIXLEY. It varied from $12 to $40.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. The officers of this railroad company continued to pay the whites a higher price than the Chinese?—A. Double, according to their figures, if I recollect rightly. They paid the Chinese $31 a month and they boarded themselves. My recollection is they paid the whites $45 a month and boarded them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. But the whites decreased in numbers and became, as it were, foremen of gangs as a rule when they had a large force?—A. I saw Chinamen doing everything—sharpening drills, and doing everything.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What was the estimate of the relative value of Chinese labor and of white labor by the day?—A. Of course Chinese labor improved as they got on with the work. Mr. Trowbridge, the foreman, I think told me at the time I had the conversation with him that there was not 20 per cent. difference.

Q. At the beginning?—A. After they had been at work four months.

Q. Taking the ordinary employments in which the two kinds of labor are used, what is your opinion of the relative value of each?—A. In a great many kinds of labor Chinese is worth more than white, but in hard, strong labor, which requires bone and sinew, white labor is better than Chinese. The whites are stronger men, but in a great many farming operations the Chinese can do as much because they are quick and agile.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. As picking strawberries?—A. Picking strawberries and other fruit, cutting crops, and a great many other occupations.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How is it where judgment and skill are required?—A. It depends on their getting used to the work. After they learn they will do the thing over again with greater accuracy and precision than whites.

Q. In other words, they are mechanical and imitative?—A. They are imitative, not inventive.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What effect have you observed in this city upon boys on account of the occupation of the labor market by the Chinese, and the same class in eastern cities being employed in different trades and avocations? Let me put it in another form. Suppose our hop-picking, strawberry-picking, and everything of that kind could not be done by Chinese—and of course it must be done—would it not open an avenue for boys, and they be induced by their parents to perform that labor?—A. I presume that is the fact.

Q. One evil effect of the occupation of the labor market by Chinese is to exclude youths from employment, and consequently they are brought up in idleness. Is there not much unemployed youthful labor here?—A.

There may be unemployed youthful labor, but it comes as much from the false teaching of our people as anything else.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. I often hear that suggested. In what respect do our people of San Francisco differ from, say, the people of New York?—A. I do not know that they do.

Q. Then how comes the false teaching?—A. When they raise a boy, they think he must be a lawyer or doctor, or have some profession or occupation that does not require manual labor; they will not put him to a trade. Then the laws of trades-unions keep boys out. They have a law or regulation that a foundery shall have but one apprentice for a certain number of skilled workmen employed, probably twenty; and I think this runs all through the trades. That has been one great reason why the boys could not be taken in to learn trades and become skilled mechanics.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I was not speaking of trades, but of ordinary labor. Is it not the tendency of servile labor always to prevent white competition, that is to say, to render labor dishonorable?—A. Always.

Q. Is not that the tendency of Chinese labor?—A. Always.

Q. So that boys will not work with Chinese; they consider it degrades them?—A. That is the "irrepressible conflict."

Q. There is not a conflict in Massachusetts, where you were born, because such a conflict with the boys and girls is not possible there?—A. I say where you bring the inferior and superior alongside, there is an "irrepressible conflict."

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there a prejudice here by which white men will refuse to work on the same road or in the same business with Chinamen?—A. I should think likely there is; but that I do not know. I suppose there will be a prejudice that would amount to that.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you know of any trades where they do work side by side, or where they work on equal terms side by side, among the tules or on the farms?—A. I do not know. My acquaintance in that way is limited.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Is it not a fact that Chinese labor has a tendency to degrade the dignity of labor?—A. I do not think so.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In the estimation of the white laborers, Mr. Piper means, of course.—A. It may be that the white man will refuse to work beside a Chinaman in the same field or when doing the same kind of labor. That possibly may be; but that it degrades labor in the broadest sense of the term, I cannot conceive of any such thing.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Did negro slavery degrade labor in the Southern States?—A. That is an entirely different question.

Mr. PIPER. I do not think so.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Perhaps you can explain that the difference is in the moral effect upon the labor-market and the laborer as between the slave in his

relation with his master and the contract Chinese laborer in reference to his employer here?—A. When a man employs Chinese labor here he employs it as free labor. It is to him free labor. He has to pay an approximate price to what he can get other labor for, because Chinamen do not work under price very much. A Chinaman will get as near the price as he can, and when he can do better he leaves and does something else. In my opinion, there is no similarity between Chinese labor and slave labor.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know how the Chinese get here, how they pay their passage, &c., and what sort of contracts they make?—A. I do not know. I have only gathered my impressions from what I have heard.

Q. From what you have heard in China and observed there in reference to the manner in which emigrant-ships are filled up, can you give us an idea?—A. I have learned more here than there.

Q. Give us what you have learned.—A From my knowledge of the Chinese, and of the poverty of the laboring class, I do not think it possible that they can get here with their own means; and therefore (it is an assumption on my part more than any knowledge) they must come here by somebody advancing them the means to pay their passage, and they working it out after they get here.

Q. Do you know what security they give for their contract there?—A. As I understand it, they give their friends' or relatives' bond.

Q. Suppose their relatives are poor, as they are, how is the penalty of the bond collected?—A. It will hang over them as a kind of debt. The Chinese have no statute of limitations.

Q. Is it not enforced by the sale of the sureties? For instance, if sisters go bail for their brothers, are they not sold to pay the penalty?—A. Hardly.

Q. It is so stated by Mr. Bailey.—A. Of course it is speculation. I doubt if Mr. Bailey has any definite knowledge of that fact.

Q. How is the contract enforced here? For instance, a Chinaman lands on our shore; there is no law here to enforce a contract made abroad. By what means do they compel the Chinaman to pay the price per month to the six companies?—A. You can very well conceive that a Chinaman coming here, ignorant of our laws, language, and customs, with these six companies or any one firm or company telling him what his duties are, with the surveillance that they exercise over him, and with an arrangement which they are supposed to have, in fact I know they have, with the steamship companies, that no Chinaman can purchase a ticket to return home unless he brings a certificate from the heads of these companies that he is free from debt; it is very natural that he will pay his *pro rata* per month until he works out his debt.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. That is, he invokes other means than the laws of our country to collect his debt?—A. He cannot invoke the laws of this country, and he will get swindled if he will try to invoke our laws. It is more of a moral obligation than a legal one.

Q. You say they cannot go back without the permission of the companies?—A. That is an arrangement between the six companies and the steamship companies.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You say they have an arrangement with the steamship companies that no Chinaman shall be taken back to China until he produces a cer-

tificate from these companies that he is free from debt?—A. They will not take a Chinaman back unless in that way. That was the arrangement.

Q. Is it a written contract?—A. No; it is an understanding between them; no written contract. In other words, they say that it is proper for a Chinaman to pay his debts before he leaves the country, and they want to see that his debts are paid.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company, a common carrier, subsidized by the General Government, refuses to take a Chinaman home unless his associates say he has paid his debts?—A. Not only that company, but all the companies—other companies aside from the Pacific Mail. There was a company here, of which Macondray & Co. were agents, and complaint was made to me by missionaries on behalf of the Chinese. I remember going myself to Major Otis, who was the head of the house of Macondray & Co. I told him I thought it was a great outrage that they should put this exaction upon the Chinese. Otis said, "This is the custom; it has been in existence for years; the Pacific Mail Company do it, and if we do not conform to the custom all the trade will go over their vessels and we will not get any." I presume it is a custom that exists to-day.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you regard Chinese labor as in the nature of slave labor here?—A. No; I do not.

Q. You regard it as free labor?—A. If I am correct in my supposition, these contracts do not bind them to work for any specific length of time; they only bind them to refund a certain sum of money, and when that money is paid they are as free as you and I.

Q. The Chinese labor, as between them and their employers here, do you regard in the nature of free labor entirely?—A. I think so.

Q. Is there a surplus of labor on this coast, taking the two kinds together?—A. At the present moment, I should say no.

Q. Has there been at any time?—A. Never, in my opinion.

Q. Does the Chinese labor now stand in the way of the employment of white labor on this coast? Are there white laborers here idle on that account?—A. Perhaps it does in certain occupations; as Senator Sargent remarked, in the matter of light farming—hop-picking, fruit-picking—labor that cannot afford to pay full-grown white-labor pay. If the Chinese were not here it would give employment to youth. Perhaps it crowds out that sort of labor and compels it to lie idle, because they have got no other occupation; but for full-grown muscular labor, any man who is willing to work, who has stronger muscle, can find work at remunerative wages in this State to-day. I am only stating an opinion.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How long is it since you were with me in Congress?—A. It is twelve or thirteen years.

Q. During that time, I suppose you occasionally received applications for office?—A. I did; a great many more than I wanted.

Q. With your experience, do you consider the statement extraordinary that twenty-five or thirty men would come to you in the course of twenty-four hours and state that it was impossible for them to find employment—that their families were suffering, and they desired Government employment?—A. Yes; but you do not suppose that I believed all they told me?

Q. Not all of them, but many of them.—A. Those men are not willing to work; that is the fact of it. I am talking now about a laborer, a man willing to work with his hands. I do not believe to-day that there is a man willing to work, who has got common industry and is sober, but can find labor that will be remunerative.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What do these Chinaman get a day? [A pause.] They get a dollar and find themselves and their own lodgings. That is the common price here of mechanics?—A. I do not know what the price is.

Q. I believe that is conceded. A Chinese shoemaker is hired at one dollar per diem. He boards himself and finds his own lodgings. He is hired by a middleman; somebody hires him; he has nothing to do with the manufacture?—A. You can get information from others. Statistics are better than impressions.

Q. Do you think a white man can sustain himself on a dollar a day and find himself, and board himself and family, in this city?—A. It would be pretty hard work.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. You are pretty familiar with our manufactures, and you were, also, when governor?—A. In a general way.

Q. Is there not now a large number of Chinamen engaged in manufacturing cigars, cigar-boxes, boots and shoes, at the present time in the city, working in shops?—A. I presume so.

Q. I think you went out of the gubernatorial chair in December, 1867. Were there many Chinese working at the shoe-trade and the cigar-trade in this city in 1867?—A. The cigar-trade has been built up since then very largely.

Q. Were there many Chinamen at work in making cigars in 1867? I speak of it, then, because I think you came right here to this city then and lived for a year or two?—A. There were a good many even then.

Q. It was just about commencing?—A. It was a branch just being developed.

Q. The manufacture of boots and everything of that kind had been just commenced by the Chinese?—A. Manufacturing then was in its infancy. Several branches had been started.

Q. Do you not think that had a great deal to do with bringing, in 1868, 11,000; in1870, 10,000; in 1874, 16,000, and, in 1875, 18,000 Chinese to this port?—A. Very likely it is among the causes that led to their increase; it is not impossible or improbable.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Then squarely considering the mode in which the European or white laborer must live, can the white laborer successfully compete in general skilled and unskilled labor with Chinese?—A. That is a pretty large question.

Q. It is the question.—A. Where simple muscle is all that is required, I should say no; but where brains and muscle are required, I should say yes.

Q. The cigar-trade requires both brains and muscle. Making cigars is skilled labor?—A. No, hardly. It does not require much brains, after a person has learned it.

Q. Take it skilled or unskilled, can a white man make cigars and support a family with the wages that a Chinaman makes cigars for?—A. I should suppose not.

Q. Then the white man is excluded from that trade?—A. I should suppose the cigar-trade, at any rate, would be carried on by women and boys. It cannot be followed by a strong laborer, who has a large family to support, because the business will not warrant the payment of full-priced labor.

Q. Have not the Chinese laundrymen driven out females from that employment? Is not practically to-day the washing all done by Chinese instead of, as in eastern cities, by laboring women?—A. That I cannot answer. I should think the Chinese laundries were doing a large portion of it, from the number I see located on the different streets.

Q. Then they have practically driven those women out of that field of labor?—A. I do not know that they have, any more than the establishment of large steam-laundries where capital and machinery have had the effect to drive them out.

Q. Then, in your opinion, the introduction of Chinese labor has the same effect upon the labor-market as the introduction of machinery?—A. In a way it has.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. First, I should like to ask the governor what restrictions are thrown around the emigration of Chinese from Chinese ports? Under what regulations do they go aboard ship, and under what regulations are they received as passengers?—A. The laws of the United States govern the importation of immigrants on board of American vessels.

Q. They have to go through an examination under the laws of the United States?—A. The laws of the United States are very strict against the importation of servile labor on board of American ships; and several acts have been passed with which the committee is more familiar than I am. We had an act in 1862, in 1867, and, I think, again in 1870, which makes it very onerous, and the penalties are very severe against any American bottom bringing into this country persons bound to contract of service for labor; and one of these acts provides that before the consuls at the foreign port shall grant the ship a certificate of clearance, before she can clear at the foreign customs, he shall certify that all passengers on board are free passengers; but at the port of Hong-Kong, with all due deference to the Congress of the United States, of which the committee are distinguished members, and owing to the ill-advised and niggardly policy of our Government in regard to our foreign affairs, the consul is provided with no sufficient staff of help to enable him to do his duty properly, and he cannot, by any possibility that I can conceive of, examine a ship-load of Chinese and tell whether they are free or whether they are not, unless he takes the simple say-so of the people.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to say that the most of these Chinese embark from Hong-Kong, a British port?—A. Practically all.

Q. Would any treaty arrangements made between us and China prevent the embarkation of these Chinese immigrants from a British port?—A. That you can judge of as well as I. I cannot conceive of anything.

Q. Then such an arrangement to prevent their immigration to this country would have to be made with the British government?—A. Primarily.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I am not now asking whether it would be in consonance with or

against treaties; but suppose Congress should enact a law that no American vessel and no foreign vessel should take on board and bring to the United States, from any port anywhere, more than a certain number of Chinamen in proportion to its tonnage, would that be a matter of treaty regulation with England? Would it not reach taking Chinamen on board at Hong-Kong as much as any port of China?—A. It would. Hong-Kong is not in China. That is the difficulty people get into. They cannot conceive the fact that Hong-Kong is a British colony.

Q. That was not the point I was making.—A. I understand you.

Q. I only want your judgment whether, if China were willing we should make a law which said Mongolians shall not be taken on board any vessel to be brought into the United States above a certain number, that law would not be effective against Mongolians from every other place they came, irrespective of any treaty? I am not raising the question whether it would be for or against a treaty.—A. Can you conceive of a law of that kind that will successfully stand the test of an investigation by the courts?

Q. The Supreme Court has distinctly decided that in case where a differential duty was made between the United States and Russia upon Russian hemp, a subsequent law of Congress which put a higher duty repealed the treaty *pro tanto*. So that if we should pass any law preventing Chinamen, the treaty would not be a bar against the validity of the law.—A. You can abrogate a treaty by a statute, of course.

Q. Therefore I leave the treaty out of my question.—A. If you should say by such a law that American vessels should only bring a certain number, of course you throw the whole trade into British bottoms.

Q. But say all vessels, as we do in the general emigrant laws?—A. Then you would run against a snag, I fear, in our treaty with Great Britain.

Q. Why? Could Great Britain challenge the right of our Congress to prescribe that a certain class of persons, be they coolies, be they paupers, be they Mongolians, be they anything except English subjects, should not be brought into the United States upon any vessels, domestic or foreign? What business is it to England?—A. They are in her vessels.

Q. Of course, when we touch English subjects it is a distinct matter.—A. But when you touch British trade then you touch Englishmen.

Q. Very well; but we may look after our own safety in preference to British trade?—A. It is only a question of law.

Q. Do you mean to say that England would get angry if we affected her trade?—A. I say nothing about getting angry.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. It would be impossible for a ship to take on a cargo of coolies at the port of Hong-Kong for California under our present existing laws; such coolies as they take to Peru and Cuba?—A. That I would say would be impossible, because it would become a matter of notoriety.

Q. Do not the Chinese authorities in Hong-Kong, and all ports of China, as well as the better class of Chinese residents here, do everything possible to prevent the importation of Chinese women for prostitution?—A. That is a question I cannot answer.

Q. Do you not know that the Chinese six companies and the merchants lent their services here to the authorities to take them back?—A. It was so stated, and I believe they were honest in their endeavors.

Q. What has been your experience as a banker in dealing with these people financially, in comparison with the white race, as to honesty and fidelity?—A. My experience of Chinese is of course limited, because

the number of merchants is limited as compared with other people; but I have had no occasion to complain of their honesty and fair-dealing in my own experience.

Q. Are you acquainted with any Chinese who have been residents of this city for a time; say from twenty to twenty-five years?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you know that the State government has thrown every obstacle in the way of the Chinese becoming citizens, proprietors of homes, with families, &c.? Do you not know of your own knowledge, being once governor of the State, that every obstacle has been thrown in the way of those people by class legislation to prevent them becoming owners of the soil?—A. I do not know of any affirmative legislation. I think there has been a feeling that it was undesirable that they should become possessors of the soil to any extent. I do not now remember of any legislation during my experience that went to inhibit them from becoming possessors of the soil.

Q. You are conversant with the manner in which they as a class are treated here; the malignity that is heaped upon them?—A. No more than any other resident of the city.

Q. You know it to be a fact?—A. I see very little of it with my own eyes, and therefore I could not affirm as legal testimony that it is so. That is my belief.

Q. You know as a representative once of this Government in China that all those foreign governments you spoke of as having treaties with China are quick to resent any insult offered to the people of those nationalities residing in China?—A. Very.

Q. You know England will bring a fleet into one of those ports and demand redress for indignities shown a citizen on the street?—A. There is a case going on now, and has been for a year or more.

Q. You have an instance, I suppose, in mind in which the United States demanded reparation?—A. I have demanded it myself.

Q. Do you know of any instance in which the Chinese government has brought a like injustice to their own citizens residing here to the notice of this Government?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. As to the value of the rice consumed by the Chinese and a sack of flour, do you know the difference between the cost of the two?—A. It depends upon the market-value of the two articles, which varies very largely.

Q. Say a sack of rice costs $5, (fifty pounds,) which is the standard retail-price?—A. Hardly; is it?

Q. Four dollars and a half to five dollars.—A. Four and a half to five cents a pound.

Q. There are fifty pounds in a sack?—A. At $5 it would be ten cents a pound.

Q. I mean what the laborers pay for it?—A. A sack of flour would be a dollar and a half.

Q. Are we not opening a large trade with China with our flour and grain; flour particularly?—A. Not large.

Q. But comparatively?—A. Comparatively we are supplying all that is consumed there; but the Chinese cannot become large consumers of flour, because they have no means of cooking it. The fuel question is a very serious matter with the Chinese.

Q. It has been the desire of the Government of the United States latterly, and also through the business commercial relations of the country, to furnish China with all the silver bullion we could sell?—A. Yes, sir; and everything else that could sell with profit.

Q. Do we not look to China and India as a market for our silver?—A. Always.

Q. In your experience, from a long residence here in California, has it not been a fact that the larger the increase of our own population here the same ratio of Chinese labor has followed?—A. I have never examined the statistics in regard to that point.

Q. For the last three years we have been receiving a large influx of what they call in the papers "immigrants?"—A. A large immigration.

Q. What class of immigrants are they? You have seen them?—A. They are what might be termed the peasant class.

Q. Farmers with families?—A. Farmers with families.

Q. They seek homes all through the farming regions of the State?—A. I assume that they seek homes, the emigrants that come from the East.

Q. Is the Chinese labor in this country really cheap labor? Is it cheap in comparison with the labor of the Eastern States?—A. No, I suppose not.

Q. What will be the effect of this State at once now substituting for all its manufacturing interests, its farming interests, its farming labor, railroad building, and the other occupations, even to the sulphur-banks, that a white man will not work in, white labor, and for the advanced wages? What would be the effect? How could we compete with Europe? With white labor could we compete with Massachusetts in shoemaking and other callings and in woolen mills?—A. You are asking me a suppositious question. It would be impossible to give more than a wild conjecture.

Q. Most of the questions propounded to you have been of that nature?—A. I know. It is affording very little information to this committee for me to sit and guess for an hour or two.

Q. Do you know of your knowledge of any Chinese being engaged on public buildings, upon the streets, the building of sewers, or any of the municipal works of the city? Have you ever seen them engaged in that work? Do they come in competition with white hands?—A. I have not seen any. I think public opinion restricts work in that way to white men.

Q. You are aware that the Union Pacific Railroad was constructed by white labor?—A. It is so said to be.

Q. You have been over it?—A. I have been over it.

Q. Have you noticed, in your intercourse, any settlements along the route of that road from the time you cross the river at Omaha to Ogden?

Senator SARGENT. Cheyenne and Laramie, for instance.

The WITNESS. In going through the country on a railroad you cannot judge much of its settlement.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You have been recently over it?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you not see large towns and fine farms all along the Platte?—A. Yes.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the character of the population, and what is their nationality?—A. I did not stop to see. I only went through on the railroad.

Q. You are aware, at the time of the construction of that railroad, of the crimes and gambling of the roughs who followed the line until the last pick was struck? You noticed that Judge Lynch exercised his

court decisions there from one end of that route to the other?—A. It was so reported. I know nothing more than any other person.

Q. You have heard of the labor-strikes, in which the president, Mr. Durant, was imprisoned for a long time by these laborers?—A. I believe he was.

Q. Have you ever heard of anything like that in connection with the Central Pacific Railroad?—A. No.

Q. Have you ever seen a drunken Chinaman?—A. Never but one in my life. I saw one Chinaman drunk in China, and that is the only one I ever saw.

Q. What proportion of the Chinamen smoke opium to that degree which unfits them for occupation of any kind?—A. Do you mean in China or here?

Q. Here.—A. I cannot form any estimate of it.

Q. What percentage of them can read and write?—A. A very large percentage can read and write a little, but it is a mistaken notion that they can read and write to any very large extent.

Q. Do you not know that white people came to this country sometimes, in early days, under contract, and a portion of their wages was refunded to parties?—A. I have known of such a thing.

Q. You do pretend to say that, in enforcing this custom upon Chinese, not permitting them to leave this country in debt to parties here, it is confined to their debts to the Chinese alone; or does it also include debts due to white men?—A. That I could not vouch for.

Q. It is for all debts?—A. I suppose it is for all debts. That is my understanding.

Q. What, in your opinion, is the amount of money that a Chinese laborer transmits home to his people annually?—A. I could form no estimate of that.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Do they do their banking business through American houses?—A. Yes.

Q. By draft?—A. By draft or check. They export a great deal of merchandise. They export ginseng, and make their own exchanges in that way, and they buy a good deal of silver themselves, trade and Mexican dollars, and ship them themselves; but their drafts they purchase at the banks.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do they do any other business with the banks except this exchange, this transmission of bullion?—A. They borrow money.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. And keep accounts?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I have been informed that the trade in the Chinese ports which are opened to foreign trade has of late years passed into the hands of the Chinese almost wholly.—A. Very largely, excepting the import and export trade. The local trade is done by Chinese.

Q. There used to be a large trading-house there maintained by Americans?—A. Yes, several. The house of Russell & Company was and is, perhaps, the largest.

Q. That has been very much restricted in its operations because of Chinamen doing the business?—A. Not only that, but restricted by competition; by opening up communication by telegraph; and smaller houses have sprung up; and more people are doing business direct.

Q. Is it because the Chinese are doing their own local trade?—A. In the interior, up the Yang-tze River, take the ports of Chinkiang, Kiukiang, and Hankow, the Chinese have almost driven out the foreigners, because it is a cheap trade.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The foreigners do the principal part of the exporting trade?—A. Yes; because that is done on credit.

Q. In view of this cheap trade of the Chinese wherein they drive out white labor, is it not to a great extent advantageous to the white classes in the raising of grapes, the packing and canning of fruits, sacking potatoes, and working upon a farm?—A. If you would give me time I could prove either side of that question to my own satisfaction.

Q. It is quite recent that we commenced the manufacturing business in this State?—A. Comparatively recent.

Q. We shipped large amounts of money East a few years ago to buy everything?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it possible to successfully carry on manufacturing here, where our capitalists consider money worth 1½ and 1 per cent. a month and employ white labor at the extreme prices?—A. If the committee will permit me, I have peculiar opinions about this matter, and I may as well state them in brief. My view in regard to Chinese labor in the manufactories here is a good deal as it is in regard to tariff and manufactures in the United States—that a tariff is essentially necessary in a new country to build up manufactures, to give them protection while they are young. After a manufacture gets firmly established, after they get skilled labor, and get apprentices who have learned the trade, perhaps the tariff then may be lessened, or may be taken off altogether, because it can then successfully compete with manufactures from abroad. So too with regard to manufactures here. But for the Chinese I doubt if we would have had any manufacturing, or it would have been small, as compared with the present. The very fact of the Chinese being here, and that their labor was procurable at a moderate rate, has induced the opening of manufactures, and perhaps now, or shortly, as they can get apprentices at work, the Chinese labor can be dispensed with. I think that is true of the shoe-factories; that they are getting boys and girls, and working them in as apprentices, so that they can gradually dispense with Chinese labor, and conduct the manufacture successfully with white labor alone.

Q. Do you know that any large number of skilled operatives, manufacturing men, shoemakers, are out of employment here?—A. I do not know. I am not in a way of seeing them, if they are.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you think that that result would work out of itself naturally; that is to say, white labor gradually to be introduced and crowd out Chinese labor? Would that result gradually come about, or will it be necessary to cut off Chinese labor in the first place?—A. I think it is gradually coming about.

Q. Without interference?—A. Without interference. It may be that public opinion has some effect, but I know in these shoe-factories they are gradually working boys into the factories, so that where they had two or three hundred Chinese laborers they have not a hundred now, and they are supplying their places with white labor.

Q. Quite a percentage of these manufactories already employ white labor?—A. Yes; I think they are working white laborers in in that way, and have been for some time.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Are there not avenues now open to manufacture in which all this hue and cry against Chinese cheap labor can be averted? For instance, I will call your attention to a fact. We bring tallow from Australia; we collect it in these markets; we put it into casks. I was connected with the Australian Steamship Line for two years. We brought out from 50 to 100 casks of tallow from that distant country. It was shipped to Boston or New York a few years ago and made into candles and brought back here, and it is being done to-day. Take the article of starch, which is the cheapest manufactured commodity in the world. We imported here in 1873 78,000 crates, with 12 boxes in a crate, made in New York, in Oswego, and Black Lake. If you notice the manifests of the shipments by railway, you will see every day shipments of starch and shipments of other commodities which our country is redundant with. Now, are not those two avenues open to manufacturing interests? We burn more candles than any four States in the Union with our mines. Some of the mines purchase more candles than a large city East would. Could not candle-factories be started? Could we carry on that manufacturing interest without its being started as you intimate in your testimony by Chinese cheap labor?—A. You are asking me for a guessing opinion, which would not be worth a straw any way.

Senator SARGENT Would not that be better in the way of testimony than by suggestive questions?

The WITNESS. You can get that from others better than from me, because I am not in a way to judge of that.

Q. (By Mr. Bee.) Do you know in what particular branches of manufacture the Chinese are engaged in here?—A. Shoemaking, tailoring, making cigars, making cigar-boxes, making boxes, &c., &c.

Q. Overalls and miners' clothing?—A. Yes.

Q. Are they employed to a great extent as house-servants?—A. I should think they were by the more moderate living class, who cannot afford white labor. They want a boy or maid of all work, and they cannot get a girl to do that. They have a Chinaman to wait on the table, and cook, and do various outside things.

By Mr. KING:

Q. You think there is not a surplus of labor in the State at the present time?—A. Yes, sir; in my opinion there is no surplus.

Q. You think that the labor of the Chinese is not any cheaper in comparison than white labor in the Eastern States?—A. I should think not.

Q. If the Chinese were absent would not the white emigration of the East come to California, and does not the presence of the Chinese here have a tendency to prevent that immigration?—A. It is possible.

Q. That would then, if the Chinese were absent, furnish the State of California with the same amount of white cheap labor able to move our crops?—A. It costs a good deal to get here. There is labor that would be willing to come and cannot come for lack of means.

Q. Are you not conversant with this fact, that in the East at the present time universal distress among the laboring-classes prevails, and that a large number are out of employment who would come here were it not for this Chinese labor?—A. I think there are more who are prevented because they have not money to pay their passage.

Q. There are a number out of employment?—A. I suppose so.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In reference to the labor strikes on the Union Pacific railroad I

believe you were asked if you knew of any such strike among the Chinese. Did you ever know of a labor strike in the South among slaves?—A. No, sir.

Q. Judge Lynch, in those outlying territories where there were no courts, used to execute judgment, I understood you to say, upon loose persons or criminals who went there?—A. I only stated that when crime was committed it was usually punished by Lynch law.

Q. I should like to ask if there was among those rude workers on the railroad a public sentiment justifying the punishment of crime, and thereby showing that the public sentiment did not approve the crime, and, therefore, it was a credit to the general mass who built the road?—A. Such evidently was the case. If this former pamphlet, as I ran it through last night, is to be published as an addenda, I want to make one correction of my former testimony, which was certainly reported wrong. I am made to say, on page 9:

> In the year 1800, according to the best statistics I could obtain, the importation of India opium into China was about four thousand chests, 133 pounds each, according to the best data I could obtain. In the year 1873, or we will take the year 1871, the importation of opium into China was 10,500 tons. In addition to that, the native production amounts to fully the foreign importation.

What I did say was this, as I took it from an extract that I wrote to the Department: In the year 1800, 4,000 chests, of 133 pounds each, were imported. In 1869, 85,000 chests were imported. This includes 32,000 chests smuggled from Hong-Kong into China, and 53,000 chests actually imported. In the year 1800, the domestic production of opium was nothing. In 1869, the estimated production was 75,000 chests, making a total consumption, for 1869, of 160,000 chests—21,000,000 pounds, or 10,500 tons. The value of the opium imported was $68,000,000, equal to 75 per cent. of all the tea and silk exported.

OCTOBER 23, 1876.

THOMAS H. KING sworn and examined.

Mr. PIXLEY. Mr. King is a merchant of this city, who has been for ten years a resident of China; an active man in the consul's office at Hong-Kong; has assisted and aided in placing Chinese on board steamer; is an extended traveler through the portion of China from whence these people come, and is the most intelligent person in all the detail of this matter that I have been able to find in the county of San Francisco. In response to my desire he has written out, first, a statement, and then a specific and direct response to all the interrogatories that are propounded. This statement is in reply to the general questions in regard to this matter. Mr. King has been present here and knows the course of our examination.

Senator SARGENT, (acting chairman.) It is entirely regular for you to read that part of your testimony. Proceed.

The WITNESS. I have commanded vessels many years in the China trade, also in the China coasting-trade. I have been engaged in carrying to and from China large numbers of Chinese; also transported on the China coast and seas; have lived on shore in China, as a resident, in different parts; visited almost every part of China usually visited by foreigners; am acquainted with the manner of Chinese immigration from China to California in particular, also to Australia; and from China to Peru, Cuba, to Luzon, and Strait settlement; also to Siam. I have a knowledge and experience of Chinese coolies coming to California—I

use the word cooly, because it is used in China—as well as of Chinese coming to California to go to other places, and you will understand the word cooly applies to all these people under contract for labor. I have a better knowledge and experience of Chinese coolies coming to California than elsewhere, for the following reasons:

1st. I have resided and long commanded vessels sailing out of Hong-Kong, where all embark; been engaged in bringing them here in large numbers during long voyages, with competent interpreters, inquiring into and seeing their ways and manner and system of labor contracts. I was also employed by the United States consul at Hong-Kong to superintend the examination of immigrants to comply with the cooly laws made by the United States Government. This cooly act enables the consul to exact large fees from every cooly, which the ships pay, and requires them to charge more charter money. The consul also having the option, can make obstacles and compel the Chinese to pay large fees to remove. The consuls also require many conditions from ships in the shape of large unofficial fees or indirect revenue. That makes the cooly trade to California a very remunerative one for consuls, consequently it is their interest to continue it; and especially is this true of the women. Of the many thousand Chinese whom I examined while acting for the consul at Hong-Kong, nearly all, but a few boys, or those who had been to California before, appeared to be going under contract, seldom knowing the purport more than that they were going for three or five years, for as many dollars per month, to labor as directed, often knowing that they were to be cared for if sick, and sent back at the expiration of the contract, or their bodies, if dead, and so otherwise ignorant that they were very easily scared if any one intimated to them that they were being deceived. Sometimes they refused to go on board at Hong-Kong, as was the case with a few cargoes once, a few years ago, going to New Orleans, when they nearly all jumped overboard, some drowning, in Hong-Kong harbor.

They often abscond from their contractors bringing them to Hong-Kong, or when they may have been stolen for the Peru or Cuba trade by their contractors. I have often seen their contracts, and had them translated. They generally bear the seal of some petty Chinese official of the interior, and state that their relatives or friends pledge for their security, and that the contract will be kept by the cooly; contractor advancing money, to be repaid out of small earnings, with interest often as high as five per cent. per month, and that pay as due shall be given or remitted to China. Nearly all who come to California are from two districts or counties lying close to the city of Canton—Sinong and Sinwai. They are always at variance, often fight on shipboard, and have been known to have pitched battles in California. But few are artisans arriving here, being mostly ignorant agricultural or other laborers from the very lowest classes. From these districts go also all Australian Chinese coolies, and these are caught or bought, mostly those for Peru and Cuba, but not from there to Luzon, Strait settlements, Java, Borneo, &c. They are obtained at Swatow, Amoy, and Ningpo, for those places. Most of those who come here are brought out to supply the cooly broker or contractor here, who hires them out. They send their agents to China to pick them up, with credits to disburse their expenses and advance money on contracts. Of others are largely those Chinese who, earning a few hundred or thousand dollars, returning from their visit to China, bring, in proportion to their means, bands of coolies out here under contracts, and are often sublet to Chinese as well as Americans here. All contracts I have had translated and explained are guar-

anteed, first, by friends or relatives, who get a share of advance to the coolies, and violations are often visited upon them in China by the petty officials, who are parties to the contracts, for fees, and contracts are passed through the cooly brokers' or six companies' agents there, which the contractor acts through. On their arrival here they are packed like hogs to such companies, having his contract viséd, and commences his fees to insure his care of sick, and return, dead or alive, but not his pay from the contractor, but that he shall fill his part, if able to compel him, the coolies to do it, or prevent his return, until he does. When breaking his contract, the companies' spies hound him to prevent his return to China, by arranging with the steamship company, or through Chinese in the steamship company's employ, to prevent his getting a ticket, and, if obtained by others for him, he will be forcibly stopped on the day of sailing by the large force of the six companies' high-binders, who can be always seen guarding them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean by "highbinders?"—A. I mean men who are employed by these companies here to hound and spy upon these Chinese and pursue them if they do not comply with their contract as they see fit to judge it.

Q. It is a term used to express Chinese persons who act in that capacity?—A. I have often heard the term applied to designate bad men. It is an English term, I believe.

Mr. PIPER. A man who can be hired to assassinate another?

Q. (By Mr. SARGENT.) A bravo?—A. Not a bravo in Spanish.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In what country?—A. In Chinese.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Are they not men who could be hired to assassinate a man?—A. I think they are, and frequently do assassinate about this town. I am told they frequently assassinate Chinese in this town.

Q. At the instance of the six companies?—A. At the instance of the six companies. I have it from Chinese who have explained this to me when beyond the fear of their country or persecutors, when they would tell the truth.

Q. That is to say, in our language, if one of these men, supposed to be subordinate to these companies, and many are here under their patronage, rebels and revolts, and will not do that which he has agreed to do, then these companies can hire these men to assassinate such persons?—A. They keep them in their employ to intimidate these coolies.

Q. To the extent of assassination?—A. They have been pointed out to me by reliable Chinese.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know of a case of that kind within your knowledge?—A. Not of death, only by newspaper reports.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know of a case where some left their employment in shoe-shops in this place, and when they went to get their money out, then they were set upon?—A. Only by newspaper reports.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You have seen these men?—A. Yes, sir; I have had them pointed out to me by reliable Chinese.

Q. Is there any distinguishing-mark upon them?—A. No, sir; only that they are rather better dressed than coolies and other Chinese found in the State. All sailing-vessels to China have conditions in their charters to take no Chinese but those supplied by the companies. When loading a ship at Puget Sound for Hong-Kong several years ago, I had many Chinese, some coming hundreds of miles; they told me, when hearing that I would carry Chinese passengers back to Hong-Kong, and including the cost of passage here. On inquiry I found they were escapes from these companies' clutches. Many of them came to the ship at night to get passage, fearing that the companies' agents there might be on their track. The companies' agents there, discovering that the escapes would probably go with me, came and chartered the whole passenger-capacity of my large ship, at a much higher rate than offering here at San Francisco, and on conditions that I should take no other Chinese passengers than those furnished by them. They paid several thousand dollars to me in advance on the charter, and engaged to send several hundred, but on the day of sailing no passengers, no charterers, were to be seen. Then I shipped the escapes as part of my crew, and took them to China, that is, such as had not been driven away or intimidated. I found that the whole Chinese part of my crew had been bribed by the companies' agent there to intimidate and drive those men away. On the long voyage following, close and frequent examination of the escapes proved to me that they were not fugitives from justice but from the six companies. All coolies returning to China complain of the extortions, deception, and arbitrary conduct of the companies here. So ignorant do they remain of our laws, and so much do they rely on the power of the companies, that they, when in China, more fearlessly do they invest their own money got here in bringing back coolies, knowing like themselves that fearing persecution and by intimidation through ignorance they can enforce their contracts when made. Of late the companies have made a reputation by requiring conditions to encourage coolies by modifying the contracts so that when successful in acquitting themselves the coolies earn higher wages, above a certain percentage, as they often do, providing that as domestics and artisans they shall be entitled to it. But it only stimulates them to greater dissipation, being induced or inveigled, so as to be kept in debt to the contractor or in his bondage. Seldom, however, is this bonus saved here, for when it is not squandered, the contractor urges it to be sent to the cooly's friends, to prove his luck, and stories of it being circulated, it is easy for contractors to get more coolies, or it operates to the advantage of the cooly himself when the time comes for him to play contractor. I would say here that I do not believe a part of the Chinese come here willingly. It has been my experience with a large number of them that they are inveigled here by these Chinese contractors who bring them to this country.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is there any force used?—A. No force beyond that they have told me frequently, that they came because their people or themselves were in debt, for which they would be punished in China, and that they took up this objectionable employment of a voyage as a means to get rid of debt or to support their friends.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How do they pass through the authorities of the United States at the port from whence the sail?

A. I will explain that in due time.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. They come here to better their condition in China?

A. Yes. Pamphlets containing all sorts of stories are circulated by contractors in the districts where the coolies are obtained, about golden times and chances offering, which are read to most of the coolies, who cannot read, and thus they are largely brought on board ship by those coming here. Upon acquaintance with the cooly contractor here I often hear of their complaints because the coolies evade or break contracts, or demand concessions in bodies. From observation in China and here, as well as among many hundreds at a time during long voyages to and from, and by a close investigation during many years, I am satisfied that it is a system of bondage-labor, which is attested by the mortality among them, by dissipation and misery. Although the condition of all the coolies, generally speaking, is improved over that in their own country, it is nevertheless a competition which is fatal to the American or European labor, and but few contractors and companies, and those only who supply them with necessaries and luxuries, derive any further benefit from them.

Of the women, but very few, rarely any, come of their own will, but they are bought in China, generally from brothels, to be sold here on arrival or held by importers in brothels here. Of those few rare instances, there are some who send to China direct for mistresses, purchasing there rather than to rely on the limited market here afforded. But they are commodities, and the traffic as carried on has all the super ision, yet greater profit to the six companies, as I am told by many of Chinese here. The coolie women, or bawds, make a business traveling to and from China, conducting this trade; and when official or unofficial outcry or obstacle is offered here the stream continues from China nevertheless. This is but less true of the coolies who come here via Portland, Oregon, where sailing-vessels are constantly loading for at Hong-Kong. So it is at the extra cost of passage here from Portland only that the traffic is continued. If you understand what I mean, it is that when this outcry has been raised here on several occasions by officials and unofficials here, or the people at large, more especially about the Chinese women, it has continued via Portland, Oregon, for a time, as by reference to arrivals in Portland immediately following this agitation it will be found that these women come in a steady stream nevertheless, and that they come from Portland down here. It is so frequently of the coolies.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. The white prostitutes are brought here from the East under very much the same circumstances, are they not?—A. Yes; but they are more or less free, I presume; but these people are so many chattels. The Chinese women are always brought on steamers here. Many are kept in slavish life, and they often pass from one to the other, men or women, by purchase, kept in debt by advances, and when free they often sell themselves for long periods. The common mode is to loan them money to gamble with, which they lose, and thus they keep themselves in debt. This also applies to the men, all being alike inveterate gamblers. As passengers on shipboard they are dirty in their habits. Very few, even before embarking, but have lice in both hair and clothes. A large part of them have the itch. Very frequently they offer to embark with the small-pox, and very frequently venereal diseases. Owing to the great change from hard labor and sparse diet, with bad, filthy abodes and miserably clad, to a full diet, no labor, well clad, and good lodgings on shipboard, together with want of exercise, they become sick. This

is particularly the case with sailing-vessels where scarcity of water for washing contributes to this effect as well as long and laborious voyages. The practice on ship-board of sodomy and pollution is common. They seldom use alcoholic drinks, but all tobacco in coming; and few use opium coming. Only those who have been here before use opium and alcoholic drinks. There are but few men come who have passed thirty years of age, unless they have been here before, and but few use opium coming. Most of them coming are under twenty-five; half of them under twenty-two years of age. I found that they, owing to expense, never acquired the habit of opium or alcoholic drink in their own country, but they soon do here. In order to keep them in debt they are induced to do it. They are inveterate gamblers, often creating big debts on the way here in order to keep them in bondage after they get here. That I have frequently witnessed when carrying six, seven, and eight hundred of them at a time on shipboard. I have seen their contracts and bonds given on shipboard for their gambling debts contracted on the way, which they have told me they had to work out after they got here, as well as advances in China.

Q. Who do they give these bonds to?—A. To the contractors, who accompany them, or to some man who will file his claim against them after they have arrived here.

Q. Some man who advances the money for these gambling purposes?—A. Yes, sir; on shipboard they are submissive, and they act in dread of authority coming here, but not in returning from here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. They become civilized here?—A. And when disturbances occur it always generally arises between factions or districts from which they come, readily distinguished by the difference of dialect. They also frequently maim or kill one another on shipboard, more frequently in California and Nevada, as evidenced now by the renewal of the Sam Sing and Hop Sing war in Virginia City. They commonly call all their own district men "my cousin," when speaking of or recommending him to service, and they say, "He no my countryman," when asked about another district man. Frequent inquiry convinces me that no others come here than those from the districts mentioned, their immediate vicinity, and the banks of the river Canton and the island at its mouth, as well as Hong-Kong and Macao; but we find, including the city of Canton, that this section contains many millions, and it is shown that nearly half a million float within this region and about the city of Canton alone whose lives are spent in small boats. Then it can be seen where the inexhaustible supply comes from. I have photos of much of this region, nearly all of it, and of its people, showing these facts. I refer to this lest it may be said that the only section the Chinese come from to this country is this small area, and that they cannot be had from other sections, which latter I believe true; but the authorities show or state the population of the "Two Kwang," the province of China where these people come from, to be greater than the United States, and the one city of Canton to be greater than all the Pacific States. The principal reason why other sections of China do not come here is the enmity and the cause of trouble arising between the two sections or adjoining counties, as now here, and the greater ignorance of this country, because those speak a different dialect from the other sections of China. As a fact, the dialect differs almost entirely every hundred miles apart in China. When coasting along in China, taking passengers from half a dozen ports in double that number of hundred miles, none of one place could understand the dialect of the others.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. The written language is the same for all those provinces?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The characters are the same, but the words differ?—A. Yes, sir; they are so different that they can understand hardly a word. When the commissioner to the Centennial from China passed through here he could only receive a deputation from the six companies through an interpreter. I learned that from a German who accompanied him, who was able to speak English, and he told me that the only intercourse he could have was in "pigeon" English.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In which gentleman was the difficulty, in the interpreter or the mandarin—which one could not speak this dialect?—A. Neither of them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The mandarin could not talk with the other Chinese?—A. He could not talk with the other Chinese. He could talk with this interpreter, and they conversed in English with the commissioner.

Q. The Chinese letters or characters are the same, but they form different words, as we use the same letters in French and in English, but they spell out different words?—A. It is in the combination. I am not sufficiently acquainted with Chinese character to speak about it, but as I understand it it is a further combination of characters which expresses their words.

Q. Suppose the Chinamen had written in Chinese what they wanted to say to the Mandarin, could the Mandarin have understood what they meant?—A. Certainly. They afterward communicated in that way.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. The officials in China have a language of their own?—A. The official language is what is termed by foreigners the Mandarin dialect.

Q. The court language?—A. The court language.

Q. Do they communicate with the lower class in the language of the lower class at any time?—A. Only through interpreters.

Q. Language becomes a matter of caste there?—A. Yes; the language becoming perverted, different sections speaking a different dialect from the official language. At any of the ports of China where Americans or Europeans reside, only a few of the Chinese merchants who deal with them are allowed by foreigners to live in that section. This is particularly so at Canton, the vicinity where these people come from; and at Hong-Kong, also, the European and American residents are almost entirely at a separate side of the city. They have in most all such places special laws and regulations for the government of the Chinese, and particularly in Hong-Kong, prescribing the hours at which they may be out of their houses at night, and licensing special gambling-houses for them, which Europeans or Americans are not permitted to visit. They have also their specific passenger acts applying to Chinese coolies, and laws regulating brokers who are engaged in the traffic, a copy of which I furnish, which also shows the cooly acts of the United States; also much information of the number of European and American firms and residents; also, the banks, religious and other institutions in China, as also Hong-Kong, &c., by which it will be seen how very limited is the number of Europeans and Americans in China, and of all

nations, compared with the hordes of Chinese in this city alone, and that the number of Europeans and Americans is decreasing in China, a fact easily ascertained by reference to the dates, if we except Americans and Europeans employed by the Chinese to teach in their military and naval schools and collect their revenue from Europeans and Americans, a thing which they cannot trust their own Chinese people to do. As to the effect which the stoppage of the cooly trade would have on our commerce with China, the foregoing would show that there is but little or no knowledge of this country outside of the district they came from. Canton was long since the only very important place of trade, but now, owing to the opening of the northern ports of China to our trade, Canton has, except to supply these hordes, dwindled into insignificance compared with Shanghai, a thousand miles north of it, and even several places between, such as Amoy and Fuhchau, the great tea-marts. In fact the American in China is only known for buying tea and silk, and selling cotton drilling and cloths, coal-oil and ginseng, and being a *small-fightee* man.

Q. What kind of man?—A. That probably needs an explanation. The Chinese always say that the Americans in China oppress them less, fight with them less, make less demonstration, have less men-of-war, with less naval forces, than any other nation. They say he is a good trader and a very "small-fightee man."

Q. What do they do with the great quantities of ginseng which are sent them there?—A. They use it for medicine. As to the immediate trade with these people, that is not a matter of any considerable consequence. Far less with Chinese than with others does the trade appear affected by disturbances. While the English, French, and Americans were at war capturing Pekin and bombarding Canton, all commerce proceeded at other places, ships discharged and loaded their cargoes, which were bought and sold as before and since. During the continuance of the troubles Europeans and Americans lived at all other ports of China, as before and since, undisturbed. In fact all the drudgery, and, it is said, even the scaling-ladders of the armies operating against the Chinese was done by Chinese coolies, hired readily in any part of the country for that purpose, much of which I witnessed. I have frequently talked with the Chinese in the northern part of China, even in the open ports, about the emigration of the Chinese to this country, and they knew nothing about it. Chinese merchants continually engaged in trade with foreigners knew nothing about the immigration here; they never had heard of it.

Q. Suppose the knowledge should come to their minds that here was an El Dorado where they would be much more comfortable?—A. They speak a different dialect.

Q. Suppose it penetrated through that dialect to their minds that here was an inviting field, would it not open a still larger chance for immigation here?—A. No; owing to the enmity of the different sections of the country, and they knowing that there was a different class of people here, they would not come here. All that is true of Chinese emigration going to different parts of the China seas, to the Straits Settlement, including Singapore, Penang, and many of the English colonies. There you cannot get the Chinese from Hong-Kong or the Canton district to go. They only go from Swatow and Amoy to Luzon, where many thousands a year go.

Q. So that the Chinese in one section are not tolerant of those of another section?—A. No, sir; they only go from Amoy. They cannot get them from the adjoining provinces to go to Luzon.

Q. How is it that the central government is able to hold them together?—A. It does not hold them together. They are at continual war in some section or another. It is only a few years since a rebellion of many years' standing has been put down, and that has only been done for another to arise.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You think, then, that the information of this country which they have got for the past twenty years in reference to this matter is disseminated to the extent fully that it will ever reach?—A. If it is disseminated further it will be of no consequence.

Q. You do not think it will increase the immigration any further than it is, if I understand your statement?—A. It will not be increased from other sections, only from the populous district of Canton.

Senator SARGENT. (To the witness.) Proceed with your statement.

The WITNESS. I consider those here, of course, cannot either in justice to our own requirements be summarily disposed of to the detriment of their own rights. Consequently the imperceptible degree trade would be affected by their being forbidden to come here longer would soon be filled by ourselves. Our teas and silks would still come along as cheap as now, especially since Japan has rivaled China in these productions. China has no other market to obtain flour and shells, and finds it best for all the other few articles she buys. I say few, because aside from flour it is comparatively small. The manifests of the vessels clearing from here will show that, aside from specie which banks are supposed to ship, flour is the principal article, and if we consider the number of Europeans and Americans who are supplied with it at the ports of China and in the China seas, including the ships visiting there, it will be seen that the Chinese are yet very inconsiderable consumers of flour. Largely owing to the heavy exchange against us as well as to get commissions from the coolies' money at both ends, do the Chinese compete in this article of flour, which is the considerable article to be affected. It will be seen that the American firms, not the Chinese, are the shippers to a great extent of all other goods exported; as shown by the manifests of the vessels of imports paying duties by Chinese, but a part goes to supply the Chinese. You can ascertain from our large grocers and the Chinese stores how much is consumed by Americans here of the products imported by the Chinese, except their opium and such few articles, principally which the Chinese use, besides clothing.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Can you give the commission the amount of duties derived from Chinese traffic in this port alone?—A. That is a matter of statistics.

Q. Certainly it is a matter dealing in statistics, but it is an important matter.—A. I am simply touching on it in a general sense, stating that a large portion of the traffic and trade which the Chinese have the credit of making here and paying duties for as using the articles themselves, is largely used by Americans, such as oil and rice, which can be easily seen, shipped to the interior for the use of the Americans, and that the Chinese claim credit as paying duty for their own consumption to offset what probably would be the value of using our wheat. If the trade narrowed down we would be better with the same number to consume our home products than the duties would amount to. If all the imports were for China, which is not the case, instead of that number of men's mouths of European or American it would be fourfold, with their families. The steamship companies would only be affected by the passenger-traffic of

the Chinese. The monthly increase, however, of other freight clearly shows this, and that any diminishing of the Chinese cooly cargo or stoppage of coolies would be more than met by the increased freight going on for other goods before a year elapsed. That is simply a statement. In keeping with that I have simply made an answer to the interrogatories.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are the interrogatories given in your statement?—A. They are stated by their numbers simply.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The first printed interrogatory of the committee is, "How many Chinese are there in this country?"—A. The six companies, I suppose, only know.

Q. What is their moral and physical condition?—A. Bad, dirty, with vermin and skin diseases especially.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How do you know this?—A. By observation daily with them.

Q. By actual inspection?—A. By actual inspection.

Q. Are you a physician?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do they come here voluntarily, and by what means do they get here?—A. As a rule they come voluntarily, but often have inducements of false representation held out, and frequently to pay some forfeit, bond, or debt of themselves. They sell their services for a term of years to cooly-brokers, and some have declared that it was to pay debts they were inveigled into by gambling and other vile ways. I would state that that method is a very common one by which the Peruvian and Cuban cooly-trade is supplied. The Chinese being inveterate gamblers, they are by pimps and runners coaxed into places of dissipation, where they will readily begin gambling and soon lose money upon their pledges given, and when not able to pay it they are obliged to go as coolies, fearing the consequences, as intimidated by the petty officials, who are a party with the pimps or runners generally obtaining the money. They contract for years and go away to labor.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is that confined to Peru?—A. That is a general thing with the Peruvian cooly; and I have been told by many Chinese that I have brought here that that has been the case frequently with them. Therefore I state it here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. This state of the Chinese in reference to their immorality, vermin, and disease is notorious in the free ports, is it not, also?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How does it come, then, that they are able to come here under the laws of the United States? How is it possible for them to get on board ship under the regulations, which are very strict?—A. I will touch upon that point in a few moments.

Mr. PIXLEY. The witness has not yet got through with the third interrogatory.

The WITNESS. To avoid punishment at home they agree to come here, when otherwise they would have staid at home. The time of year most active in contracting for them by cooly-brokers is during the winter months, when scarcity of agricultural labor weighs heaviest, and then

immediately after the New Year festivities, February, March, April, and May. They come in greater numbers during these four months than all the rest of the year, as is shown by the statistics of their arrivals. These months are the only ones when sailing vessels and extra steamers are required to bring the great numbers. At other times the regular steamers have not enough, and often but very few, to fill their capacity. Especially is this true of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, who measure their space, including the upper deck, making three decks on which to carry passengers, contrary to law. By obtaining spaces measured in that way, in which cargo is carried, they have, as a rule, always when offered carried 20 to 30 per cent. more than they are lawfully entitled to carry, charging $40, sailing-ships $25 to $30. As a shipmaster and with many others discussing the question of the capacity of ships to carry passengers here, I have frequently, with the consul at Hong-Kong and others, referred to the United States laws by which the number is to be ascertained to a given space. Our American law is fifty cubic feet to each one. It also provides distinctly that passengers shall not be carried more than on two decks; but the Pacific Mail Steamship Company has been carrying all along on three decks, the two permanent decks below and under their hurricane or upper deck, in which they stow, as a rule, about as many as in any of the larger decks below. At Hong-Kong, under the British passenger-act, when ships are measured to ascertain the number of Chinese they can carry, the British act requires forty cubic feet. Consequently, one-fifth more is allowed under British law than American. Then even with that space, and taking on board as many as would be allowed by American law at Hong-Kong, they fill with cargo the space which under American law they are supposed to provide these people with on the voyage. When during the voyage by consuming coal, provisions, and water they take that cargo away, they on their arrival here have a space to measure according to the greater requirements of the American law, evading it all the way through. So both sailing-ships and steamships, the steamships in particular, have been constantly carrying from 25 to 30 per cent. more than the law allowed them to carry, for I understand there is no law which allows passengers to be carried on more than two decks.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In what manner does the Pacific Mail Steamship Company avoid this law? By claiming that they carry passengers on three decks?—A. By carrying them on three decks.

Q. And the law prescribes they shall carry them on two?—A. Only on two.

Q. Who is to blame for this, the Chinese passengers or the Pacific Mail Steamship Company?—A. I have not claimed that the Chinese are to blame.

Q. Is not the Pacific Mail Steamship Company responsible to the law of the United States for overloading ships arriving here?—A. As well have they succeeded in evading it.

Q. No matter about evading it, but are they not responsible? Are the Chinese to be blamed for this matter?—A. I do not claim that.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You speak of this as one of the evils of the traffic?—A. I speak of it as one of the means by which those engaged in the traffic evade the laws in conducting it.

Mr. PIXLEY. In other words the witness states the fact, and the commission can draw such conclusion as the facts justify.

The WITNESS. Steamers limit their luggage to very small amount, but not sailing-vessels. Consequently, those coming by sailing-vessels bring sometimes tenfold the luggage, consisting of clothing, utensils, &c., and extra furniture, provisions, which is but cargo smuggled in free of duty for the cooly-brokers or contractors. Frequently opium and silk and cotton goods, and often their native alcoholic drinks, are brought in this way.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Successfully smuggled in?—A. Yes, sir; as being part of their clothing and their furniture, a certain amount being allowed each one, according to the United States passenger law.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The evasion being that it does not belong to them, but to the brokers?—A. To the brokers.

Q. Whereas the law is apparently complied with by the idea that it belongs to them?—A. Yes, sir; that is what I wish to convey.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How much opium is a passenger entitled to bring in as a private store, if any?—A. I do not recollect positively.

Q. It may be that he does not smuggle any in?—A. It is a common occurrence with almost every vessel when searched coming on shore to find the Chinese in possession of this article.

Q. Is not that seized by the United States Government?—A. Sometimes, when they find it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. For what purpose do they come? With the intention of remaining and making the United States their home, or returning to China when they have acquired a competence?—A. They come to earn a certain sum of money and return. They never care to learn our customs or habits, or to follow them. Except to this end, and for this purpose only, do they attend schools and missionary places.

Q. Do they become attached to our institutions and reconciled to live and die here?—A. But few ever know more of our institutions than that which they are brought to labor about. They know the police and courts punish or protect them, and that the use of money enables them often to escape punishment. They have no respect for oaths.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Let me understand what you say as to the use of money. In what manner is this money used to escape punishment—through American courts or through the Chinese tribunals?—A. They understand that they can commit crime with greater impunity by the use of money.

Mr. BEE. We do not admit that.

Senator SARGENT. Let us hear the witness.

The WITNESS. I mean by the use of money, that they understand they can commit crime with greater impunity; and when relying on a certain sum of money, that by the employment of counsel they will be able to evade punishment.

Q. (By Mr. BEE.) Not by bribery, then, of our courts or police, or anything of that sort?—A. No, sir; I do not mean that. I will explain that: once in coming here I had an interpreter on the voyage well versed in the English from a long residence in Australia. In talking with him upon the relative difference of his views of Australia and California, he explained to me that if in Australia he committed a crime he would be

punished for it, but here he could give a lawyer money and get off; that he could use money here to advantage in that way.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Probably he would use some to get witnesses?—A. You may draw your inference.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Do you think they pay large fees, then, to lawyers?

Mr. PIXLEY. They could not obtain such talent as Colonel Bee unless they paid for it.

The WITNESS. The courts of Hong-Kong and China never rely on their oaths. I do not believe that one in a thousand of the claimed converts to Christianity respect or believe in it but as a means to obtain employment.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What courts do you speak of in Hong-Kong?—A. The English courts.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What kind of labor do they perform?—A. As domestics they plod along in drudgery. They are not so valuable as formerly. Before, many, including artisans' occupations, offered, but of late they canvass the cities as tinkers, chair and crockery menders, drive carts, and act as hostlers and gardeners, besides large numbers who are peddlers of fruit and vegetables and provisions imported by Chinese, which they also peddle about town, as rice and oil. They do the largest part of the laundry-work of the Pacific States, carry on fisheries of the inland waters, are largely employed in all agricultural pursuits as employés, often are proprietors of garden and fruit farms, and are also largely engaged in gold-mining, generally working out poor or abandoned diggings or claims. In this city they find employment in factories, and in all kinds not requiring steam-power. Learning the trades, they soon set up for themselves in the craft, and by their cheap mode of living soon control such industries, as shoe and cigar making, and other kinds. They are the only scavengers of the city. Of late they have entered into trades as masons, carpenters, painters, tinsmiths, &c., keep stores of their own, and sell American commodities. It applies more to this city than to the interior, as I have seen them.

Q. What is their character as laborers?—A. Plodding, attentive to learn, stimulated by hope of getting a bonus from the contractor as soon as accomplished, to earn more and higher wages, to be generally used in dissipation and vice. Without tasks they are slow, indolent, and careless, requiring constant watching and urging. They will only imitate. They have but little originality or judgment about their work; they will evade and slight work with or without a task.

Q. Do they learn trades and work in factories?—A. Trades they learn, and Chinese factory-work is hired from contractors, who receive the money for them and govern all disputes, these contractors agreeing to furnish a given number of men or boys. If one leaves, gets sick, or dies, another one is furnished, like animals. Learning the trades at the expense of Americans, they soon go to work for Chinese or on co-operative plans, as seen by many small factories of all such kinds in the city, where they huddle in the work-rooms, eating and sleeping in the same space in which they work, under or above ground, in filth and disease.

Q. What rate of wages do they receive?—A. From my observation

of them as domestics, about ten per cent. less than Europeans; as hostlers and gardeners, from thirty to fifty per cent. less; as agricultural laborers, twenty to thirty per cent. less; as common laborers, fifty to sixty per cent. less; as artisans, from fifty per cent. and upward less than Europeans or Americans, and all other; as laundrymen, peddlers. they earn about half that which supports white labor here.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is there a demand for Europeans at these high rates?—A. I think there is.

Q. The labor market is not overstocked here?—A. No; I do not think it is.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How does their employment affect white labor, and do they prevent the immigration of white labor to this coast from Europe and from the Eastern States?—A. For reasons mentioned in my answers to the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th interrogatories, they are fast closing upon all such pursuits, and stopping white Europeans or Americans from coming here, as well as driving out those who have come here and been engaged for many years past.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Does white labor from Europe come directly here, or through New York or other large Atlantic ports?—A. Mostly from New York. They very seldom come from Europe via Panama. If via Panama, via New York, as it is cheaper.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the condition of their health, and their habits of cleanliness and sanitary regulations?—A. As a rule, the largest part coming here of age have distinct marks of having had the small-pox, yet still a larger proportion when returning, showing that this disease always exists among them as a people. Several close examinations made on large bodies proved this to be the case. I will say that I examined some 800-odd men we once had on board when in quarantine, to ascertain how many had marks of small-pox or evidences of having had the small-pox. The ship was quarantined for small-pox, and several had died on board previously. The condition on which the men were allowed to go on shore or out of the ship was that they should show that they had the small-pox before, and those who had not had it were to be sent to some other place. Of eight hundred and odd whom, with the physicians, I had stripped from head to foot and closely examined, more than 740 showed to the satisfaction of the physician that they had had the small-pox before.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is not that about the average of the laboring class here who have had the small pox?—A. Of Chinese?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I should suppose so. I should state here that on taking them back to China, I found a greater proportion then than that. It was very rare to find a Chinaman thirty years of age returning to China but what had the small-pox, whether before he came here or after he was here; but it exists among them all the time.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. They inoculate for the small-pox in China?—A. They do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say you found that a certain percentage, which was quite large, of those coming here had had the small-pox?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your observation is that on going back a still larger proportion had had it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Showing that a great many of them must have had it here?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you know whether they inoculate for the small-pox here or not?—A. I do not know; but I have had them tell me that they are averse to vaccination.

Q. You do not know whether they inoculate here for the small-pox or not?—A. I do not.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What percentage of them die with it here?—A. From what I can see there is no way of arriving at it. They frequently die of it, and get a burial permit and are buried without any one knowing what the disease was.

Q. That is an impossibility here under our sanitary regulations.—A. It is stated by the health physicians here that it is a fact. When they are sick they are not attended by any physician, and they get readily permits of burial.

Q. Do they not cure more of their sick in proportion to the American people?—A. I was going to say that I had eight hundred and fifty of them on board, bringing them here. According to the British passenger law of Hong-Kong, ships are required to have one Chinese physician for every two hundred people that they may bring, and one for any fraction of two hundred. Consequently, I had on board five physicians on that voyage, and when the small-pox broke out I did not learn of it until they came to me and told me that one had died.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are they more successful in curing small-pox than American physicians?—A. Not one of those five physicians knew or would state that they knew anything about it, nor would they go and attend several others whom I found afflicted with it. Immediately that I found this one dead of the small-pox, they all stated that they did not know anything about it or how to treat it. Nor would they go and nurse those whom I put in the hospital provided for such cases on board. I had to make them fast and keep them in the hospitals as nurses; otherwise they would not have staid with them. They never offered them any medicine, and all stated that they did not know how to treat it. Each one of these physicians have a certificate of examination granted at Hong-Kong, showing to the satisfaction of the British passenger officials that they were qualified physicians.

Q. Is the dangerous form of small-pox to be taken from the lighter form which is got by inoculation?—A. I am not sufficiently versed in that question to answer.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do I understand you to claim that a large number of the Chinese have already had the small-pox?—A. A very large number.

Q. Hence it would be very difficult for them to disseminate the disease in any superior race which they may settle among?—A. I may state that I have seen them where they have had it two or three times,

as they have told me, and cases are common in China where they have it two and three times. Their places of abode are filthy here as is their person. There are but few who do not wear clothes extremely dirty, especially their under-garments. They seldom bathe. A majority of them are afflicted with skin, venereal, or similar diseases. Yet their condition here in all these respects is above their condition in their own country, as I have personally seen by visiting many large as well as small cities, towns, and villages and traveling in their country and along their coasts. They are seldom found free from vermin. They have no regard for sanitary rules, from the highest to the lowest of their race. Especially is this true of their abodes in every instance requiring labor to secure it or expense to maintain it, both of which they avoid.

Q. You speak of the interior cities which you have visited. Are there not regulations there which prevent you from going into what they call the inner city?—A. No, sir; not since the last China war.

Q. Had you free access to all portions of these cities?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that the members of the expedition which the United States Government sent to Peking to take the transit of Venus were not permitted to visit the interior cities anywhere? Do you know that fact?—A. I read of it. Mr. Low has told you to-day that Americans cannot visit all parts of China. I do not claim to have visited all parts of it, but only that usually visited by foreigners. None visit Peking without permit. Tien-tsin is the port of Peking where foreigners reside conducting the trade with Peking. Peking is not an open place for foreigners or Americans to visit, like a dozen or two other ports along the China coast.

Q. You must recollect that your testimony so far is sweeping. You do not except any class of those people?—A. In respect to their sanitary condition I do not except any of them.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You are speaking now of the open, so-called, treaty ports?—A. I am speaking of the Chinese, as a rule, at the treaty ports and other places. I have visited many ports not treaty ports.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Name some of them.—A. You mean Chinese places, not foreign places as Hong-Kong and Macao?

Q. Where Chinese reside.—A. Canton is one.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Macao is to all intents and purposes a Chinese city?—A. Still less European than Hong-Kong is, but it is claimed by the Chinese never. It is conceded to the Portugese.

Q. The great mass, nine-tenths, are Chinese?—A. Ninety-nine-hundredths of them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Name the places.—A. Canton. In its immediate vicinity there are a dozen outlying cities and villages, including the section that this people come to this coast from, that I have visited, Macao, Hong-Kong, Swatow, Namoa, Amoy, Chinchew, Hacitan, Fuhchau, Tamsuie, and Keelung, on the island of Formosa, the only open ports there; Nanking, Cheichang, Ningpo, Cheepo, Yangchau, Shanghai, Suchau, Hang-chau, Chefoo, Nuchang, Tien-tsin. The extremes of those places embrace a distance of two thousand miles.

Q. Could you visit all parts of those cities as a merchant?—A. Yes,

sir; without any hinderance, and travel a distance into the interior from them.

Q. And see all classes, from the mandarins down?—A. All classes.

Q. And their habits?—A. Yes, sir. I may here state that I have commanded vessels in which I have carried high officials, such as the viceroy of Formosa, when going from the court of Pekin to his post in Formosa. I carried him and his suite and his females. He was a passenger on board of my vessel. Is Mr. Gibson present?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, sir.

The WITNESS. I once had the pleasure of having you accompany me from Fuhchau down on the river Ming. My name is King. I commanded the Wanderer. You will recollect I visited your house frequently. I have not seen you since then, fifteen years ago.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What was your occupation, business, or pleasure, that called you to those places?—A. I commanded a coasting-vessel then. Mr. Gibson will well remember.

Q. All these are sea-ports?—A. They are sea-ports.

Mr. GIBSON, (to the witness.) I begin to remember you. I did not at first.

The WITNESS. Our naval paymaster's brother was with me at the time you accompanied me down to the mouth of the river, with the viceroy, on the Wanderer.

Mr. GIBSON. I do not recollect that.

The WITNESS. Do you remember me taking you on board at Tsingchau?

Mr. GIBSON. I remember about the Wanderer, but I do not remember that occasion.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. These were sea-ports?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you penetrate into the interior from the sea-ports also?—A. A distance of many miles. It is a very common thing for foreigners in China to take large pleasure-boats, fitted up with berths, and go many miles up the river and spend days away in the interior.

Q. From what you saw on these various excursions, and in your business and intercourse in these cities, you base your statements in reference to the sanitary condition and the cleanly or uncleanly habits of the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you visited other foreign ports and other foreign countries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What countries?—A. Almost every sea-port of the world.

Q. Are they generally noted for their cleanliness?—A. More particularly than the Chinese ports; a thousand-fold more than any Chinese. More especially is that true of the Japanese, who live apparently a semi-barbarous people.

Q. They are very cleanly, are they?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You stated that the wages of these men here was generally expended in dissipation. Did I understand you aright?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If so, they necessarily cannot transmit much of that money to their people in China?—A. I said generally.

Q. They must leave it here if they are dissipated.—A. I said they remit through these companies what extra money they get here. I understand it as a part of the contract of the Chinese coolies here that the contractor shall continually remit a part of their pay from here.

Q. You were treated with due respect in visiting all these places? Did you ever have any indignities visited upon you? [A pause.] You are an American citizen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You looked upon your nationality with pride, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You liked to be called an American, did you not?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Answer the question. Did you ever have any indignities visited upon you?—A. I have been attacked by the Chinese; my vessel has been attacked by them. I will arrive at that by and by.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. From what parts of China do they come?—A. Principally from the two districts, the southern part, Sinong and Sewai, near the city of Canton, province of Takem, which is in the southern part of China; also along the river districts and islands, as Hong-Kong, Macao, and others at the mouth of Canton River, but from nowhere else in China, except upon very rare occasions. They are all known as hakahs, which I believe is a very low caste among their own people.

Q. Do any sail directly from Chinese ports, or do they all come by way of Hong-Kong?—A. All come from Hong-Kong under British Asiatic passenger acts, through Chinese cooly brokers, licensed by the authorities. These brokers, connected with the companies here, pass all coolies through their establishments, complying with the official requirements of the British acts to remain a few hours on shore before embarking, for the purpose of registration, for which they pay fees. However, the river-steamers from the Canton districts arriving down in advance bring nearly all, only the day before the sailing of the vessel, and like so many animals they are conveyed about.

Q. In what way do they live in this city?—A. Go and see them when they least expect it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. As this is a matter of record, and Congress cannot see for itself, please state how they live here.— A. I think I dwelt on that before.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How does their residence in localities affect the price of property?—A. I have no information upon that subject.

Q. How many have families?—A. From what I have learned from them and by my observation, I am convinced that not half a dozen legitimate families can be found in the Pacific States among the Chinese. Often women who have been bought bear children, who are cared for and treated as their children, care being bestowed to raise them, especially if males.

Q. How many Chinese women are there in this country, and what is their condition and character? Are they free, or are they bought and sold as slaves?—A. I do not remember. The companies only know, and they never will tell, fearing an outcry, I am told. But few come here except from Chinese brothels, or raised for prostitution in China, which is a business there. They are sold here after their arrival to live with some one man in the city or some place in the interior, from where the men come to purchase them, or to live in some brothel in the city or the interior. As a rule they are young, often only thirteen years old, and accompanied by less diseases on arrival than the men, but mentally they are very weak, acting like slaves, with but little or no education, and often appear dejected. Old Chinese women or bawds make a busi-

ness by constantly traveling to and from China of buying and selling them, sometimes advancing to the prostitutes in China, who are brought under contracts for a period of time like the men, or for enormous interest on money required to get here, all of which, I am told by the Chinese, passes through companies here the same as men. Some few of the women are got out for mistresses under the care of the bawds, and live with the men and have children by them. That is, they are called wives, which is the only kind of wives Chinese have here, unless Mr. Gibson makes for them of second-hand material. Bought and sold, as applied to women, means, as I understand, for periods, not for life, and yet their contract is called "bill of sale," and often understood for life, although contrary to Chinese laws. As I understand, it is a common practice in China for foreigners as well as Chinese to purchase them and get a bill of sale, but generally those coming here are for periods, I understand, because they are more advantageous to the owners, urging them to greater efforts for gain for a few years, only to find at the end of that time it has induced dissipation and extravagance incident to such a life, and they are then deeper in debt, misery, and the toils of their bondage than ever, unless by chance they are purchased by some Chinaman who forms for them an attachment and association, and when relieved of the load by his death or a release they begin life on their own account. These statements have been made to me both in this city and up in the mining-regions, where I have lived for a few weeks at a time, and where these Chinese women congregate.

By Mr. BEE:

You say that you do not believe that there are over a dozen legitimate families resident here, virtuous and good people, of Chinese nationality. Are not these small-footed women a badge of aristocracy in China? They come from the upper classes, do they not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are the aristocracy of China?—A. So called, although many of them are very poor. It is considered a badge of distinction. So we have aristocrats the same here.

Q. Do you not know that there are over fifty of these small-footed women here in this city?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not know that there are over one hundred Chinese merchants' families here of respectability?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you read the works of Mr. Williams on the Middle Kingdom of China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you read the works of Sir Henry Davids?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Of Menhurst, Dr. Legg, and others?—Some others.

Q. Do they all substantiate your testimony in reference to the disease, and filth, and squalor, and the degradation of those people? Do they agree with you or you with them?—A. I think in a measure it is true, where they discuss it.

Q. We will show that there are several hundred families here of respectability.—A. I particularly had that called to my attention a few evenings ago. A Chinese merchant or store-keeper, who I gave passage to many years ago, came to me at my house within a week, making some inquiry. I had not seen him in a long time, and in answer to other inquiries I made of him (and he is a very respectable man, and he has been here eight or nine years) he told me, among other things, that he had just paid $700 for a wife.

Q. Is it not customary generally in China for the husband to pay the father of the family for his wife?—A. I have so learned that there is a dowry which passes for the first wife, but the others, the handmaids or concubines, are all matters of purchase.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are these women bought and sold by their parents or by bawds?—A. By bawds; never by parents. I never heard an instance of their parents coming here with them. It is a common occurrence for Chinese women, more especially about Canton and in that region, to buy young girls—children—and bring them up for prostitution, with a view of selling them as soon as they are old enough.

Q. A Chinaman buying one of them would say he had bought a wife?—A. Yes, sir. I ask a Chinese woman, "Is that your child?" and she says, "Oh, my pocket-child."

Q. What does she mean by that?—A. That she bought it, and was keeping it to sell.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. As a matter of speculation?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do these people leave China willingly and freely, and knowingly, knowing that they are to be brought here for the purpose of prostitution?—A. I think not.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How many Chinese companies are there, and how are they organized? Are they organized to make money, and in what way do they make it, or are they relief or benevolent associations?—A. My answer to that, of course, is the result of my experience with them, and connection with the people who originated them, and the inquiries I have made of large numbers of Chinese going to and fro of the six companies.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Give their names.—A. I cannot give them here. Originally they were the agents of Chinese firms of Hong-Kong. The principals there were Wo Hang and Hing Wa, both portrait painters at Hong-Kong in 1850 and 1851, and conducted it many years afterward. They were the principals in opening this passenger-trade and sending men here to be hired out. Afterward other Chinese merchants were added, and, they requiring that some agents should be here to collect the advances and contracts, their agents banded together for mutual protection against the coolies evading their contracts and to keep other or more parties out of the business, as also to insure that the cooly should be returned, dead or alive, at the termination of his contract, and give them confidence before starting from China that so important a part would be fulfilled and that they were here to carry it out. Having these Chinese to supply, they became importers of that and all kindred commodities that they could sell to Americans; and, their business growing with their wealth, they became a power to hire immigrants, and would intimidate, overawe, and punish secretly the ignorant for any infraction of their contracts; also to prevent, except in few cases, any Chinese coming here except through them. This power and wealth accumulating, they have made a show of getting an apology for a hospital to care for their sick not wanting or able to return to China. Lately they have chartered a sailing-vessel to take several hundred such back to China as cheap as possible, instead of sending them by the better mode of a steamer. They act as go-betweens and arbitrators and judges between the Chinese, and punish offenses. I am told by the Chinese themselves that they collect regular fees, since they have combined, for purposes of registration and

for conducting the business of attending to the cooly contracts and their enforcement, but that they never guarantee the payment to the cooly by the contractor. They are supposed to defend those who pass through their respective companies if in trouble. They are the medium through which the coolies remit money to China, profiting largely thereby; and while much merchandise comes to other smaller Chinese store-keepers and contractors, all the coolies pass through the companies, which also largely continue to supply the coolies with goods which they import from China.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Are these companies firms or corporations?—A. They are firms.

Q. Have you the membership of these firms?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know of how many persons they are composed?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do they carry on litigation here in our courts?—A. I never heard of it, as companies.

Senator SARGENT. I think they have no corporate capacity, and cannot sue by any corporate name.

The WITNESS. They are known, I believe, as the six companies simply from having banded together (being the principal firms conducting the business) to monopolize the cooly traffic.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. What is their source of profit?—A. Their source of profit is the registration-fee which, I understand, all coolies or contractors pay to them.

Q. Do you know how much that is?—A. I do not.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is there anything like a monthly stipend paid by the Chinese?—A. I have heard sometimes that it is monthly, and sometimes I have heard that it is *per capita;* but the contractor frequently is the party who pays it, and the coolies know little or nothing about it.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. What do the companies agree to do in return for this fee?—A. To see that the Chinaman is returned to China at the end of his contract; if he dies to return his bones; and, it is said by some, if he is sick he is cared for to a certain extent.

Q. Looking to his interests generally?—A. Looking to his interests generally.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do not these six firms, or companies, in fact represent six districts of China, as you have mentioned here that they speak different dialects?—A. No, sir; I do not understand that they do.

Q. Do you say, then, that all these six companies, the Chinese who hibernate, speak the same dialect, the Yung-wo and See-yup?—A. I say there is measurably a different dialect between two of the six companies, the Yung-wo and See-yup men.

Q. Do all these six companies, all this mass of Chinese we have here, speak the same language?—A. I believe they do. They certainly can understand each other. I have never heard any difficulty among them in that respect.

Q. Do you not know that this is simply a benevolent organization?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not know that people coming from Louisiana, New York, Massachusetts, New England and the West, used to have organizations where they could meet together and celebrate their arrival here? Do you not know that a man from Louisiana would seek his people; that a man from Massachusetts would seek his people?—A. Clannish.

Q. Yes, clannish; and the man from New York would hunt up his people on the same principle that these six companies receive these men. They all take them to one place.—A. No, sir; I do not understand it so. They take them to the places provided by these six companies.

Q. They take them all to one place, do they not?—A. O, no; they take them to different places provided by these companies.

Q. They distribute them among the six companies?—A. Yes, sir; among the six companies.

Q. Do not these six companies provide for these people when sick and poor? Do they become a charge upon the municipality of San Francisco?—A. I believe they do take care of them to a certain extent, and I so stated.

Q. Not to any great extent?—A. Not to a great extent.

Q. They take care of the poor under their charge?—A. I believe that is part of the registration or fee which they pay.

Q. When a gentleman comes here and wants to hire five hundred Chinamen, he goes to the head of one of these companies?—A. So I understand.

Q. For what purpose?—A. To contract for so many men.

Q. Then to see that these Chinamen are honestly paid for that labor, who is responsible; is it the six companies, or any one of them?—A. No.

Q. We did not know much about these companies ten or fifteen years ago. They were not organized in the same manner as now. That you will admit. They had no organization of the six companies. Do you not know this fact, that a Chinaman coming here obtains labor, obtains a contract to construct a levee around swamp-lands? He contracts generally. He never works by the day on the levee. The white man who owns this land asks for a bid from the different Chinese companies. Each one puts in a bid how much he will construct this levee for per cubic yard. Do you know that to be a fact which I am stating?—A. I do not.

Q. You do not know then that there is any responsibility between the six companies and the American, the contractor, whereby the laborer shall be paid by the agent of one of the six companies?—A. I do not understand it. I will state that I have known gentlemen to come out here from the East to hire Chinese in a body, as laundrymen, for instance. They would take from here fifty or sixty to one hundred at a time, and when they got East they refused to comply with their contract. The money which was due to the men from the American East was supposed always to be paid to the contractor here except a certain percentage, and it was remitted. I have myself been the means through which this money remitted has passed to the contractor here; but when the Chinese would refuse to comply with the contract here, there was no means by which these Chinese could get their money from the contractor here unless the American paid it to them. In some instances they did not get it, the American claiming that there was a violation of the contract, and the Chinese there did not know enough to sue for their services on their individual account; and when they returned here they told me that they never got their pay.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. For the work which they did do?—A. Yes, sir; I do not understand from that or from any Chinaman, or from anything that I have seen that the companies guarantee to the coolie that he shall get his pay.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know of your own knowledge that any of these six companies ever contract for labor with parties here for railroad-building or anything else?—A. Not, perhaps, the six companies, but they become individual firms, forming those companies. They may make the contract, but their position as one of the six companies may be distinct from their position as a mercantile firm here. As a mercantile firm they would make that contract and pass it through the company perhaps.

Q. Then the contracts come through the merchants generally, not through the six companies. Do not those merchants advance them their provisions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who collects the pay for their labor?—A. The contractor, the merchant?

Q. You are sure of that?—A. Yes, sir; their money has passed through the hands of my firm, some years ago, when remitted from the East here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What interest do the Chinese take in the politics or institutions of the country, and how many of them have become citizens of the United States?—A. As near as I can learn none of them learn much of our institutions, except the prisons. They do not know or care about citizenship, only to evade the merest duties, tax, or burden of it.

Q. What was the condition of these people in China before coming here?—A. Nearly all agricultural or other laborers, very rarely artisans, even in their own way, coming from districts generally considered as flourishing, and a better sample of their kind. Most of them understand a few characters, but few have common education enough to read all their contracts understandingly or readily. As a rule they are ignorant, slavish, submissive, and often brutish in their own manners, living in hovels, poorly fed, worse clad, hard overworked, profane and immoral in the extreme; and these characteristics follow them here. I think, without exception, among the thousands I have brought and taken from here, they are the most profane people I ever heard.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. By whom do they swear; Confucius?—A. I am not sufficiently versed in the classics to tell.

Q. With all your intercourse with them, do you understand the Chinese language?—A. No, sir; and but very few white people that I have met in China, except missionaries, do. I will state that of merchants not one in a hundred, and still less, who live a life-time almost in China ever attempts to master or learn the Chinese language, only a "pigeon" English, so-called, except in the northern parts of China, still less in the district where these men come from, or about Canton. Those who do learn the language are more from the northern part of China, such as Shanghai. It is a very rare occurrence for a merchant living there his life-time, learning the Chinese.

Q. So far as you know, have they any conception or idea of free government?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or the right of an individual man to be heard and be a part of the government?—A. No, sir.

Q. They are a slavish people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They have no conception of the dignity of the individual man as a part of the government?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Your answer is general?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As a nation, what reputation have they as diplomats? How does their diplomacy stand in comparison with the civilized nations of the earth?—A. Mr. Low would be a better witness on that point.

Q. You seem to be so well posted on China that I want to know what your opinion is.—A. They have evaded, whenever possible, all treaty obligations that they have made with foreigners. This was true in the last war the Americans had with them. When they agreed to hold negotiations at Tien-tsin, and when the English and others were going up for that purpose, they were all massacred without any warning or any idea of hostilities.

Q. Did you ever read a speech of William H. Seward in which he stated they were the shrewdest diplomats he ever met?—A. I heard William H. Seward make a speech in Hong-Kong on this subject, and I have read his work of that travel. I think he was rather too old and infirm to judge and properly understand the question at that time.

Q. You say that the Chinese swear; that they curse. Did you ever hear a Chinaman swear by God, or his Maker? Did you ever hear him use an oath of that kind?—A. I do not understand their language sufficiently.

Q. Then how do you know that the Chinaman is the most profane of men?—A. There are commonly-known vulgar expressions and profane vulgarity, and can be heard at all times with them, under almost all circumstances, for the most trivial annoyances.

Q. Do you understand their language?—A. No, sir.

Q. How do you know when they are using it in a profane way?—A. Like people generally, the first thing they learn of a language is that part of it. Profanity is generally the first thing to get hold of, and more especially in intercourse with them commercially.

Q. Then I ask you the question again: Have you ever heard a Chinaman swear by God?—A. I have answered you that I am not sufficiently acquainted to know how they swear except in their courts. I have heard Chinese swear in the English courts at Hong-Kong.

Q. You stated that you did not believe that one of a thousand became Christians here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know it?—A. I do not locate it here so much as in China. I say I believe it from the statements made by the Chinese themselves to me and from my observation of those who have been professedly converts among the missionaries in different parts of China, that when the missionaries left they returned right to their pagan worship.

Q. You meant professing Christians, then, in China?—A. O, yes. I have had them in my employ, and I have had the missionaries in different parts of China to declare to me that they did not believe that they were sincere converts; that few or none of them were so.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. At Hong-Kong do they ever become British subjects under the naturalization law?—A. I do not know that they do by the process of law or naturalization, but for Chinese residents of Hong-Kong there are certain terms provided by British law which entitle them to protection. When they may visit Canton and there be arrested for some offense pre-

vious, or for some debt, I have generally observed that the English consul at Canton succeeds in getting all such released if they are residents of Hong-Kong.

Q. In the colony of Victoria, commonly known as Hong-Kong, have they a legislative body?—A. No, sir; it is a crown colony.

Q. They have no municipal elective bodies?—A. No, sir; no elective bodies.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the population of China, as far as can be ascertained, and the general condition, manners, customs, and institutions of the people?—A. As Mr. Low says, no man can find out the population. I do not know. The Chinese authorities themselves say that misery exists all over China among the poor; that continual famine and war exist. With them misfortune is a crime. A vessel wrecked, a house burned, in China is a crime, or to that extent considered. Whenever a vessel, Chinese or foreign, is wrecked on the shore, it is plundered and destroyed, and the people not able to defend themselves are robbed, and even held for ransom; but they are never assisted. This I have witnessed in their ports, under the eyes and guards of Chinese government officials. I will state that while Mr. Gibson was living at Fuh-Chou, and while I was in the habit of visiting there at that port, I have had Chinese boats capsize when drifting down the river to get across my ship. As is the custom there, all foreign vessels hire Chinese boatmen to convey the people back and forth to the shore, and those boats are considered as in the employ of the ship. Instead of assisting that wrecked boat that might capsize, I have had the Chinese boat I have hired go and plunder the boat and refuse to take the people out of the water alongside of the ship. When anything of that kind occurs they plunder them at once, and never assist them.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Then, as a general proposition, the value upon human life is very low?—A. It is low indeed. They are cruel, selfish, and ungrateful; lying, dishonest in the extreme, the only exception being where it is against their interest. They bribe, extort, and are extremely uncharitable to all. They hoard and bury money in fear of officials and persecutors among themselves and thieves. All classes are inveterate gamblers, as I have seen them, from the highest to the lowest, as they are here, I understand, as soon as they have the means to do so. Their mode of punishment is always of a summary kind, cruel and barbarous in the extreme. They have no long imprisonments except to compel money payment. They treat their women badly, and hold them in a very low scale.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is their religion, and what progress have the missionaries made in their conversion to Christianity?—A. Mr. Gibson had better answer that. I have never gone sufficiently into that subject. All I could get would be "Joss," and I have always contented myself to go no further than to look into their temples and see their mummery. When I have asked them about it, as I have many times during long voyages, when there was nothing else to do, and tried to get into it, I would find that they did not know their religion themselves, and could not explain it; or at least, with many interpreters speaking English, I failed to get an explanation from them which I could understand.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You seem to be very conversant with this class of people as gamblers, prostitutes, and thieves. How did you get that information so perfect when you cannot give us this important information as to their religion?—A. By going through a Chinese city and seeing at almost every short distance open gambling-houses.

Q. You do not see them here?—A. The press states they are here. I visited Chinatown here and saw them going on with their gambling much the same as in China.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The police are very strict here against gambling?—A. It is so said. It is said, however, on the contrary, that they are but a cloak for them. I do not pretend to speak of it here. I speak of their condition in China.

Q. I am speaking about the difference between their open gambling-houses and the closed gambling-houses here.—A. In Hong-Kong the authorities license gambling-houses for Chinese alone, and do not allow foreigners to go into them, but in Chinese places, in the open market, gamblers' tables meet you at almost every turn.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is there any street-walking among Chinese prostitutes here?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Did you ever observe them in China soliciting men in the streets?—A. No.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. They solicit them out of the windows here?

Mr. PIXLEY. Window-tapping?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is the Chinese quarter given up to prostitutes, or is it over the city generally?—A. Along the water-front of the city of Canton they have large boats or vessels, a hundred or more feet long and half as broad. They are flat-boats upon which are built most gorgeously fitted-up houses of one or one and a half stories high, which are called "flower-boats." They are very nice to look upon at a distance from the outside. They contain sometimesten or fifteen or twenty prostitutes. When the boats are lying in the front of the river they are places of resort. They are frequently taken by the better classes up and down the river upon trips of debauch and are known as floating brothels. Those are the ones which come under the eye of foreigners more, but there are also on shore numberless quantities of prostitutes.

Q. You spoke of their practice of sodomy on the voyage over?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you in your mind a single case, or is it a habit?—A. It is a habit. I would say that I have had sometimes thirty or forty Chinese boys leaving Hong-Kong apparently in good health, and on the voyage over, before arriving here, a voyage of two months, I have found them afflicted about the *anus* with venereal diseases. I have examined them and compelled the Chinese doctors to disclose what it was, and they admitted that it was a common practice among them. I have seen them in pollution quite frequently on ships, and often on shore in China, where it is a common practice, a common habit; I have seen it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You were speaking of these boats used for prostitution. Is it the foreigners who charter these boats?—A. The Chinese. The Chinese invite foreigners to go away for a dinner and a general debauch sometimes.

Q. You say they care nothing for life; that they use no effort to save life. Do you not know that it is a great merit of the Chinaman to save life?—A. No, sir; I never heard such a thing intimated.

Q. That they will be rewarded for it in the world to come?—A. I certainly never heard of it being practiced. I have seen Chinese floating by in the water and their own boats would pass them. I have gone and picked them up at sea at the entrance of ports. I have known their own boats to pass them when they were floating, clinging to the wreck, and the Chinese would go on the wreck and get the plunder.

Q. Have you read the writings of Chinese or English or American writers on that subject?—I cannot read the Chinese language.

Q. Writers on China in reference to that very characteristic?—A. No, sir. It is a common accepted fact that in the case of a foreign vessel being wrecked on the coast of China the only thing necessary to secure in taking to boat is fire-arms. Provisions, no; but fire-arms to protect them against Chinese. They plunder them on every occasion.

Q. They are known as the Chinese pirates?—A. No, sir; they are not known as Chinese pirates. Chinese fishing-vessels all go armed in the southern part of China; in the northern part of China not so much so. I once went to the rescue of a large American ship in the Shanghai River. I found around her vessels known to be plying for hire and carrying cargo as their vocation, and I had to open a battery on them to drive them off, and they had driven the crew from that ship and taken possession of her while they were plundering her. I will name that ship, with the occasion and time, if necessary.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the name?—A. The ship Van Couvre, in 1859. I have in my mind many instances of the same thing, many wrecks in which that same thing occurred and still worse. In one case where an American ship was wrecked in the island of Formosa, after plundering the vessel and robbing the crew, they stripped the captain and his wife and marched them many miles to shore. Mr. Gibson is aware of that. It was Captain Nelson, of the Lucky Star.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Was any action ever taken in this case by the American Government? Was it ever brought to the notice of the imperial government of China?—A. Once in a while men of war would go there and inflict summary punishment on the pirates.

Q. We have generally got even, have we not?—A. By no means. We could not get even in such a case as that, where they drove a lady miles and exhibited her naked.

Q. Owing to apathy?—A. No.

Q. On the part of our Navy?—A. Our Navy went there afterward and took some steps.

Q. A long while afterward?—A. Every one who has been on the coast of China will attest the same state of facts in regard to Chinese cruelty and their preying upon people who were unfortunate enough to get into their hands.

Q. The action of England and France is prompt and decisive in such cases, is it not?—A. Rather more so than America. They have a greater force and less employment for it.

By Sentor SARGENT:

Q. Suppose it were in fact an apathy on the part of our Navy, does that make these acts less black, less bad, less cruel on the part of the Chinese?—A. I cannot conceive why it should.

Senator SARGENT. We are not investigating the Navy, I believe, but the Chinese.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. From your intercourse with the Chinese and your knowledge of the Chinese government has the Chinese imperial government the power to protect Americans, and other foreigners who travel far into the interior of their country, from the aggressions, assaults, and indignities of their people and to enforce the treaty stipulations?—A. I do not think they have, and I do not think that in cases wherein such have been tried that the government was found sufficiently powerful.

Q. Even if they had the desire to do it?—A. I do not believe they are sufficiently powerful.

Q. In the far outlying provinces would the imperial government have the power to enforce the treaties with the Eastern powers?—A. I think not. I recall to mind one case, which Mr. Gibson probably will remember more particularly, the killing of Cunningham at Fuhchan, in which the government there was powerless to offer any assistance. And it was only some months after that the "Cyane," our man of war, went to that port and merely obtained some verbal apology. In the case of Cunningham the authorities were powerless to aid the foreigners.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is it not also true that there is difficulty in getting information of these atrocities from the coast to the imperial court?—A. From what I have learned, I have found that very little is known at the imperial court of the doings of foreigners. For instance, some few years ago we had a noted American who, at Shanghai, undertook the organization of the Chinese forces to proceed some distance above Shanghai and capture, for the imperial authorities, a city held by the rebels. Although he organized quite a large military and naval force, and had a large number of Americans and other foreigners in his service carrying it on and subduing the rebels, which the foreigners afterward succeeded in doing for the Chinese government, when a dispute or grievance occurred between the commanders. An American named Burgevine thought himself aggrieved by being dismissed by the local authorities at Shanghai. He thought to apply for redress to Peking, through the efforts of a minister. He proceeded to Peking, and had his case presented to the imperial authorities there. Burgevine told me that they had never heard of him, although he had commanded the armies and subdued the rebels, and I must believe that in case of shipwreck and these small offenses they heard still less of them.

Q. What is their education and their character in making and keeping contracts?—A. As a rule, I found very few educated beyond a few characters, and seldom without the aid of a scribe are they able to read, much less make out their contracts. When made, they comply with them only as long as it is to their interest to do so. They evade all possible responsibility, take every advantage, and commit every wrong under it to their advantage, if possible. That I have found more particularly in China. I have had less to do with them here, and I would say to their credit, as far as it goes, that I observe the companies here have more credit in this respect and among this community than their principals have in China, for I will state that the largest of their prin-

cipals at Hong-Kong, Wo Hang, is not able to make a charter, and he is considered so wanting in faith that he would not be trusted. They would not make any contract with him without a deposit or guarantee beyond his mere name. Among themselves they do as with foreigners—they lie and cheat and evade their contracts whenever it is to their interest to do so. This is from personal experience and observation of the Chinese. It was these conditions, I believe, which called the six companies into existence, requiring them to be banded together to secure the cooly and to guarantee his return to his country.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you an instance in your mind of a Chinese laborer or contractor breaking his contract with an American?—A. O, yes.

Q. Can you name it?—A. Domestic servants frequently do.

Q. I am speaking of contracts for labor on railways or levees?—A. No; I have not acquaintance among them sufficiently to speak of them to that extent.

Q. Have you ever heard of an instance of one of them breaking his contract?—A. I have heard of instances frequently. I cited you before to an instance where they were sent from here East, but I am not personally acquainted with them.

Q. You cited a case where eastern men refused to pay them.—A. No; the coolies refused to comply with their contract, and they had a certain amount due them, which amount was sent here instead of going to the coolies there, they not knowing they had a right to sue for it there. That is what I said.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the condition of commerce between the United States and China? How has it been or may it be affected by Chinese emigration?—A. The condition of commerce between China and here likely to be affected by Chinese emigration I conceive to be unimportant, consisting only of commodities imported for their use, which become proportionately less all the time as other places contribute those articles, as rice, from Siam and Honolulu. The Chinese here appear more than formerly to be using our products of food; and, as a fact, that part which the Chinese use consists of much the smallest part of that imported, even after deducting the two greatest articles of tea and silk, or hemp coming via China, and also regardless of immense Japanese supplies since the active competition of that country with China. The consideration of it is a small matter, for a large part of what they import and pay duty on and pass through their stores can be ascertained to be sold to Americans, as oil, rice, &c., as can be seen every day shipped by our large grocers, purchased from the Chinese, going into the interior, without note of that which is used in this city, say one-fourth the population of the State. This trade would be conducted by Americans if the Chinese had not got accustomed to it, and certainly would if they leave it. They export but little comparatively that they can obtain elsewhere and are in value but a part of such exports. Their treasure-shipments have decreased since losses by steamers uninsured, and lately by more exchange, thus remitting through the banks here the specie now, instead of to China in their own name as before, and so much so as to require one of the banks at Hong Kong, within a few months past, to establish a branch here, for the purpose of securing part of the business. As the Chinese cannot be wiped out, even if further immigration is stopped, it will decrease that part of the commerce almost imperceptibly. No reason need make us fear the least bad result from the loss of such un-

important trade as would be discontinued by the stoppage of the cooly trade. I have made these remarks because I have heard many harp upon the immense amount of duties which the Chinese paid, the supposition being that it was all rather on material brought for the use of the Chinese, when on the contrary we are large consumers of Chinese rice and of oil on which duty is paid.

Q. On tea?—A. The Chinese import teas only for their own use. There is no duty on tea.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the amount of our import-duties collected from our Chinese traffic?—A. The statistics will show how much the Chinese pay. They claim that the importations are all for their own use, and I merely state that a large portion is used by Americans.

Senator SARGENT. We will have the statistics here.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. At an early stage in your examination you said you preferred the use of the word "cooly." How do you define that word?—A. The term "cooly" is used in China as distinguished from an artisan or from a skilled laborer.

Q. He is a laborer?—A. A laborer there is called a "cooly," and I use the word in that sense.

Q. Then you do not mean by it a slave, a serf, or anything of that nature?—A. As Mr. Low has told you "cooly" has been more particularly applied to Chinese taken for the Peru and Cuba trade, where their contracts are always made of course with Europeans, and, the Chinese refusing to comply with their contracts, they are imprisoned.

Q. None of that class leave Hong-Kong?—A. They leave Macao, under the Portuguese law.

Q. We receive no immigrants here from Macao?—A. No, sir; only via Hong-Kong.

Q. And in China it is understood when an immigrant leaves Macao that he is going as a cooly-slave?—A. That he is going as a cooly, but it is a term of years, much the same as when he comes here.

Q. If he leaves Hong-Kong he comes here as a free man?—A. It is so supposed.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Does he come under the same kind of contract as if he went to Cuba or Peru?—A. No; the contract under which he goes to Cuba or Peru is made with a Cuban or a Peruvian agent.

Q. But the nature of it is that for a certain sum he shall work for a certain number of years?—A. Yes, that for a certain sum he shall work a certain number of years and be returned.

Q. When they come here the contract is made with a Chinaman instead of being made with a Peruvian, but it is for a number of years at a certain price?—A. Yes.

Q. So the nature of the contract is the same?—A. The Portuguese claim that is the same, but the Chinese do not go as readily with the Cuban or Peruvian agent as with their own countrymen. Owing to a different kind of labor there, it is more objectionable to the cooly, and it is more difficult to get them, requiring all kinds of artifices to induce them to go and to get them to sign their contracts. Going to Peru or to Cuba their ships are fitted as prisons with bars and grates, the same as the slave-ships are said to have been fitted, and with much larger crews. There are never only a certain number allowed on deck,

and they are treated with all the surveillance as if they were prisoners, and they would, as they do, I believe, on almost every occasion when opportunities offer, take the ships and destroy them and escape from their bondage. That is a very common occurrence.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Has the Chinese Empire treaties with Peru and Cuba by which they carry on the cooly trade?—A. They have now with Peru.

Q. Has the Chinese Empire any treaty with the United States by which they carry on the cooly trade?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The United States have passed cooly acts forbidding the so-called cooly trade?—A. It is of the same nature, as I take it, as the trade with Peru and Cuba.

Q. Can it be practiced by the United States with the restrictions which are thrown around the trade by the Government? Can a cooly be brought here?—A. He is brought here under this modified form, by his own countrymen.

Q. That is not answering the question at all. He may steal his way off the shore and get on board a ship, but can he be openly brought here as a servile laborer, a cooly. This investigation goes to prove that the national Congress and you have represented these laborers here as coolies.—A. I began by stating why I used the term "cooly."

Q. I want to put you right on the record. Do you know of a cooly on this coast?—A. From the form of contract which these people are under I look upon them as coolies.

Q. What kind or form of contract is it?—A. To serve a certain period for certain wages.

Q. Did you ever see a contract of that kind?—A. Many of them.

Q. Can you produce one here?—A. I have none. I have seen hundreds of them.

Q. Can a man pass the custom-house in Hong-Kong with that contract?—A. There is no custom-house in Hong-Kong.

Q. Can he pass the American consulate?—A. As an assistant at the American consulate I have passed hundreds and hundreds with those contracts.

Q. What questions are asked?—A. The form is merely to ask the emigrant if he goes voluntarily. Before reaching the consulate he is already schooled in his answer. With an interpreter the least cross-questioning develops the fact that they are going under conditions which they know little or nothing about.

Q. How do you know of this previous arrangement?—A. I made a business of ascertaining that fact with interpreters for the United States consul at Hong-Kong.

Q. And you knew at the time you were passing these people that it was in contravention of national law?—A. There was no way of arriving at it. They would say they went voluntarily. When you asked him for his contract he would go fumbling for it, not expecting that question to be asked, and would produce his contract.

Q. And the American consul would pass him?—A. There was no way of stopping him, if he said he went voluntarily. He might have a contract, but that does not make him a slave, according to the coolie act. If he goes voluntarily he may have a contract, be it ever so severe in its terms, and it relieves him from the cooly act.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. He enters into the contract voluntarily?—A. He says he does.

Q. Do they go on these cooly ships, where they are imprisoned in

these bars, voluntarily?—A. So they say. The Portuguese government pretend to conduct every one of them with their own guards to the ships so that they shall not be interfered with. They are all examined in open court in Macao. I have seen hundreds of them examined. There are three or four different judges or examiners, and that not only in one day, but they are kept over for three separate examinations, and they are not allowed to go home afterwards. The Portuguese government takes the greatest safeguards against their being conveyed away unwillingly, and yet when they are put aboard the ships these coolies frequently take the ships.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you not know that the governments of England, France, Spain, and Peru have sent commissioners from time to time to the Chinese government, protesting against that system of cooly labor and the shipment of coolies to their countries?—A. No. I understand that the Chinese government, under representations made by large bodies of Chinese in Peru, have sent Chinese commissioners to Peru to ascertain the correct state of affairs there; and on their representations they have forbidden any more Chinese going to that country.

Q. It was found to be slave labor?—A. Yes; and when the runners or pimps who were inveigling them away were caught in Canton they were decapitated. I have seen a ship loading in Canton waters with coolies for Cuba, and the next morning when I woke up I would find half a dozen heads stuck on poles around the town, of runners who had been caught.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Who took off the heads?—A. The Chinese officials.

Q. For engaging in that cooly traffic?—A. For engaging in that cooly traffic.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know of any such traffic being carried on between this port and any of the ports of China?—A. There is no traffic in that form.

Q, There is no cooly traffic?—A. None in exactly the form which is carried on with Peru and Cuba, for the reason, as I say, that the contracts are made with the Chinese for all who come here. When they get to Peru or Cuba they make contracts with the people of those countries.

Q. What are the conditions of the contracts with the cooly class who come to California?—A. The cooly agrees to come here and work for a certain period, for a certain rate of wages.

Q. He agrees upon the wages there?—A. That is also stipulated in those contracts which I have seen.

Q. What compensation is named in the contract?—A. Three or five dollars a month; very seldom more than that.

Q. Do you not know that that arrangement is made before the money is advanced to the immigrant to reach here?—A. I think that is always taken out of his wages here afterwards, and that there are other advances always made to him there, such as to get clothes, and to leave money at home, and to pay some obligations which he may have. I so understand it.

Q. And to support his family?

A. Very few who come here have families. As I have said, I have learned from them that they frequently come here to work in order to

pay debts of a doubtful character which they contracted at home, or by the pressure of their people or friends to accept such contracts.

Q. What is your occupation at present?

A. Merchant.

Q. How long have you been a merchant?

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In order to keep up the continuity of the examination let the witness answer this question: What power has a State to prevent the introduction of prostitutes or vagrants from foreign ports?

Senator SARGENT. We can hardly submit that question to the witness; that is a suggestion which must be answered by proof.

The WITNESS. All that I can say is, I suppose the prostitutes and vagrants are criminals, and they have been sending them back from New York.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 24, 1876.

THOMAS H. KING'S examination continued.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Something went upon the record yesterday regarding the respectability of the small-footed women. You said that for Chinese women to have small feet was a sign of a higher class. Explain that, if you please.—Answer. I will say that, as a rule, it is so; yet a considerable number are seen in their brothels, and among the very lowest classes of street laborers and beggars. I have here photographs [producing them] showing that the small-footed women as well as the large-footed ones are engaged in such lower occupations, and among the lower grades.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Were these photographs taken in China?—A. They were taken in China, where I obtained them. I will state, moreover, that while residing in China I had, among my lowest servants, coolies who had small-footed wives.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. State whether the people coming here are fair representatives, so far as quiet and order are concerned, of other sections of China.—A. The very contrary is the case, for every war with foreigners has arisen in the immediate vicinity where these people come from. Those sections have most exhibited horrible means of warfare, as attempting to poison the whole foreign communities of Hong-Kong during the last war, as was the case of many whites, who were poisoned regardless of who they were; that was not the case in any other part of China where there were disturbances with a foreign community who were at war with them. From their districts come, with but few exceptions, all the professional pirates of the China seas. Among the many thousands of Chinese fishing and trading vessels seen along their coast, theirs only are armed, carrying large cannon and small-arms, cruising long distances. They prey upon foreign and native crafts alike, if chance offers. They always pounce upon disabled vessels of any kind. They frequently plunder places along their own coast. The record shows that nearly all foreign vessels attacked or captured in China have been attacked by the people of these districts, at the mouth of Canton River. I have several times witnessed such attacks, and with my vessel gone to the rescue of such

vessels. In fact, the people from these districts furnish largely the brothels and the banditti to other ports on the China coast, the men being dreaded wherever they go; even as the servants of foreigners they are dreaded by the natives of that port.

Q. Explain further in reference to the six companies being benevolent societies.—A. Their principals are at Hong-Kong, as I understand, where messages were addressed to them at the time of the agitation here to stop immigration. It is called a hospital, which it is, in a measure. It is also known as a secret league of the Chinese in a British colony, and it is largely composed of Chinese engaged in this cooly traffic, as well as of the Chinese commercial community there, for the carrying out of secret measures of their own instead of through the lawful mediums. They are there known as defenders of those committing crimes, but caring for the helpless, no. Every day almost the British authorities have to collect such, and the beggars who also come surreptitiously from the China territory, and return them, or they would be overrun with them, as no public or private institution exists for the care of such in China. I would also state that I see by the papers I am charged with having been connected with Peru or Cuba in the cooly trade. I have never been, directly or indirectly, connected with that trade, but have been merely an observer.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How do you get such a perfect knowledge of the actions, doings, and purposes of the six companies at Hong-Kong?—A. From long, patient investigation of hundreds of men who have been both connected with them here and at Hong-Kong, during long voyages at sea, and reading daily accounts of them in the Hong-Kong papers, where their proceedings are more definitely set forth.

Q. This is under an English colony and the English government?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are such things permitted there?—A. They exist there.

Q. Are such things permitted there?—A. I will state the fact that they exist, and I suppose they must be permitted in a measure; but I also say that they are a secret league.

Q. How do you know it?—A. From the statements of the people and from the admissions of the community who live there; the general statement.

Q. Hearsay entirely, on your part?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have stated here that little-footed women was a badge of respectability, I understand, and you do not deny that now in general terms?—A. As I understood it, you asked me if it were not a badge of respectability as a general thing. I said it was so, but nevertheless they were largely composed of the lower classes and the worst classes.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the superior race? Sometimes members of the white race who have occupied high positions in society are brought down to degrading callings?—A. Yes.

Q. You have heard of that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then it is not confined exclusively to the Chinese? Such things happen in more civilized countries?—A. I suppose so.

Q. You spoke about these people along the coast. Do any of these Chinamen who, you state, are pirates, come to this country?—A. Yes; I have photographs of numbers of them here of the same class. [Producing a photograph.] Here is one of the worst of their pirates, belonging to that class.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Does he reside here?—A. He came here. I have known that man for a long time as a pirate. I know that he came here. [Producing photographs.] Here are also photoes of that class of people among them. If the committee want to use these photoes they might be copied. I do not care to leave them.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You stated that all these riots take place along the coast which you visited. How about the riot at Tien-tsin and the troubles in the Fuhkiang province?—A. They originated in Canton, all of them. The foreigners carried the war to Tien-tsin and the Fuhkiang province.

Q. There were some riots in the interior?—A. There is continual riot and war going on there. You read of it now taking place in that country.

JOHN L. MEARES sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a physician and health-officer in the city.

Q. How long have you been health-officer?—About six months from the first of May.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. From your position, will you give in general terms and in detail, as may be suggested, your opinion as to the interrogatories propounded by the commission. I will read all that bear upon what I suppose comes within your peculiar province of observation. What is the physical condition of the Chinese? In what way do they live in this city? How many Chinese women are there in this country, and what is their condition and character? Are they free or are they bought and sold as slaves? My interrogatory goes generally to the physical condition, and the fact and the result of the Chinese women among us, and especially in relation to the health of the city, their health and the health of the community in which they reside. Give us the result of your observation during your term of office.—A. I can only speak from personal knowledge of the sanitary condition of the Chinese quarter, and my opinion of the Chinaman generally in regard to, not only his physical condition, but his moral character, &c. I will state also that when I became health-officer of the city I had none of the petty prejudices which some people really have in regard to these people. I had only come in contact with them as house-servants and occasional laborers. My experience, however, since I have been health-officer of the city has changed my views in regard to these people very materially, taking them as a class. I do not understand exactly what you mean by the question relating to their physical condition. As a rule, I do not think, in a physical point of view, that they are equal to the white man. They are not capable of doing the same amount of heavy labor. As to their mode of living, of course you all know the manner in which they live.

Senator SARGENT. State it, doctor.

The WITNESS. They live in large tenement-houses, many of which are unfit entirely for habitation, and ought to be declared, if we had any authority here to declare them such, as unfit for habitation. They

live crowded in small rooms without ventilation, and, as they often have diseases of a contagious character among them, they are exposed to it. The air being vitiated by the inhalation of the same air constantly, they breathe vitiated atmosphere all the time. My experience with them has been especially with regard to the present epidemic which is prevailing in the city. They conceal their cases of small-pox. We have had seventy-four deaths reported among the Chinamen.

Q. From small-pox?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. During what period?—A. Since the 24th of May. When they die of small-pox they are removed from their place of death, either to Cooper's alley, Bull Run's alley, or some other place of deposit for their dead. You cannot by any means ascertain where they die. When they die they are conveyed that night through the streets and deposited in these little places, which they call hospitals, and we never ascertain, unless it is by accident, where these people die. Their houses cannot be disinfected on that account, and it is and has been during this epidemic a perpetual source of contagion. I not frequently but occasionally discover cases. I find them sometimes in the basement of a room; for instance where there is a hall opening upon the street. This occurred the other day. I found a Chinaman dying from small-pox about the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the eruption, and his room was immediately in the basement as you went down the steps. The only way in which that room could get any air at all was from the hall which led immediately up into the street, which was so dark that I had to take a lamp to go in. That man had been sick fourteen or fifteen days. Of course this poison was going through the door and through the hall up into the street all the time. I called a meeting of the heads of these six companies at one time early in the epidemic, and told them about these facts; that they were concealing these cases of small-pox. I told them it was absolutely necessary to do something; that they knew the people were already prejudiced against them, and if they persisted in this course I would not be responsible for what would occur. They promised me through their interpreters that they would correct it. They then reported three or four cases during the next two or three days, but stopped it from that time. It has been going on in that way until now. About six weeks ago I started a squad of men through that portion of the city and fumigated it, and since that time there has been a great improvement. This contagion which had been concentrating there for months has been removed, and the epidemic has since that time subsided very much. We have discovered a large number of convalescents during this time, over a hundred men, who have had the small-pox within the last two or three months. Of course these people have all had this disease in that quarter. There has been a perfect distillery of contagion there during this whole time. Why it is they will not report their cases I cannot understand. It is not from any benevolent motive, because I have told them that they could not only take their cases out to their small-pox hospital, but that they might have their own physicians there, and I would see to it myself personally that they should have every attention that would be given to a white man; but they have not done so.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the existing contagion of small-pox among us; where did it originate?—A. I do not speak of that as a matter of opinion; but I know where it originated. It did originate on this occasion from the Chinamen.

Q. From the Chinese quarter?—A. Yes, sir. On the 19th of May the first case of small-pox was reported to me. Within three days there were twelve other cases in various portions of the city, among a highly respectable class of people, who had never been exposed to the disease to their knowledge in any way. On the 24th the first death occurred, it being a Chinaman, who died in the last stages of small-pox, and he had been sick from two to three weeks. Then within a few days several others died, showing that the disease had existed in the Chinese quarter prior to this time, I do not know how long. They may have had any number of cases there without a death. That made it positive that the first death occurred in that quarter. I do not think that is a matter of much consequence, however. During the winter-time we frequently have cases of small-pox imported from the East among the immigrants, but we do not regard that. Those cases are isolated or removed, and precautions are taken to prevent its spread. I do not think in any civilized or well-regulated community we ought ever to have an epidemic of small-pox. I do not believe we ever would, if the local authorities would take proper measures to prevent it; and as they have taken every measure that it was proper for them to take during this epidemic, I do not think we would have had an epidemic here at all, if it had not been for the concealment of these cases in Chinatown. During the early part of the epidemic, probably three-fourths of the cases occurred among white people in that portion of the city who had to pass through Chinatown constantly, going to and from their business. Of course, after a while it became general; the whole atmosphere became poisoned with this contagion, and people in any portion were liable to take it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. These Chinamen circulate about the city, ride in street-cars, and thus would be the means of communicating it?—A. I think there are two or three ways by which it might be communicated. In the first place, I believe, a very large number of cases occurring, as they have occurred, in that portion of the city, it would first infect the atmosphere of that portion of it. Then, it is a notorious fact that the Chinamen of this city generally go into that quarter during the night. Many of them sleep there; many of them have their wash-houses there. Clothing might be conveyed to one of these infected houses, and, after being washed, might remain there for two or three days, and it would absorb this poison. It is possible the disease might be conveyed in that way, because it is very insidious; but I think that it has become epidemic principally because of the atmosphere of that portion of the city becoming first infected, and then gradually spreading itself over the whole city.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. It is a fact, is it not, doctor, that the small-pox becomes epidemic in cities where no Chinese reside?—A. Yes, sir; but all authorities will tell you at this day that when that is the case, it is from neglect of the local authorities; and it is many weeks after the occurrence of the first case before the disease does become an epidemic.

Q. Was that the case in Philadelphia, three years since?—A. I do not know about that, exactly; but I know the authorities state that fact. I presume that cases occurred there occasionally, and no proper precautions were taken until after a while the disease became epidemic. That is what the writers upon the subject will tell you.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is your opinion, as a medical man, as to the continuance of this disease and its permanence among us, predicated upon the assumption that the Chinese quarter shall remain as it is now?—A. I do not believe that the disease will continue here as an epidemic. I do not think it is possible that it should continue a very great length of time, because all the unprotected persons must within a short time take the disease. If it were not now that we were having new food for it, hundreds of people coming into San Francisco every day, I think probably it would cease to be an epidemic very soon; and besides most people have been protected by vaccination.

Q. Has it any other form than an epidemic?—A. It can be sporadic. I presume in the East, during the winter time—in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—there is scarcely a time when there would not be sporadic cases of small-pox that only occasionally become an epidemic. It becomes epidemic here without regard to the season of the year. In the eastern cities it is rarely an epidemic in the summer time. It is a disease of cold and wet weather.

Q. Unlike the yellow fever and those diseases?—A. Entirely different. The only disease we have any fear of here is the small-pox, because if you would bring yellow fever into this climate it would die out.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You spoke about fumigating the Chinese quarter. Please tell us in what condition you found that quarter.—A. Horrible; inconceivably horrible.

Q. Is it indescribable? Can you give us an idea of it?

Mr. PIXLEY. Perhaps the witness had better state preliminarily that he was authorized by the city government to fumigate the Chinese quarter, and then he can give us the result of his observation.

Q. (By Senator SARGENT.) That is the truth, is it not?—A. Yes, sir. I found these people living in large tenement-houses, as a rule; large numbers of them crowded in individual rooms, without proper ventilation, bad drainage, and underground, with a great deal of filth, the odors from which are horrible.

Q. Give us an idea of the number who occupy a room, and the height of the ceiling of the room, &c.—A. Sometimes you go into a room which was originally built probably higher than this room. They will have bunks sometimes all around, and sometimes they will have a platform in one corner of the room; for instance, [illustrating,] to extend over one-fourth of it, probably not more than three or four feet in depth, and numbers of them will sleep on that platform. I found cases of small-pox concealed in places of that sort. I recollect once finding a case concealed in the hall. I went into one of the large tenement-houses. Some one reported a case of small-pox there. I went all through it, but could find no case. They always deny the existence of anything of the sort. Finally I went to a Chinaman who had on one occasion reported a case at the health office, and he said he thought he could find it. He went up with me to the third story, and in a corner of the hall I saw a little box, probably eight feet long, three feet wide, and four feet high. I supposed it was a cupboard; a place to keep something to eat or clothing in. He put a ladder against it and slid a door, and there I found this case of small-pox. They will not tell you the truth about those things. The fact is, I have found out from my own observation, to take them as a class, you cannot believe them on oath when it is their interest to lie at all. I do not say that that applies to

every Chinaman; but take the Chinamen here as a class, I never saw people in my life who would lie with the same coolness that they will, and when you catch them in it, it does not move them a particle. They are perfectly indifferent to it.

Q. What did you find in the way of their underground burrowing?—A. They live underground in bunks. The topography of that portion of Chinatown is such that you enter a house sometimes and think it is a one story house, and you will find two or three stories down below on the side of the hill, where they live in great filth. Perhaps the local and State authorities are to be blamed for that to a considerable extent. If there was a board here, as in Boston, to declare these houses not fit for habitation, we could relieve the city of a great deal of that difficulty.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How as to the question of ventilation?—A. There is no ventilation at all. The only wonder is, that human beings can live in those places and have any health at all.

Q. What amount of opium-smoking or opium-consumption do you find among them?—A. I could not tell. Of course if you go anywhere in the Chinese quarter you will find Chinese smoking opium, and a great many of them smoking tobacco.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In what manner do they smoke—as one smokes a cigar, walking about?—A. They generally lie down with the paste and a pipe, and with a little light in the hand, which they touch it occasionally with.

Q. Do you find many of them in a small room smoking opium at the same time?—A. Frequently half a dozen or more lying about. Sometimes you will find twenty people together smoking. They seem to me to be entirely indifferent as to the welfare of each other or of the white people. I do not mean so far as their families are concerned. I have no doubt they have strong attachments in their families, but as they seem to me, I have never seen any class of people so indifferent to the sufferings of their fellow-creatures. For instance, take these little hospitals which they have. Go in Aleck alley, where there are but small rooms, horribly filthy; you find Chinamen there dying with consumption and other chronic diseases, lying in their filth, with no person to take care of them, and absolutely in a state of starvation, and they will beg of you. I never went into one of those places that they did not beg me for five or ten cents to buy something to eat with. They ask for bread, and if you hand one of them a piece of stale bread he will devour it. A man told me he handed one a lump of hard rice, who did die two days afterward, and he took it and consumed it like a starved wolf. He appeared to be perishing from hunger. These are places absolutely procured and run and sustained by these six companies, for benevolent purposes, as they call it.

Q. As hospitals?—A. They do not recognize them as hospitals, because the city does not allow hospitals of that kind to exist in the city. I prosecuted a case not long ago which is still pending in court. The idea is that it is a sort of mess-house, a benevolent institution. These cases of small-pox are deposited in these hospitals. For instance, you go into one of these hospitals to-day and you will not find a sick man in it, but to-morrow morning there will be three dead Chinamen there.

Q. Where do they bring them from?—A. We do not know where they come from. We cannot find out by any possible means.

Q. Do they have many attendants around these so-called hospitals?—A. I never can see anybody who is an attendant there. You may go now

to Aleck alley and find five or six Chinamen in a small room. If a person not accustomed to those things opens the door and goes in it almost knocks him down, the odor is so terrible, and you cannot find anybody waiting on them. I suppose somebody does go there sometimes and do something for them, but it looks to me very much like they are starved. It is a notorious fact, which you can ascertain by an examination of the officers of the law, policemen and others, more than you can from me, because they have seen more of them, that the Chinese are entirely indifferent to the sufferings of their brethren. When a man gets in a condition that he can do no more work, when no more work is to be obtained out of that man, he is looked upon as somebody in the way, and they want to get rid of him as soon as possible.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are women sent to these hospitals?—A. I have never seen any women there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Pursuing the question as to the manner in which they live, the balconies built about the house, and the roofs and the sheds about buildings, how are they utilized?—A. They are generally utilized. Frequently you find bunks in places of that sort to sleep in. They utilize every particle of room they can.

Q. Where do they cook?—A. You generally find in one of these places a kitchen, a large range principally, and they seem to use it in common.

Q. Do you ever find any cooking done in their sleeping-rooms?—A. No, sir. I have never seen any cooking in a sleeping-room.

Q. Do you ever see any little brasiers? I am speaking more about what I have observed myself. If you have never happened to observe it of course you do not know.—A. I have not observed it.

Q. What diseases are prevalent among Chinese? How is it in reference to venereal disease? Does your observation enable you to testify upon that point?—A. There is a large amount of venereal disease among them, especially among the females; but among the males also. We have had some very horrible cases of syphilitic diseases from them at our hospitals. In fact the so-called leprosy they have here is simply the result of generations of syphilis, transmitted from one generation to another.

Q. Have you observed many cases of leprosy?—A. The authorities sent back to China, some months ago, thirteen. I know two other cases here.

Q. What was the condition of these leprous persons? Describe it.—A. They were horrible; some of them with their noses eaten off. I think most of those cases were, as I tell you, the result of syphilis transmitted from one generation to another.

Q. Is it what is known by the profession as leprosy?—A. Some professional men would call it leprosy and others would call most of the cases syphilis. Some of them, I think, are purely lepers. There is a distinction between the diseases.

Q. How is the skin of the patient?—A. The disease of leprosy the name indicates. Leper means "scaly." It first commences on the extremities, a little, round, circular spot, red and shining, and then a scale forms on that, and it is a succession of scales forming and dropping off all the time, and after a while another adjoining that, and so on, until it will cover the whole body.

Q. Do you see anything like that here?—A. O, yes. I have seen men at the hospitals—some of those we sent back. Their feet dropped

off by dry gangrene, and their hands were wasted and attenuated. Their finger-nails dropped off.

Q. You have seen those things among the Chinamen here?—A. Yes, sir. I saw those thirteen cases at the hospital that were sent back, and there are some two or three that we know of now in the Chinese quarter. I do not look upon that as a contagious disease except by transmission from one generation to another.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Let me ask you if a large number of Chinese domestics employed about town do not congregate and sleep in this Chinese quarter?—A. It is generally understood to be the fact that most of them sleep in the Chinese quarter. I cannot say that from my personal knowledge. I know, as a rule, that they do not sleep at home. Where they sleep I do not know. The presumption is that they sleep there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose a woman has these leprous tendencies, (not, of course, fully developed, because she would be an object of horror,) would connection with such a woman produce contagion or cause a disease to the individual?—A. It is a matter of opinion. I doubt it very much.

Q. You think it must be transmitted from parent to child?—A. Yes, sir. The best evidence is if this was a contagious disease we would have had thousands of cases here in this community. These thirteen cases had been at the hospital for years. I have known them six or seven years.

Q. Are you aware that in the Sandwich Islands they are compelled to isolate cases of leprosy?—A. Yes, sir; and very properly; because they do not wish this disease transmitted from one generation to another. But you do not find in either China or Honolulu that white people are afraid of taking this disease. In fact these people had been in the hospitals for years, in contact with the employés of that hospital constantly. I have frequently gone among them myself without any fear. As a fact there has been no case of white persons contracting the disease here.

Q. Let me call your attention to another matter which, perhaps, is not an authority here. According to Scripture history and tradition, the leper was driven out from the city, and went to desert places. If any one approached him he was not allowed to speak to him, but made to cry, "Unclean!" "Unclean!" You think that science has shown these precautions to be unnecessary?—A. I do not think medical men are apt to consult the Scriptures about the medical profession in any way.

Q. You think those precautions are not necessary?—A. The best authorities say that this disease is not contagious, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, but it is carried down from generation to generation.

Q. In the ordinary form of syphilis, as it exists among the Chinese women, does that produce a very bad form of the disease?—A. That is the common idea. I do not believe it myself. I think that the white man is just as bad in that respect as the Chinaman. It only appears to be worse with the Chinamen, because, like in the Sandwich Islands, and among all people who are not treated for syphilis, it is handed down from one generation to another generation, until it assumes a tertiary form, and presents a horrible appearance; but the primary syphilis which people contract, I do not believe is any worse in the Chinaman than in the white man or negro.

Q. Do you know any other skin-diseases—itch, or anything of that sort—among the Chinese?—A. I am not sufficiently familiar to state

that fact. I see little except in an official way, of course. I have nothing to do with them as a medical man.

Q. Is this opium-smoking general, or confined to the loafing class?—A. I should say it was very general.

Q. What is the effect of smoking opium upon a person's energies and adaptability for labor, and his intellect?—A. I do not think it is any worse than excessive drinking. I think excess in opium-smoking will degrade more rapidly than excess in drinking alcohol.

Q. As a medical man, if the proposition were presented to you that a man had the merit of not drinking any whisky, but was an inveterate smoker of opium, would you think he was any better, morally or physically, for the difference?—A. I think that would depend very much upon the individual case. I have known a great many opium-eaters.

Q. Excessive opium-eaters?—A. O, yes; you find them among the very highest class of people—white people—statesmen, ladies, and all.

Q. Do you think that smoking opium is as much a vice carried on in Chinatown as if, instead of opium, whisky were substituted?—A. I think it is rather better for us that they should smoke opium, for if they drank liquor to some excess, I do not know what would become of us.

Q. It would inflame their passions?—A. When they smoke opium they are inoffensive so far as we are concerned, because when they get under its influence they drop off and go to sleep, and that is the end of it.

Q. What is the effect upon the Malay of eating hasheesh? What induces the Malay to run the muck?—A. I do not know. Every nationality must have its stimulant of some sort. One will prefer one and another another. As a fact, the higher civilizations prefer liquor—alcohol. Take it as a rule, the use of other stimulants than alcohol is looked upon as more degrading, and it may be, so far as the individual is concerned; but so far as any injury to us is concerned, I believe it is better for us that they should smoke opium than drink alcohol.

Q. You think they are more peaceful?—A. Yes, sir; they do themselves more injury, perhaps, but they do us less.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You stated that there had been 74 fatal cases of small-pox in the Chinese quarter.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please state to the commission the number of other cases confined to the white population in the same time since the 24th of May.—A There have been 202 deaths among the whites, and up to this time there have been reported at the health-office 1,002 cases since the 19th of May.

Q. Do you know of any cases concealed by the white people?—A. Yes, sir; there have been, to my knowledge, about three cases. We finally got at them, but they were concealed. There may have been others that I know nothing of, of course.

Q. The papers stated that there were five cases in South San Francisco in one house.—A. That is one of the cases; I mean there were three in the same family.

Q. Did the ships arriving here from the Pacific South American ports report the small-pox raging in Valparaiso and other ports this way, and a fearful epidemic last February, March, April, and May at Callao and San Diego de Cuba?—A. I think it was generally understood—I cannot speak from my own knowledge—that there was an epidemic of small-pox in Central America. It is so frequently the case down there, however, that it does not prove much.

Q. It prevails pretty much all the time?—A. Yes; in all those South American countries.

Q. You have been a resident of this city a good many years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We have had the small-pox frequently here?—A. It has prevailed, within my knowledge, but once as an epidemic. That was in 1868–'69.

Q. Did that originate in the Chinese quarter?—A. I do not know. I was not here at the time, and therefore I cannot tell you.

Q. Mr. Meade has called your attention to the epidemic in Philadelphia, in 1872, which was so fatal. Have you any knowledge where it originated?—A. I have no personal knowledge.

Q. Do you not know that the epidemic carried off in the ratio of seven-eighths fatal cases in the aristocratic portions of Philadelphia along Chestnut and Walnut streets?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you not know that the small-pox always exists in large cities? A. I cannot say that I know that it always exists. For instance, we have not had a case reported here, not a known case, for eight months prior to the 19th of May, but it is supposed to exist as a sporadic disease in very large cities. I doubt very much that it does exist in the eastern cities in the summer time. You do not hear of it then; but I suppose there is scarcely ever a winter that it does not exist in all the northern cities, not as an epidemic, but in sporadic cases, which are taken care of, and thus prevented from becoming an epidemic by being isolated and removed to proper places.

Q. What is a disinfectant? I do not ask this question for the mere purpose of testing your professional abilities, but I want to make a point by it.—A. What we mean by a disinfectant is an antiseptic that will arrest the decay of animal or vegetable matter, or will destroy that germ which is the seat of contagion.

Q. Then, do you not think that excessive smoking of opium, as it is charged is carried on in the Chinese quarter, naturally acts as a disinfectant?—A. Individually, I have often thought that one reason of the Chinamen being so largely exempt from some of our contagious diseases was that they live in an atmosphere of smoke. That does not, however, protect them from this specific poison of small-pox; but I believe that this smoking of opium and the inhalation of it constantly, and tobacco-smoke and foul air, are deleterious to their death. A great many of them die of consumption—lung diseases. Still, I do believe, as an individual, it prevents them to a large extent from contracting such diseases as scarlet fever, diphtheria, and measles perhaps. But, then, there is another reason why they do not have that class of diseases among them to such extent as among the white people, and that is because the Chinese population is principally an adult population.

Q. Have they not been vaccinated, a large percentage of them?—A. I look upon them, as a class, as thoroughly protected against small-pox as any other class of people living. They have been inoculated. I have been informed by intelligent Chinamen that in recent years they use vaccination to some extent, but every person in China is inoculated. Inoculation is compulsory there. They are supposed to be inoculated while infants. Therefore it is that the adult population do not fear the disease. I have heard from travelers that sometimes you see a woman in the streets of Hong-Kong with a child on her back with the small-pox. People have no fear of it. All are presumed to have had the disease, but in a population of 400,000,000, of course in the interior districts large numbers will escape inoculation. Of course the disease is perpetuated by this system of inoculation, but as a nation I presume they are better protected against the disease than other nations.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you think they practice inoculation here?—A. I think not. They may do it in infancy. Several infants have died during the prevalence of the small-pox here among Chinamen. I do not believe they practice it. The chances are, if they had practiced it, those children would not have died. They do not practice vaccination here that I know of, and I know, for I was once quarantine-officer of this port, and it was necessary occasionally to vaccinate the Chinamen who came here on ship in consequence of small-pox existing. This was ordered by the board of health, and of course they did not care about being vaccinated by us. They thought themselves already protected.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have not climatic influences something to do with the cubic-air law by which a person can occupy quarters without contracting disease? For instance, take the hot climate of the eastern cities, both day and night, and our atmosphere here, its coolness at night—what number of cubic feet of air can a person exist in here?—A. I do not know that I can state from any personal knowledge. The fact is, in regard to this cubic-air law, I look upon it as being exceedingly defective. You had better put a hundred men in this room, and let them sleep here, and give them ventilation, than to put five or six in it and have no ventilation. For instance, on shipboard men are not presumed to have five hundred cubic feet of air, but then ventilation is thoroughly established, and they are breathing fresh air all the time. I do not believe that those laws amount to much myself as an individual.

Q. In this climate do you think a small space engenders disease to that extent that it would in the eastern and southern climates of our country?—A. I do not think it does to the extent it would in the eastern climates in the summer time. In fact, I think if we had the heat here that they have in the East in the summer we would have a plague almost every year, with the sanitary condition of that portion of the city.

Q. You speak of these underground places being unfit for tenements, having no ventilation. I wish you would describe a little more minutely what you mean by "underground."—A. You know that they have passages which go from one street or alley to another, and in all these underground places where I have been I found people sleeping in those places. I found in small rooms large numbers with their bunks built around. They generally have bunks all around these small places, these small rooms. I do not know that they are any worse than a large number of their rooms above the ground. They seem to me to care less about ventilation that any people I have ever known.

Q. Are you familiar with such localities in the eastern cities?—A. No, sir; I am not.

Q. You say it is difficult, and that you have not been successful in entering their hospitals to find any one in charge, Do you not know it to be a fact than when an officer or a stranger enters any of their quarters they hide, that they run and get out of the way if possible; that they are afraid, as a general rule?—A. They would not run from me.

Q. Not when they became acquainted with you?—A. No, sir; they know me, and I do not think they exhibit any fear of people as a rule.

Q. Does smoking opium fill our prisons and jails to the extent that whisky does?—A. I cannot say from personal knowledge. I have very little to do with those matters.

Q. Does opium-smoking make these Chinese vicious and quarrel-

some?—A. I do not think so. I do not think they are a quarrelsome people.

Q. Opium-smoking does not increase our taxes to any certain degree in comparison with whisky-drinking, does it?—A. Not that I know of.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say that climatic influences modify the evils that might arise from the condition of the Chinese quarter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That if that quarter was in an eastern city—New York or Philadelphia—during the hot weather, it would produce a plague every year?—A. It would produce especially those diseases which afflict children, from the excessive heat producing rapid vegetable and animal decomposition.

Q. Then is there any reasonable prospect that by and by the Chinese will extend to the eastern cities, and be there as they are now here, unless they shall take precautions to prevent their coming?—A. I think they are bound to extend all over the country, with such a population in China and the advantages they derive from being here.

Q. You think it is an additional danger to the East in that they have not these beneficial climatic influences?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you lived in this city?—A. Seven years.

Q. Do you notice whether Chinadom is extending or contracting in its area?—A. It is extending.

Q. State what you have observed in that way?—A. I have observed that it is extending, for instance, a great deal on Dupont street, Stockton, and that portion of the city.

Q. How far is Chinadom now from the City Hall?—A. It is close to it; right on Washington street you know, and Commercial street, and Jackson.

Q. How near is it to our Wall street, viz: California street?—A. The nearest point would be Washington street above Kearney. Of course there are here and there China stores.

Q. That is within two or three blocks?—A. Yes, sir; a few blocks away.

Q. They are gradually extending toward our best business streets, are they not?—A. I think so.

Q. Is your memory of this city old enough to know the condition of the portion of the city which they now occupy before they were so numerous there?—A. No, sir.

Q. You do not know about its being filled up with stores?—A. No, sir; not from personal knowledge, only from what I have heard.

Q. As Chinadom is now situated, does it separate a part of the city where there are desirable residences from the business portion of the city?—A. I think so. I think it acts injuriously to the value of the property in all that North Beach portion of the city.

Q. It cuts off the whole North Beach property, the fine residences, from the business portion of the city?—A. Yes, sir; I think it makes the property less desirable. It would be for me, and I have heard hundreds express the same opinion.

Q. The street-cars, reaching that handsome portion of the city, run through Chinadom?—A. Yes, sir. Ladies and children have to pass through these smells and sights to get down to Montgomery street.

Q. It makes it very objectionable to ladies, or even gentlemen, walking through that portion of the city?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Will you furnish the committee with a diagram or small map, showing the relative position of this Chinese quarter?—A. Yes, sir; I will do so.

Q. Do you regard the health ordinances of this city as ample and sufficient?—A. I do not.

Q. What is your system of inspection? Is it a permanent one?—A. Yes, sir; we have permanent inspectors.

Q. How many officers are there for the city?—A. We only have four permanent inspectors, but during epidemics such as exists at this time, we can appoint as many as we please. We have now about thirteen or fourteen.

Q. In ordinary times how often do you inspect these quarters?—A. There is no regular inspection of those quarters any more than any other portion of the city. As a rule nuisances are reported at the health office and are abated by these inspectors. Of course, so far as Chinatown is concerned, nuisances are rarely reported from that quarter. On that account, for the last eight months we have had a special inspector for that quarter, who goes around and looks up these nuisances.

Q. Do you regard one inspector sufficient for that large quarter?—A. No, sir; I do not. I think we could use very profitably all the time three times as many as we usually have. Our health laws are defective. In these new countries it is very often so, but if we had the power I could abate a large number of nuisances in that quarter that cannot be abated at present.

Q. It is very desirable that the power should be invested in the health department?—A. In some department, and probably the health department.

Q. It properly belongs to the health department in connection with the police department?—A. Yes, sir; it is so in other cities. I notice in the health laws of Boston, the board of health have power to declare any house as unfit for habitation; and if that were the case here it would be very beneficial to us, particularly as there is a great deal of property owned by wealthy men in that portion of the city which is in a horrible condition. In fact, I do not think it could be put in condition fit for habitation at all. It would either have to be pulled down or burnt up. They get enormous rents from these people; a large number of Chinamen occupying these small rooms, they make immense profits. I dare say that some of those tenement-houses rent for as much even as a house on Montgomery or Kearney. Here are twenty, thirty, and forty men living in one room. I do not know what they pay, but in the aggregate it makes large rent for a house which none but the lowest of the low would occupy under any circumstances.

Q. From the natural location of this Chinese quarter it should be a healthy one?—A. It ought to be one of the healthiest portions of the city.

Q. Then with proper police and health regulations the evils which are complained of might, in your opinion, be largely abated?—A. To a very great extent, with proper police and health regulation. I think probably it would be the means of scattering these people more, and if we are to have them among us, it would be a great deal better for us if they were scattered more than they are at present.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the death-rate among the Chinese as compared to the American population?—A. I cannot tell you accurately. It is less, of

course, because more than one-fourth of the deaths that occur in this city are under twelve months of age.

Q. Leaving out the death-rate among infants, taking American adults and Chinese adults, how does the death-rate compare?—A. I could not tell you just now, but I might ascertain for you.

Q. Have you any opinion about it?—A. No, sir; none that would be worth anything, because our statistics are not kept in that way. For instance, we have the death-rate under one year of age, under five, under ten. Quite one-half of the deaths that occur in this city occur in children under ten years of age.

Q. What is the comparative longevity of the Chinese?—A. I think they are a short-lived race, from my own personal observation. That opinion is not sufficiently accurate to make it statistical, but that is the impression made upon me by my own observation. As we see them here they are not a hardy, hale race. They are not capable of the same amount of physical labor.

Q. Are there any Chinese men here of seventy-five or eighty years of age now, those who came here long ago?—A. I do not think I have ever seen any who were that old. I have occasionally seen an old man, a very old man, among them. I used to observe that particularly when I was quarantine officer here. Then I inspected each one individually who came into the port, and I would occasionally see an old man, and would be surprised at seeing so old a man coming from China.

Q. Among the immigrants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In regard to small-pox among the Chinese, is it generally fatal, or comparatively fatal?—A. We very rarely come in contact with them until they die. They conceal their cases, and move them from the place of death to a depot, and they cannot be buried without a certificate from the city physician and a permit from me. Then the case will be reported from one of their little hospitals to the city physician. He goes there and sends in his certificate of death, and they are buried, and that is the great source of complaint I have had against the Chinamen, that they have concealed, in my opinion, hundreds of cases there; I know a very large number. They will not report the cases, notwithstanding my remonstrances. I have called up these Chinese companies, and told them the importance of it, and how they were prejudicing the white people against them, and how they were destroying the business of our city and valuable lives of our people.

Q. How many reported cases are there of deaths by small-pox?—A. During this epidemic the number of deaths of Chinamen was seventy-four. If you give them the same percentage of deaths that we have among the white people, then we would have had in Chinatown five times seventy-four cases. The percentage of deaths among the whites has been 20 per cent. Of course that is the only way that I can calculate the thing at all. We have had the disease concentrated there among them, and the chances are that although we have an occasional case among them now, most of them who may have the small-pox have had it.

Q. Do they not practice inoculation?—A. Yes, sir; inoculation is compulsory in China. As a nation they are very thoroughly protected, and so esteemed to be, and therefore they care very little about this disease. For instance, I have discovered cases of small-pox occasionally in Chinatown. I would go into a room where there would be twenty or thirty Chinamen working upon slippers, and there would be piles of slippers and a case of small-pox in the corner.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Those slippers go out through the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For sale?—A. Yes, sir. I saw a horrible case of small-pox on one occasion which had been concealed twelve or fourteen days, and two or three large piles of slippers in the room—perhaps a hundred or two pairs—and probably fifteen or more Chinamen working there. They do not regard the disease at all; they care nothing about it.

Q. That is very interesting. For instance, the morning papers will occasionally speak of two cases of small-pox at Oroville, Grass Valley, Placerville, Drytown, Virginia City, Carson, &c. Would those slippers absorb the poison, and going out be worn by people, thus communicate the disease to them?—A. It is generally understood among medical men that that is one way of transmitting the disease, especially in woolen goods.

Mr. PIXLEY. In addition to slippers, the Senator might ask if they do not work exclusively in woolen, and make overalls for laboring-men, and undershirts and blouses.

(By Senator SARGENT.) Do you observe that, doctor?—A. I do not observe that in Chinatown. As a rule they do not manufacture much in their tenement-houses where I have seen them.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Have you not known cases of small-pox in Chinese laundries?—A. I have never discovered a case in one. I suppose I have had a hundred cases reported to me. I have been very much annoyed by it. Because a Chinese laundry exists in some portion of the town they take it for granted that the small-pox is there. I think three-fourths of the laundries in this town have been reported to me during this epidemic; but I would not expect to find them there, because they would be certain to move them from a place of that sort to Chinatown. There may cases occur among them, and undoubtedly they have; but they have got too much sense to keep a case of small-pox in a Chinese laundry.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is their objection to their communicating to you knowledge of small-pox cases?—A. I cannot understand why. I had a meeting with these six companies. I know some of their interpreters very well. Some of them are intelligent men, and they make all sorts of promises. They asked me such questions as did lead me to believe at first that they did not care about these people going to our hospitals, because they could not be treated by their own physicians. One of them remarked to me that the anatomy of Chinamen is different from that of white men, and in other respects he was a very intelligent man. I told him if they would take them out there they could have their own physicians; they would be supported there at the city expense and should have proper treatment, and vastly better treatment than in the little close rooms in the Chinese quarter. I thought I had the thing all arranged so that they would report to me. They did report a few cases, probably five altogether. They stopped reporting then and have not reported since. I do not think it is because they did not think they would be kindly treated, because they do not treat their own sick kindly. I am positive about that. Their own sick in the little hospitals are treated inhumanly. I do not mean that they would treat a member of their own family so, but I think they are perfectly indifferent in regard to suffering, as much so to a Chinaman as to a white man. It is something unaccountable. This is only the result of my own observation.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you known of cases of a dead woman being found on the streets in Chinatown?—A. Nothing of that kind within my knowledge at all. I have found dead Chinamen.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Speaking of the extension of the limits of Chinatown, is that extension brought about by the purchase of real estate by the Chinese in their vicinity?—A. I do not know about that. I think it is the extension of their business. They desire, like other people, to get into other places, where they can get more of the white trade.

Q. The white race generally own this property?—A. I think so.

Q. And rent it to these Chinamen for the purpose of building up this "festering sore?"—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there not large numbers of Europeans and Americans who hibernate and live with these Chinese in this Chinese quarter? Are not seven-eighths of our houses of prostitution located in the Chinese quarter?—A. They are located over the town generally, scattered pretty well around. Of course a very large number of them are in Dupont street; and those, to use the expression, the least respectable are in that quarter of the town.

Q. A large percentage of these people live there, do they not?—A. A very large percentage. I think it would be better for us, if we are to have the Chinese population, that we should have ten thousand Chinese women; that is, if this population is to continue.

Q. To what extent do you find diseases in the Chinese quarter in comparison with the rest of the city, and what are the diseases prevalent there?—A. I cannot answer that question, because I am not called there as a medical man, nor is any medical man of our own race. Of course that could only be ascertained through Chinese physicians, but my observation leads me to believe that most of the deaths are caused from chronic diseases, and principally from consumption. I think it is from the inhalation of bad air and opium and tobacco smokes that the constitutional diseases are produced, which finally terminate in their death.

Q. Do you think that disease is engendered to any greater extent in the Chinese quarter than in other thickly-settled portions of the city?—A. From my observation, I should consider that the greatest source. Of course we have other quarters in the city very bad, but principally from defective sewerage; but our laboring-classes, all people here, as a rule, live in a very respectable manner. I mean our white population. Of course you will find in some of our low portions a dozen families crowded into tenement-houses, and a great deal of filth.

Q. Who is to blame for this defective sewerage?—A. I cannot say that anybody is to be blamed for it. This is a very new city. There is an amount of sewerage already done here, and being done now. Probably if we were to place this city in a proper condition in regard to its sewerage, within two years the rent of real estate would be almost valueless. The topography of the city is such that sewerage is expensive. We have done an immense deal in this city for a quarter of a century. We are doing a great deal now.

Q. Then the Chinese are not to be blamed themselves for this lack of sewerage?—A. Not at all.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. You spoke about finding a dead Chinaman in the street. Is that the case, which was stated in the papers, of a Chinaman in the last stages

of the small-pox who was wrapped in a blanket which a person stumbled over one night?—A. That case occurred on the corner of Stockton, just where the cars go up into Stockton from Jackson street. This Chinaman was found in a dying condition right on the pavement. A gentleman opened his store early in the morning and found this Chinaman, a man who had been sick, I suppose, at least two weeks. He was in a horrible condition. It was a horrible sight.

Q. He died from small-pox?—A. O, yes; he had the small-pox. When I got there some Chinamen had taken him down into Aleck alley.

Q. Was he in such a condition that he could not have walked to the place where he was found?—A. O, no; he must have been carried there. He died within twenty-four hours.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Was there any inquest had in his case?—A. No; it was not necessary. The evidence of the cause of death was plain.

Q. And the authorities did not go into an inquiry as to neglect in his case?—A. You cannot go into an inquiry, because you cannot find out where they come from. If I could only find out that, I could prosecute for not reporting him.

Q. Do you have coroner's inquest here in the case of sudden death?—A. Yes; but it is a very difficult matter to get a coroner to make an inquest in a small-pox case, or to get a jury for those cases. To show you how they treat their people sometimes, I will state that some weeks ago there was a case reported to me of a dead child at North Beach. I went up there, and found, a hundred yards from the bridge which goes out to Meigs's wharf, a child three or four years of age lying just on the edge of the water. It had died of the small-pox. The water washes up against Bay street there and makes it a steep bank, and among a good deal of the *débris* washed up was this dead China child, three or four years old. A man had seen two men and a woman go there and deposit this child. He did not know what they were depositing at the time, but after they left, as a matter of curiosity, he went to see what it was, and found this dead China child. Of course there are white people, too, who could do things of that sort.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Does your position as health-officer give you a knowledge of the general extent and consequences of Chinese prostitution here?—A. Not any further than the knowledge of any other intelligent physician in regard to that matter. Of course we all look upon these Chinese women as prostitutes. I suppose as a rule they are. That has been my opinion, as it has been the opinion of almost every person in the city, but I do not think that is one of the things it is necessary to make so much fuss about, because we have plenty of prostitution outside of the Chinese. They have a few women here. I think it would be a great blessing for us if we had a great many more Chinese women for the use of the Chinamen themselves. We have abundant sources of sporadic diseases here, as in all large cities, outside of Chinamen, and my experience is that prostitution with the Chinese women is confined to a very low class of white people. You may go into some portions of the Chinese quarters, for instance on Pacific street, and you will find the lowest class of white people, and negroes, and Mexicans, and Indians, and Chinamen, all mixed up together horribly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Are the cases of which you have been speaking limited to that

class?—A. That is the case on Pacific street, particularly; but so far as the syphilis is concerned, I think we have plenty of it outside of Chinese women. I really do think if we are to have this population here it would be much better for us all to have more Chinese women, because if they had a large number of Chinese women here, then the Chinamen would marry and have children, and those children would be a very much better class of people than the present race of Chinamen; just, as a rule, the children of the ignorant European population who come here, having the advantages of our fine public schools, become intelligent and first-rate citizens, much better citizens in many cases than their fathers. It is really one of the serious objections to the Chinese that they are not raising up good citizens. I do not think that any country can be great with so large a population not raising up children.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you regard the Chinese women as the chief source of syphilis here?—A. O, no; I do not consider them the chief source of syphilis here. You misunderstood me. I think they are a source of a considerable amount of it, but there are not enough of them to make it the chief source.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How many prostitutes do you think there are in this city?—A. I do not know.

Q. Have you read Dr. Sanger's History of Prostitution?—A. I never did.

Q. If my recollection is correct, he estimates the number of professional prostitutes in the city of New York at eight thousand. It was published some ten years ago. I was surprised at the small number, but perhaps the use of the word "professional" explains it.—A. That limits the number. I think more syphilis is propagated from the unprofessionals than there is from the professionals. That is my observation as a medical man.

Q. The moral of that, then, is touch not at all. Of course that is the obvious moral from all such matters; but that being so, and there being about four thousand Chinese prostitutes here, if Dr. Sanger is correct at all in his statistics, is it not the principal source of prostitution?—A. I do not know about that statement. I should doubt very much about there being four thousand Chinese prostitutes here. I cannot speak from my own knowledge.

Mr. PIXLEY. The number varies from 1,200 to 2,000.

Senator SARGENT. According to the estimate, there are 4,000 Chinese prostitutes on the coast, then.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What number of Chinese prostitutes do you estimate as being in this city?—A. I have no means of making an estimate. I can only state from hearsay.

Q. What number of white prostitutes is there? A large number or a small number?—A. Large number. I could not say how many, because I have no means of estimating it; but there is a large number.

Q. How does the degradation in that quarter among white women compare with the degradation of the Chinese quarter?—A. I think in the Chinese quarter they are a much more degraded class as a rule, but then we have some among the whites as degraded as it is possible to be.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do many of the Chinese prostitutes hive in the same quarters?

Do they divide their rooms by partitions running horizontally?—A. I cannot say in regard to that. I frequently go into that quarter, where there are a number of them.

Mr. PIXLEY. We shall have witnesses here who are positively informed in regard to the detail of this matter.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You know that the large number of the domestic servants of this city are Chinamen?—A. I do.

Q. Do you not think that this prostitution can be looked upon, in reference to them, though a social evil, as an actual benefit? Do you not think they come in contact as house-servants with our children, and do you not think that the prostitutes who are here, which those Chinamen, of course, have access to if they desire, in a measure tend to protect our own families?—A. I have never thought of it in that light.

Q. Suppose there were no Chinese women here?—A. I think it would be better for the Chinamen if they had more of them; that is, if the women confined themselves to Chinamen.

Q. Did you hear of a white man being turned out of one of the hotels on Pacific or some of those streets a few months ago, when he was nearly dying of the small-pox, and he was found the next morning by the police in an elevator connected with a mill, in a dying condition?—A. That is not true. It could not have occurred without my knowing it.

Q. It was the newspaper report. Did you hear of a man being found in a lumber-yard in the last stages of small-pox?—A. There was a Chinaman found in some lumber. They were fumigating one of the houses and found him.

Q. The case I speak of was on Stewart street.—A. That was not so. This case was reported to me. I examined that case. It was not small-pox.

ALFRED CLARKE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. What is your position?—Answer. Clerk in the chief of police department.

Q. How long have you filled that position?—A. About eight or ten years. I have been a member of the police department for about twenty years, holding different positions in it.

Q. State, if you please, what is the number of Chinese in San Francisco.—A. That I could only give an estimate of, because I have only a general knowledge of it. It is given by Langley, in the directory, at about 30,000. I suppose that is about right.

Q. What is the condition of the quarter which they inhabit with reference to cleanliness? Give to the commission a general idea as to the result of your observation of the Chinese quarter.—A. I have been but little in the Chinese quarter lately, but by general observation whenever I went there it was pretty dirty. I have not been there much lately, because my duties have called me to the office. There are officers who are in attendance before you who are there every day.

Q. Can you give any estimate of the number of Chinese prostitutes, gamblers, or criminals?—A. There is a big number of Chinese prostitutes and gamblers, but it varies a good deal in proportion to the energy of the police in prosecuting them or breaking them up. The chief of police sent out and got some statistics from officers who made an actual count of the present number of Chinese prostitutes. They would be able to give you figures more correctly than I can.

Q. Can you give us any idea of the percentage of criminals among the Chinese?—A. My impression is that during the last year about 67 were sent to the penitentiary; I can get figures for you at the office to show the total number.

Mr. PIXLEY. That is what I sent to the police department for. I will ask Mr. Ellis, the chief of police, to take a position on the stand.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I should like to examine this witness a little before he leaves. I understand you have been connected with the police department for some twenty years, in one capacity and another?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your general observation, in the position in which you have been placed, as to crime among the Chinese, its proportion as compared with the white people, taking large and small offenses?—A. It is not so easy to get convictions in cases where crimes are committed among the Chinese, for the reason that the witnesses who are cognizant of the facts constituting the crime are generally Chinese themselves, and they do not generally desire to press prosecutions in our own courts, because if there is a difference among them, they generally desire to settle it among themselves.

Q. What is the proportion of convictions?—A. The chief has figures bearing upon that question. It is pretty nearly even.

Q. What is the proportion of arrests, then?—A. The number of arrests in proportion to the population does not vary much, according to the figures which have been compiled and which are now present.

Q. Have you ordinances here by which police-officers are authorized to break up these dens of prostitution and make arrests?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And to punish this want of cleanliness?—A. Yes, sir. The laws and ordinances in relation to prostitution and cleanliness are intended to bear upon all equally, but of course among the Chinese the officers find more to do.

Q. Will you state why these dens of prostitution are not broken up, these notorious and offensive places.—A. We can only break them up according to law. We cannot go into these houses and force these women out of the country, to go somewhere else. We have from time to time endeavored to use legal means to bring to justice the violators of law in regard to keeping houses of prostitution, &c., and the thing has been going on here for years. At one time we had eighty or ninety of them in a little jail that was erected for that purpose, and during the time that we pressed those prosecutions the practice of prostitution diminished very much. At one time I think there were not more than forty or fifty in the city who were out of jail, but that was about 1866. About that time there was a proposition considered to locate them away out in the suburbs, outside of the city, and it looked at one time as though that would be carried out; but an act was passed by the legislature, which was commonly known as the "Chinese house-of-ill-fame bill," which prohibited Chinese houses of ill fame anywhere; and when that became known the proposition failed, because these people seemed to think that if they could not be allowed under the law to exist anywhere, they might as well stay where they were as to move.

Q. Any house of prostitution is a nuisance, is it not?—A. Yes, sir; prostitution is a crime here.

Q. It may be abated, locked up, cleaned out, may it not, by your officers?—A. No, sir; we can only abate them by convicting the persons guilty of the offense and putting them in jail. If they pay the fine, there is nothing to prevent them from committing the same acts over

again, except the fear of the law, and if we can get evidence to punish them again, good and well; but if we get at any particular gambler or prostitute, we may find it a little difficult to get evidence in the first instance and almost impossible to get it after that, because they are going to be more careful.

Mr. PIXLEY. The witness has in his hands some of these contracts, the only two original contracts for the service of Chinese women that we have ever been able to find.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do you know anything about Chinese women being held in a state of bondage in this city for purposes of prostitution?—A. My line of duty has given me some knowledge of such things. I know of them by convictions in courts and by hearing statements made by these people.

Mr. KING. I understand you have some contracts. Will you produce them?

(The witness produced two papers written in Chinese characters.)

Mr. PIXLEY. We offer these papers in evidence as original contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you read them?

Mr. PIXLEY. I will read them by proxy, by asking my friend Mr. Gibson to read them. He is a translator of the language, I believe.

Mr. GIBSON. [Examining papers.] They are in manuscript, and I do not know whether I can read them without my dictionary.

Mr. PIXLEY. They have been translated officially, I will state, and if the commission will indulge me I will read the translation.

Mr. GIBSON. They are my own translation, I think.

Senator SARGENT. Then perhaps it might be well to call Mr. Gibson to testify whether it is a correct translation of these contracts.

Rev. OTIS GIBSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. [Producing a manuscript.] Is this your handwriting?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you state whether that is a translation of these several contracts?—A. I cannot answer unless you let me see the original contracts at the same time. [Examining one of the contracts.] That is correct. [Examining the other contract.] And that is correct.

Q. Will you please read those contracts?—A. This document is translated here, which I recognize as my own work, and consider it a correct translation. It is as follows:

An agreement to assist the woman Ah Ho, because coming from China to San Francisco she became indebted to her mistress for passage. Ah Ho herself asks Mr. Yee-Kwan to advance for her $630, for which Ah Ho distinctly agrees to give her body to Mr. Yee for service as a prostitute for a term of four years.

There shall be no interest on the money. Ah Ho shall receive no wages. At the expiration of four years Ah Ho shall be her own master. Mr. Yee-Kwan shall not hinder or trouble her. If Ah Ho runs away before her time is out her mistress shall find her and return her, and whatever expense is incurred in finding and returning her Ah Ho shall pay.

On this day of the agreement Ah Ho with her own hands has received from Mr. Yee-Kwan $630.

If Ah Ho shall be sick at any time for more than ten days she shall make up by an extra month of service for any ten days' sickness.

Now this agreement has proof. This paper received by Ah Ho is witness.

TUNG CHEE.

Twelfth year, ninth month, fourteenth day.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What year was that?—A. It was in 1873, about October.

Q. Where was that contract executed; here?—A. Yes, sir; it is supposed to be.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say it was executed here?—A. Supposed to be. I do not know about that, only I suppose it to be.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have you any knowledge of the persons mentioned there?—A. One of these cases, I think, was arrested, and I tried them, but I do not remember them. I would not know them now. One of them, I think, was sent to the mission-house, but I do not remember which one. This other contract is very similar. Shall I read it?

The CHAIRMAN. Read it.

The witness read as follows:

An agreement to assist a young girl named Loi Yau. Because she became indebted to her mistress for passage, food, &c., and has nothing to pay, she makes her body over to the woman Sep Sam, to serve as a prostitute to make out the sum of $503. The money shall draw no interest, and Loi Yau shall receive no wages. Loi Yau shall serve four and a half years. On this day of agreement Loi Yau receives the sum of $503 in her own hands. When the time is out Loi Yau may be her own master, and no man shall trouble her. If she runs away before the time is out and any expense is incurred in catching, then Loi Yau must pay that expense. If she is sick fifteen days or more, she shall make up one month for every fifteen days. If Sep Sam should go back to China, then Loi Yau shall serve another party till her time is out. If in such service she should be sick one hundred days or more, and cannot be cured, she may return to Sep Sam's place. For a proof of this agreement this paper.

LOI YAU.

Dated second day sixth month of the present year.

Q. (By the chairman,) [pointing to a figure on one of the original contracts.] This appears to be a picture. Is it any part of the document?—A. It is mere fancy note-paper.

Q. It is no part of the contract?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Do these papers bear the signatures of the parties?—A. The signature of the one party. The signature is placed here. [Pointing.]

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. It is the signature of the woman?—A. Yes. They write the name and she puts the mark.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. That is the mark? [Pointing.]—A. In this case this is supposed to be the mark, a blot. Sometimes they do not use the agreement. The girl has a copy of this paper, and is supposed to keep it. She sometimes loses it and has no redress.

ALFRED CLARKE recalled.

By Mr. KING:

Question. Suppose a Chinawoman escaped after being bound by one of these contracts, what does the owner do?—Answer. The owner usually tries to find her.

Q. Suppose she finds her in the hands of some other Chinaman?—A. He would be invited to give her up.

Q. I will read the testimony which you gave before the legislative committee the last time. Do you recollect testifying in answer to the question, "Suppose a Chinawoman escapes, what do the owners do?"—Is this your answer?

Follow her, and take her back. If they fail, they generally have her arrested for larceny, and get possession in that way. They use the processes of our courts to keep these women in a state of slavery. They do not let them get out of their clutches, however, if they can help

it, for they know that there is no legal way of reclaiming them. When they become sick and helpless, there are instances where they have been turned out to die. The bones of women are not returned to China as are the bones of the men. The six companies do not control this woman business; it is under the management of an independent company, called the Hip-ye-tung. Whether they import the women or not, I don't know, but they look after affairs here. A Chinaman married a woman at Gibson's, and after the marriage received notice that he must pay for the woman or be dealt with according to the Chinese custom. He was made to believe that he would suffer personally if he did not comply with their demands. Acting upon information we arrested a number of them, and got some of their books, which we had translated. On the rolls I think there were 170 women. Seven or eight Chinamen were arrested, but all the witnesses we could get for the prosecution did not exceed three or four, and no conviction was had. I think at about that time this ordinance which was read in my testimony before, was passed.

Was that your answer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that true then and is it true now?—A. Yes, sir. They do not quite as often get women arrested in our courts. They cannot get them arrested, because a sheriff would not now give them a warrant, but some time ago they obtained some arrests and used the process of court.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Would not give a warrant?—A. Would not give a Chinaman a warrant for a woman for stealing unless he brought corroborative proof, unless there had been a theft committed.

By Mr. KING:

Q. This question was also asked you on the legislative examination:

Assuming the population of the Chinese in this city to be twenty-five thousand or thirty thousand, what proportion belongs to the criminal class?

You answer——

Senator SARGENT. Let him give the answer now.

The WITNESS. I think the answer is about ten per cent. I think that is the answer there, and I guess that is about true, but we have made out some figures in the police office just now, in the last week, which are in the hands of the chief of the police, and those are fresher evidence and perhaps more acceptable. I said it was about ten per cent. I think that is about right.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is it not customary for the landladies or keepers of these white houses of prostitution to go or send East occasionally for new women?—A. Yes, sir; that is done.

Q. And it is frequently the case that they furnish the money; as a general thing they furnish the means for their transportation?—A. That is done too.

Q. And there is generally an agreement, as you understand, is there not, as to how that money shall be repaid?—A. It is generally understood; yes, sir.

Q. And in your experience, in connection with this subject, do you not know that the clothing of many of these women kept in white houses of prostitution is owned by the mistress of the house?—A. That is often so.

Q. And in case of these prostitutes running away from their employers they are arrested on the ground of stealing the clothing they have with them, which belongs to the mistress. Do such cases happen?—A. There have been a very few instances of that kind; but then the laws are so much better understood among the white people than they are among the Chinese, that that sort of thing cannot be carried on.

Q. Then the system of importing Chinese prostitutes here does not

differ very materially from that of importing white prostitutes?—A. The main difference, I think, is this, that among the Chinese it is recognized as being an established custom which ought to be obeyed and ought to be respected, for as soon as any woman gets discontented among our own people she finds out that there is a law which gives her liberty.

Q. But in effect the mode of importing the two classes here and supporting them is about the same?—A. The result is quite different, because these Chinese women have generally submitted passively and helplessly to this imposition, degradation, and slavery, to be sold and bought, and transported at the will of their masters, but the white women who are living a degraded life are not quite so easily handled, because they know the law does not so oblige them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Mr. King called your attention to your former statements. I want to ask you, in this matter, do you speak from personal knowledge or merely from rumor and report?—A. Some of it is personal knowledge and other is matter of rumor. For instance, in relation to those bills of sale, I did not see the purchase-money paid on those bills of sale; I did not see the signing of the contract; but I got those bills of sale from women we had in our hands.

Q. Have you ever seen any other bills of sale than those presented?—A. O, yes. In relation to the bills of sale, if the commission desire to verify that, the highest proof I can refer to is not my testimony, but the records of our own court, in which it is stated that a certain person was charged with a certain act, that is to say, selling a woman, and that she was tried and found guilty by the court and sentenced to six months in the county jail for that act.

Q. Have you any personal knowledge of a case where a woman escaped and was captured and taken back?—A. I have had these women tell me so. I have been informed of that by the women and by others connected with them.

Q. You said when they made escapes they were sometimes arrested for larceny and taken back through the operation of our laws. How do you get at the fact that the charge of larceny is a pretense to recover the possession of anybody?—A. In this way: a Chinaman would come and say a certain woman stole a certain amount, perhaps two or three hundred dollars. He would get out a warrant and go as an officer and point her out, and when the woman was pointed out he would get other persons to come and file a bail-bond for her. When the bail-bond was filed, those who gave the bail-bond would accompany her as her friends, go away with her, and afterwards the Chinaman would come to court and perhaps represent that the charge was unfounded; that the property had been restored, and in that way try to make it appear that the charge was unworthy of further notice, and get the case dismissed.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. And the Chinawoman would be left in his possession?—A. Yes; they used frequently to get warrants from Sacramento and come down here. It is not tolerated by the officers, and therefore it is not continued in practice, but such a practice has occurred. As the senator has asked the question, I will give an instance that occurred. There was a Chinese wash-house up on Sutter street, I believe, but if not there, it is in that locality. (I am not testifying from accurate knowledge, for I was not there.) At 7 or 8 o'clock in the evening a carriage drove up there, and there were one or two white men in it. They went in a wash-house there, opposite, and took a Chinese woman out and took her away.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were they white men?—A. White men.

Q. How long is it since that occurred?—A. Two years ago, perhaps three. One of them showed a badge of office, I think, something resembling a star. The police authorities thought that was something that demanded a very vigorous investigation, and they were at it for two or three weeks, and they finally got hold of some negotiations which were going on for the return of the woman in consideration of the payment of a certain sum of money or her purchase-money. The officers tried to get a hold of her. To make the story short, after perhaps three weeks' search they found the woman concealed very close where this building now is, in a Chinese wash-house. They arrested the man who had the woman there, but the case did not come into court, because we found that the principals in the affair had met and arranged the thing to their own satisfaction. I suppose they paid the principals. As I understood the case, the main facts were these: That this woman had been married in violation of her contract, or, if not married, that she was in this house consorting with the washerman there in violation of her contract, and that they had a right to the assistance of the Chinese who were interested in like matters to have this contract supported, vindicated, and sustained. The woman was captured in pursuance of that obligation, and she was kept until the contract-principals met, and an agreement made that there should be no prosecution in the case, or if there was, that there should be no evidence given. If that agreement was made it was faithfully carried out, because with all that the officers could do they could not have had any evidence in court to prove these facts, that is to say, to prove that the woman had been unlawfully kidknaped from the place on Sutter street.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. These white men apparently were employed by the Chinese to do this work?—A. Yes, sir. Then there was another young man arrested a year or a year and a half ago for participating in a similar affair. I think in that case he was unsuccessful, but, if I remember aright, he was fined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In these facts you speak, of do you get them from the statement of the parties, or as developed in the proceedings of the court?—A. I have a very strong belief that this case of kidnaping a woman in Sutter street, which I have spoken about, was brought into court; but if it was not, it was investigated thoroughly by the police.

Q. I am asking your sources of information. How do you get this story—from report or rumor, or from hearing the trial in court? Do you get it from any official source?—A. From report.

Q. It is the story that was told about it?—A. Yes, sir; at the police office.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Tell the commission what you know about other secret occasions. Take any case, and state how you get the knowledge of it.—A. I have had information from several people from time to time—Mr. Gibson, for one—of those who brought Chinese women here, paying something in the shape of head-money, possibly $5 a head. I think that was the amount Mr. Gibson told me. I guess he got it from information. But to get right at the point, Mr. Gibson made a complaint at the police office that a certain Chinaman whom he had married to a China-

woman had been invited to appear before the Hip-ye-tung, and there to give an account for the purchase-money, or otherwise conform to the customs of his countrymen. Mr. Gibson thought that an important case, and we took means to try to bring it to light. Officers were sent to make inquiries. They did so, and I think watched the place. The result of it, at any rate, was that eight Chinamen were arrested in the rooms where this tribunal held their sessions, and they were tried in the police court upon a charge, I think, of conspiracy. But the statement which Lup Sam Yung (I think that was his name) gave was to the effect that having married this woman he was called before the Hip-ye-tung and told he would have to pay the price for her.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean by the Hip-ye-tung?—A. That is the name which this tribunal I am speaking of had. This case was tried in the police court. This Chinaman testified that he was threatened before that tribunal, and that weapons were drawn, and he was told, in substance, that if he did not pay for the woman he would be killed, or words to that effect; but the result of the trial was that the parties were acquitted or discharged, because the evidence was insufficient to obtain a conviction.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were you present at the trial?—A. I was present at the trial.

Q. Where was this tribunal held? Where did it sit?—A. On Jackson street, between Dupont and Stockton, if I remember rightly. We brought down the safe, and after some difficulty got the thing open, and found some books; and among the books was one which contained a list of women, I think about 150 women, and some accounts. I cannot now state from memory; but it was understood at the time that those papers related to the transactions of this society or company called the Hip-ye-tung.

Q. How many persons did this tribunal consist of? What was its character?—A. I understood that there were thirty or forty, or more, and I think that was the statement of the witness, but we did not succeed in getting more than about eight of them. The others we did not try to get afterward, because we had no proof sufficient to go on against them.

Q. Were there any convictions growing out of these prosecutions?—A. No, sir; on account of insufficiency of proof.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. On what proof did you have to rely—Chinese or white?—A. Chinese, certainly. The man who was threatened was the strongest witness. I think there were other witnesses called in corroboration. I think three or four of the Chinese who were charged swore positively that no threats had been made, that the meeting was a friendly conference.

By the CHAIRMAN.

Q. In regard to this tribunal, what is the evidence as to its character, its jurisdiction; did it assume to use personal violence over those under its jurisdiction?—A. That was the way this was understood by us at the time. Of course there were persons who thought there was not anything in it, but I thought there was something in it; Mr. Gibson thought there was something in it. My observation leads me to think that there has been a union of effort among those who are interested

in sustaining Chinese prostitution, because there is a good deal of money involved in the matter. If there are a thousand prostitutes here, and all worth $500 apiece, there is a good deal of money at stake; and if all run away, it would leave their masters poorer than if they can keep them together and successfully sell them, or keep earning money with them.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Does not your knowledge lead you to believe that this organization goes outside of prostitution? If Chinamen have a difficulty, is it not settled in this tribunal or a similar one.—A. I think that is true, but I have no positive proof of the fact that they have such societies.

Q. I do not ask for proof, but your opinion.—A. They have societies for regulating matters among themselves. I know that the washermen have got a society, or at least I am strongly convinced of it.

Q. If two Chinamen have a difficulty, do you not believe that that is tried in this tribunal that you have spoken of, and settled there, either by fine or imprisonment, or both, and that such a tribunal has been existing in this city for the last ten years?—A. I think they try to settle the affairs among themselves; but this Hip-ye-tungi we were speaking of, I think, was limited to affairs connected with prostitution.

Q. Do you think there is another tribunal to try cases where Chinamen get into difficulty or have disputes about money-matters, such as have existed in this city for the last ten years?—A. The clearest statement I can make about that is that the police have been occasionally called to suppress riots and disorders which have occurred at assemblies of Chinamen.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Secret assemblages?—A. I suppose they were. Of course, we could never find out what it was about; but sometimes there would be half a dozen Chinamen badly hurt, and a number would be arrested.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Have you not learned this from the Chinese themselves? Have they not made complaint? Have not some of these six companies informed you that there was such a tribunal, at which they settle their own affairs, outside of our courts?—A. I have heard some of them state to that effect, that they had met among themselves and arranged the matter.

Q. Have they not informed you that they have a regular tribunal, similar to our courts, to try cases, and either determine them by fine, or by punishment, or both?—A. I am not so clear about that.

By Mr. KING:

Q. I wish to ask you whether or not you know of your own knowledge of notices being posted in any part of the Chinese quarter of this city offering rewards for the assassination of persons?—A. That I have heard of and read of, but I do not know it of my own knowledge.

Q. In what language?—A. I have heard and read of notices being posted in the Chinese language offering rewards for assassination.

Q. Do you know of any person who ever saw those notices? In other words, who reported it to you?—A. I could not tell you now.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. I should like to have you state to the committee what you know from your own knowledge, or from hearsay from the Chinese, about the regulations of the Chinese laundries in this city. What are their regula-

tions?—A. I have seen a little shanty built, and on inquiring why it was built I have been told by the persons building it that it was building on behalf of the Chinese in order to carry out one of their customs, which was that a certain number of houses or dwellings should intervene between two Chinese wash-houses. The shanty would be put up for a day to stand until it was counted by the Chinese inspectors, and then taken down the next day, and then put up the next year at the same time and place. But the Chinese washermen have had a board of management. I am told they used to assemble near the corner of Sacramento and Stockton streets. I have never been there, though, to know. It would not be allowable, under the customs of the Chinese, for a Chinese washerman to start a laundry unless he had the permission and consent of this board.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you understand that to be in the nature of a trades-union regulation?—A. Something like that.

Q. Among themselves?—A. Among themselves.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Have not the news-boys of this city got the same regulation?—A. I do not know that they have.

Q. Have they not divided the city up into districts?—A. I do not know how that is.

Q. Have not the shoe-blacks got the same arrangement?—A. I do not know that they have, or that they have not.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Do you know the amount they pay to this union, or whatever they call it?—A. The Chinese laundrymen?

Q. Yes. What is their license per year, as you know from twenty years in office?—A. I think I have heard the sum of two dollars and five dollars spoken of, but whether as quarterly stipend or yearly I do not know.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I want to call the attention of the witness again to this subject about a secret tribunal to regulate the business of Chinamen. Have you any knowledge as to the existence of such a tribunal, outside of the mere talk you have heard? Have you seen any evidence of its existence?—A. I have never been in one, and never had any clearer knowledge than about the Hip-ye-tung, which I have described to you. The parties were arrested. The matter was testified to in court; I heard the testimony. The persons were acquitted. That is all I know.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the machinery by which they would enforce their decrees and judgments by physical force, by imprisonment, &c.? That is the point.—A. There is a case in court now where it is charged that a Chinaman was imprisoned by his fellow countrymen for not settling a claim, and there are persons under arrest for that. A great many Chinamen have been taken off here and killed, and it has not been easy for the officers to find it out.

Q. Do you know anything yourself going to that point?—A. I do not.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You spoke of the attempt to suppress prostitution in this city. Have any attempts been made to suppress white prostitution?—A. O, yes; there are arrests of white women every day.

Q. Has it been suppressed?—A. It has not.

Q. What is the number of white prostitutes in this city?—A. I can only give an opinion.

Q. Qive us your opinion, you having been twenty years in office?—A. I think a thousand, perhaps more.

Q. Are there not five thousand?—A. No; I think not.

Q. How many Chinese contracts of the character produced here have you ever seen?—A. I think I have seen three or four besides these.

Q. In the course of twenty years?—A. Perhaps more.

Q. How many?—A. I will not say that I have seen more than three or four.

Q. Speaking of this Hip-ye-tung company, do you understand that they had a roll there of the Chinese prostitutes?—A. They had a paper there, which I saw, that contained Chinese characters. I think Mr. Gibson or Mr. Loomis translated it. I can only believe that their translation was correct. It showed the names of one hundred and fifty women.

Q. I understand you to intimate that they were one hundred and fifty Chinese prostitutes?—A. That is what I supposed they were. I do not know that the paper said they were prostitutes; perhaps it did not.

Q. And you supposed that this Hip-ye-tung company has the control or management of that business? Do I understand you correctly?—A. I thought so then.

Q. If they had but one hundred and fifty names, what becomes of all the other Chinese prostitutes? Are they outside of their jurisdiction?—A. I will tell you how I thought that was. At the time these arrests were made, the Chinamen, I believe, went and got the most important things out of the safe, and when we got there very little was left.

Q. Do you know anything about that?—A. I do not; but still I believe it.

Q. You say this list contained that number?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many Chinese prostitutes do you really think there are in this city?—A. One time we got them down as low as forty out of jail, I believe. I do not think there are over eight hundred or a thousand in the city now.

Q. That includes all the women, does it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Are not quite a number of those living in a state of matrimony, that is, one man with one woman, as his wife?—A. There are officers who are on those beats every night, and they can give you clearer and better evidence than I can on that point.

Q. In regard to these tribunals which you have been asked about, is there not a board of arbitration in these six companies, as in every other organization like that?—A. I so understand it.

Q. Have you ever had any information that looked to you at all definite that there were any other tribunals in those associations than those of arbitrations among the members?—A. It is a thing I never looked fully into. It does not particularly interest us. It is not particularly in our scope?

Q. You never saw anything that would be sufficient evidence for you to believe the fact that there was such a thing, did you?—A. No; nothing more than the general fact that when Chinese cases come into court they are very frequently settled among themselves.

Q. Is there not in every benevolent society in this city a board of arbitration to settle disputes between the members?—A. I do not suppose there is.

Q. These settlements that you speak of were offenses or troubles between two Chinamen, were they not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has there not been in nearly every trade in this city a trades' union?—A. I am not certain about it, but I presume that is so.

Q. You understand, as a matter of history, that every trade has its trades' union?—A. I think such is the case.

Q. And they have their rules and execute fines upon their members, try them for offenses against their rules, fine them, expel them, dictate how many apprentices they shall have, dictate the employment that they shall take? Is not that so?—A. I have read of such things.

Q. And these other tribunals among the Chinese you have only heard of by rumor?—A. All the knowledge I have is rumor, of course. I have not been present at any Chinese meetings of that kind.

Q. Do you think it would be any advantage to this community, if these Chinamen are to stay here, that there should be no Chinese prostitutes?—A. There are a number of these women who are visited by Chinamen almost exclusively, who do not see white men.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the question?

Mr. BROOKS. I ask the witness, as an experienced police officer, two hundred thousand Chinese being here, if it would be any advantage that there should be no Chinese women?

The WITNESS. That would be a question better put to a medical man, or one who had studied human organism and its needs. I have had more to do with police matters than with these things. My opinion would not be of any use on this subject.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. For what class of offenses are the Chinese generally arrested and brought in?—A. The most numerous, probably, is gambling, prostitution, and the violation of the pure-air law.

Q. In reference to the cubic-air ordinance, what are the penalties imposed upon them?—A. Ten dollars, generally.

Q. Ten dollars fine?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Or imprisonment?—A. Or imprisonment for five days.

Q. And, if he is taken into prison, his hair cut?—A. His hair is cut in the county jail, if he goes there.

Q. Do you know how many queues are cut off under that ordinance?—A. I have nothing to do with that. The hair-cutting is done at the county jail.

Q. Do our city officers aid these women in their endeavors to escape from these bonds?—A. Generally; yes, sir, I think they do; they certainly do.

Q. What is the result generally; are they returned to their bondswomen, or are they kept here and taken to the mission-schools?—A. The fact is we do not get hold of a great many cases now. It has got to be pretty generally understood among the Chinese, and since it has been understood we do not hear of many cases.

Q. It is diminishing?—A. I do not think it is diminishing; it has almost as much strength now as it ever had. In fact, I do not know of any diminution of it at all, but it is difficult to get at these cases.

Q. Does the procurement of prostitution exist among the whites?—A. Of course it does; and I spoke of white women.

Q. Was not a white man sent to State's prison for two years, a few days ago, for procuring white girls for prostitution?—A. Yes, sir. There was a white woman convicted in a house of ill-fame, but the reason she was prosecuted was that she had hired a girl in New York and pretended to bring her to a good place, and brought her to a house of prostitution. Some gentleman on the train telegraphed to us about

it, and an officer was sent up and intercepted her, and the girl was shown to be true, and the woman was severely punished for that offense.

Q. Are the penalties generally inflicted more severe upon the Chinese than other classes?—A. I do not think they are. I do not think any magistrate here would think it consistent with his oath of office to punish a man more because he was a Chinaman.

Q. Do you know of any white man arrested for infringing upon the cubic-air ordinance?—A. I do not know that there have been, and I do not know that there have been many offenses committed by white people. I think it would be hard for you to find any place where white people live that they have not got more than a cube of eight feet to each occupant.

Q. When these parties cannot pay the ten dollars fine for the infringement of the cubic-air ordinance, what is done with them?—A. They are sent to the county jail.

Q. What is the measurement of the cells in the county jail?—A. I have not been there for two years.

Q. Are they not arrested in large numbers, thirty and forty at a time?—A. Yes, anywhere from thirty to forty of a night; but if the officers bring in that number, they are brought to the city-hall and put in the city prison.

Q. How large are the cells there?—A. Those cells are, I think, about from nine to eleven feet wide, and about sixteen feet deep. That is my impression.

Q. What is the height?—A. About ten feet.

Q. How many would they put in a cell?—A. I do not think they would have to put in as many as a hundred. They will have to lock up the prisoners; but this law you are talking about especially exempts prisons, jails, and asylums from its provisions. Therefore, the officer who puts twenty-odd into a cell which is not of capacity to hold more than eight, is not committing any offense by doing so, because the law excuses it.

Q. Does it not save cost to our courts and save taxation for these people to arbitrate their own difficulties?—A. I think it would.

Q. Largely so?—A. I think that would be the effect of it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do the Chinese sue each other in your courts here in civil matters?—A. Sometimes.

Q. Is it not a frequent occurrence?—A. Occasionally.

Q. Only occasionally, do you mean?—A. I am not much in civil courts, and I can merely state from general information. I frequently read in newspapers of suits brought in the district courts by the Chinese against each other.

Q. Is it your understanding that they generally settle among themselves their civil disputes?—A. I think most of their disputes are settled among themselves.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you not know, of your own knowledge, from connection with the police court, that all these trades which the Chinese engage in, washermen, cigar-makers, &c., all have their trades' unions, in which they meet and arbitrate their difficulties?—A. I understand that to be the case.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I wish to understand whether any members of the Chinese six companies have ever said to you, to your recollection, that there was a tribunal among the Chinese which settled matters, criminal or civil?—

A. No, not in such words as that; but a man would say that the thing had been arranged or settled among themselves—fixed up.

Q. Does that relate to criminal as well as civil matters, in your observation?—A. In my observation it relates to criminal matters to some extent—to a considerable extent.

Q. Do you know of any benevolent secret society, Masons, Odd-Fellows, Sons of Temperance, among white people, where they compromise the crimes committed among themselves or assume the jurisdiction of crimes committed by their members?—A. No, I do not.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. In your observation of these people does contact with our civilization improve or deteriorate them?—A. I should think it improves them.

Q. What effect have they upon our civilization; any?—A. I should think the converse of the proposition would be to draw us down a little bit.

Q. Do you think they have that effect?—A. I do not know.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 24, 1876.

HENRY H. ELLIS sworn and examined.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Question. How long have you been connected with the police department?—Answer. Twenty years.

Q. You have been a detective on the force for how long during that time?—A. Upward of fifteen years.

Q. What position do you now hold?—A. Chief of police.

Q. Will you go on and state the number of Chinese you think there are in the city?—A. From the best information I can get, I should judge about thirty thousand. Perhaps there may be a few more.

Q. Will the number vary in the different seasons of the year?—A. Very much.

Q. What is the season when there would likely be the most?—A. The winter time; the rainy season.

Q. What would be the largest number, do you think, during the winter months, inhabiting the city?—A. I should think there might be 60,000 here at one time during the rainy season.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the number in the State?—A. I have a general idea, but no positive knowledge. I suppose it varies. The accounts give to us somewhere from 120,000 to 150,000.

Q. Go on and state their general habits here and their crimes. I believe you have a statement made out?—A. I have a list here compiled from the books, a statement of the arrests, both white and Chinese. One is for the year ending June, 1876, and the other is for three months subsequent to that time.

Q. Read that, please.—A. For the year ending June, 1876, the white arrests made here were 17,991; Chinese, 2,117; total, 20,108. July, August, and September of the present year the total arrests of whites was 5,047; total arrests of Chinese, 878; the total being 5,925.

The paper submitted and read by the witness is as follows:

Number of arrests, by months, from 1st July, 1875, to 30th June, 1876, and from 1st July, 1876, to 30th September, 1876.

Months.	White.	Chinese.	Total.
1875.			
July	1,3 5	67	1,412
August	1,274	62	1,336
September	1,174	65	1,239
October	1,378	83	1,461
November	1,444	60	1,504
December	1,949	107	2,056
1876.			
January	1,518	86	1,604
February	1,478	130	1,608
March	1,495	283	1,778
April	1,628	395	2,023
May	1,544	460	2,004
June	1,764	319	2,083
Total	17,991	2,117	20,108
1876.			
July	1,535	262	1,797
August	1,770	297	2,067
September	1,742	319	2,061
Total	5,047	878	5,925

The Chinese population of the city and county of San Francisco is reported by Langley as 30,000; 2,117 criminals, being equal to 7.05⅔, for the year ending June 30, 1876.

Chinese per cent. of the whole number of arrests, say 20,108, for the year ending June 30, 1876, the number of arrests being 2,117, equals $10\frac{2}{3}\frac{6}{0}\frac{5}{2}\frac{4}{4}$, or 10½ per cent. Chinese per cent. of the number arrested, say 878, for the three months ending September 30, 1876, 2.92⅔ per cent. of the Chinese population of 30,000.

Chinese felons sent to State prison during the year ending February 17, 1876, say 68, equal to $13\frac{1}{6}\frac{1}{3}$ or 13⅔ per cent. of 504, the whole number of convicts sent during that time.

We did not have the record down any later than last February.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were these convictions for felonies?—A. Yes, sir; that is, for the State at large; this latter statement does not apply to the city alone.

The white population, according to Langley, is reported to be 240,000; 17,991 criminals, being equal to $7.49\frac{5}{8}$ per cent. for the year ending June 30, 1876.

White criminals for the three months ending September 30, 1876, is 5,047, being $2.10\frac{7}{24}$ per cent. of the whole white population of 240,000.

Here is a summary of the whole thing:

2,117 Chinese arrested, 1875 and 1876, being 7.056 per cent. of their population.

2,117 Chinese arrested, 1875 and 1876, being 10.5 per cent. of the whole number of arrests.

878 Chinese arrested, for three months, ending September 30, 1876, being 2.923 per cent. of their population.

68 Chinese convicts sent to State prison during the year ending February 17, 1876, being 13.63 per cent. of the whole number sent for the year.

17,991 whites arrested, 1875 and 1876, being 7.496 per cent. of their whole population.

5,047 whites arrested for three months ending September 30, 1876, being 2.103 of their population.

30,000 Chinese population, being 12.5 per cent. of the whole population of the city.

It appears from this statement that, during the latter three months, the Chinese criminals exceed, according to their population, the whites by a little; and, taking the last year, ending June, 1876, it is about equal.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. State if there is any difficulty or embarrassment about the arrest and conviction, and the obtaining of proof which will lead to conviction of Chinese criminals as compared with other criminals?—A. There are some exceptions; sometimes we get a little assistance; but, as a rule, it is more difficult to arrest Chinese than whites. The reason of that is because we can get no information from them unless some of them are directly interested themselves; and when the cases are brought into court it is much more difficult to get evidence, if it is of a Chinese character, and then it is very unreliable.

Q. Does this statement embrace the crimes of Chinese against Chinese, or more especially of Chinese against whites?—A. It embraces both classes. There is a great number of complaints made by white people against Chinamen, against Chinese servants, for example. Every day there are complaints of Chinese servants robbing houses where they are employed.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you ever noticed cases where, for the preliminary proceedings, as, for instance, the arrest and perhaps the indictment, Chinese testimony was accessible, which would fail on the trial?—A. Yes, sir; numerous cases of that kind. It is a very difficult thing, indeed, where Chinese and Chinese testimony are concerned, to obtain a conviction.

Q. What do you say with reference to the reliability of Chinese testimony?—A. I say it is very unreliable.

Q. Do you refer to that generally?—A. Yes, sir; of course, as I stated at first, there are some notable exceptions.

Q. Do you know anything, of your own knowledge, or information from the Chinese six companies, whether there is any court among the Chinese to settle criminal or civil matters?—A. I do not know that of my own knowledge. I only know it from rumor and hearsay.

Q. From hearsay, coming from the Chinese, do you know of their settlement of criminal cases which have been commenced in courts?—A. I know of one case which came under my observation, where an attempt was made to settle a criminal case in which I was concerned myself. The criminal was eventually found in an inner room adjoining the room where a large congregation of Chinamen were gathered. The man who took me there informed me that I would first have to wait and see what disposition was made by those people.

Q. Was he a Chinaman?—A. He was a Chinaman. The criminal was afterwards produced from an inner room.

Q. Did you know anything about the proceedings among the Chinese at the time that you refer to?—A. No, sir; I knew there was great excitement among them; but, of course, I did not know what was said. It was in Chinese.

Q. Do you know, of your own knowledge, or information coming from Chinamen, of Chinamen being convicted of offenses, and judgment being carried out among themselves?—A. I have heard of such things, but have no knowledge of my own.

Q. You have heard of it from among the Chinese themselves?—A. I cannot say that I have been told by Chinamen anything of that kind.

Q. From whom did you hear it; from the police, or whom?—A. It has been understood by the police generally that such was the fact.

Q. Do you know anything, of your own knowledge, of notices being posted offering rewards for the killing of Chinese?—A. Such notices have been posted.

Q. How do you know that? Have you ever seen the notices themselves?—A. I have seen a notice on one or two occasions purporting to be a notice of that kind. It was in the Chinese language.

Q. Did you have them interpreted?—A. They were interpreted verbally.

Q. Have you ever preserved any copies of them?—A. I do not think any copies have been preserved. There may be.

Q. Mr. Cooper asked the previous witness what influence the presence of Chinese has upon our civilization, upon the morals of the white race. What do you say about that?—A. I think it is injurious, beyond question.

Q. In what respect?—A. I think a large number of men, and boys even, visit the Chinese quarter and have to do with Chinese women; and it necessarily has a bad effect upon them.

Q. Do you mean that it makes prostitution more common by their being here, or that it is more flagrant and open, or what?—A. It is more common, and it is more accessible to boys and youths.

Q. Are there any modes of solicitation employed by Chinese not employed by whites? What is the mode? Describe it.—A. They generally stand at their windows, little wickets in their rooms, and solicit people by calling to them and asking them to come in. As a rule they use English enough to make known their desires and wants.

Q. Do you know whether these women prostitutes generally are held as slaves or not?—A. It is universally believed that that is the fact.

Q. Believed by whom?—A. By the police and the people who know most about them.

Q. You have had occasion, I suppose, to be brought in contact with the Chinese of all classes a good deal in your profession as policeman, detective, and chief?—A. A good deal more formerly than of late years.

Q. Do you know how prevalent Christianity is among them? How many of them are Christians, if any?—A. I do not know; but I have my own opinion about that.

Q. Is it the result of your observation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you in your own mind a Chinaman who professed Christianity and observed it in conduct and morals?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you say about that?—A. I say I have no faith whatever in their conversion to Christianity.

Q. What causes you to form that opinion?—A. I have seen some of them who professed Christianity come down and take a hand and an interest in cases in court totally at variance with their professions; that and the general knowledge I get outside which goes to make up one's belief.

Q. What is the condition of the Chinese quarter, generally?—A. Very filthy, as a rule.

Q. What is the nature of the filth? Do you mean merely old rags and slop-holes, such as you find around houses, or do you mean excrement and vile refuse of animal matter?—A. Yes, sir; even in that particular. Indeed, without the police here they would be buried in their own filth in many quarters.

Q. How do they dispose of their offal?—A. They are compelled by the police to clean up once or twice a week; and they go around in carts and haul it off, in the same manner as the dust-men haul off dust of nights.

Q. The sanitary regulations of most cities provide those things.—A. I say in the same manner that is common and done voluntarily by all

white people. But in the case I speak of, it is done by compulsion. The police compel them to do these things.

Q. What is the nature of the filth they leave around their houses and alleys? Is it merely the refuse of food?—A. Refuse of all kinds, thrown out indiscriminately everywhere; and, as you said just now, even worse than that in places. They have little places in some portions of Chinatown where they have vaults that are overflowing with filth. That has been the case in times past. Probably it is in better condition now than it ever has been before.

Q. For what reason?—A. Because we have detailed two or three officers to go up there and pay special attention to Chinatown and try and straighten it out, and get it into a condition of cleanliness fit to be seen; and, on account of the epidemic, sanitary measures and others, special pains have been taken to clean it up. It is a fact, however, if you will allow me to make the remark, that wherever the Chinese colony get into a building, there seems to be a blight fall upon it, and it looks, a few months after they attack it, so to speak, as though it were a hundred years old.

Q. How is that effect produced?—A. I do not know.

Q. What is the effect on the walls of houses?—A. Blackened up, and filthy and dirty. There is something surprising about it, but it is a fact, nevertheless, that as soon as the Chinamen take possession of a building it seems to go to rack and ruin, and become filthy, dirty, and discolored.

Q. What is the condition of their stairways?—A. Very filthy, indeed.

Q. Do they, of their own accord, wash up the stairs, like American housewives?—A. As a rule, they do not.

Q. Is Chinadom extending over new area?—A. Slowly it is. It has extended within the last few years to some extent.

Q. How many blocks do they now occupy?—A. Some ten or a dozen blocks have been given up to the Chinese generally. I do not mean entirely, but it is understood that they will finally come under their control.

Q. How is that with reference to the heart of the city? Is it in the outskirts?—A. It is not the central part exactly, but it is the heart of the old portion of the city, the northern part of the town here.

Q. Is there a handsome quarter of the city beyond them, out toward North Beach?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do persons living in that portion of the city get down to Kearny street and Montgomery street, where the ladies do their shopping and the merchants their business?—A. We had one avenue to get up and down there. I live over there, myself, and can speak of it as I find it. We had Washington street up to, say, about two years ago. The Chinamen began to get in on Washington street, and wherever they get in they maintain a foot-hold and crowd everybody else out. They did this on Washington street. Now it is quite a task to go up and down Washington street alone, at some hours of the night; and, to a lady, it is very disagreeable.

Q. You say they crowd others out. Is it because of repellent characteristics on their part, or because they pay higher rents, or why?—A. Probably from both causes. They pay higher rents, and whites do not like to live alongside of Chinamen.

Q. What is the effect upon a man who has a flourishing retail business if the Chinamen get on one side of him, or both?—A. No matter what any man's business may be, it is obnoxious to him, as far as my observation goes.

Q. What is the effect upon his custom?—A. It would interrupt his business, certainly injure it to a certain extent.

Q. I understand you to say that causes him to move away somewhere else.—A. Yes, sir; that is one of the causes.

Q. You say the Chinese quarter is extending continually?—A. Yes, sir; principally westward at the present time.

Q. Toward California or Stockton street?—A. Toward Stockton street, and southward as well.

Q. Allowing the same process to go on that you have observed here during the last half-dozen or dozen years, the Chinese gradually extending, what would become of the business part of the city?—A. I do not think they would ever get down into Montgomery street or into California street, the lower parts of the city.

Q. What is to keep them away? What is to prevent them from taking Montgomery Block, for instance, provided it is profitable to the landlord?—A. I believe they will be on Montgomery Block. I supposed you alluded to Montgomery street.

Q. Suppose Montgomery Block becomes a hive, like the old Saint Francis Hotel, or like the church, how would that affect the business people near Montgomery Block, the white people?—A. I should say disastrously.

Q. Then would it cause them to move away?—A. I should say it would.

Q. Who would fill up their places?—A. The Chinamen.

Q. Then the Chinamen would extend along Montgomery street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And get toward California street?—A. That would be the natural tendency.

Q. Are there not Chinamen on California street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is to prevent their extending both ways?—A. They do not interrupt the trade there on account of the business carried on there.

Q. It has not reached its worst features on California street. Let me give you this instance: Take this building, the Palace Hotel, an enormous great building, which, it is stated, does not pay interest on the mortgages on it, &c. Suppose this building were divided up to be a hive of Chinese, would it not become profitable?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any law that would prevent the owner of this building from devoting it to a profitable purpose, where otherwise it is unprofitable?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you see anything to prevent the Chinese from taking possession of this building?—A. Not if the owners were willing.

Q. I ask your observation of persons renting property, if the owners will rent to Chinamen rather than leave their houses empty or unprofitable?—A. They seem to have done so in that quarter. I suppose public opinion would have some influence over the owners of property in some localities.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do the people in other parts of the city object to the Chinese living among them?—A. In other parts of the city they do not settle, except that they establish wash-houses.

Q. I asked if the people object to the Chinese living in other parts of the city? Is the public opinion against it in neighborhoods?—A. Yes, sir; decidedly.

Q. Has that the effect to drive the Chinese together in one locality?—A. It may have a tendency that way. I could not say positively. I have heard that influences operate to bring them together.

Q. If the presence of Chinese has this effect upon property and makes it disagreeable to live near them, there would be objections made to renting them property in any other part of the city?—A. I should say so.

Q. Is the effect of that to crowd the Chinese together in small localities?—A. As I answered, it would probably have a tendency that way.

Q. Is the Chinese quarter more densely populated, taking the whole place, than any other part of the city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it much more densely populated?—A. I should say it was, much more.

Q. Taking the per cent. of arrests, giving the whole number of arrests here at 20,108 for the year ending the 1st of June, of that number the Chinese were 2,117. What proportion does that bear to the whole Chinese population as compared with the white population?—A. The percentage is about equal.

Q. At what do you estimate the entire population of the city?—A. 270,000. My calculation is based upon that estimate.

Q. What do you estimate the entire Chinese population at?—A. 30,000. They are included in the 270,000.

Q. Taking them out there would be 240,000?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do 2,117 Chinese bear the same proportion to 20,108 whites as 30,000 bears to 240,000?—A. I think you will find that calculation correct.

Q. You made the calculation?—A. I did not make it. It was made in the office. You will find that it is correct.

Q. Then, so far as the proportion of arrests is concerned, leaving out the difficulty of proof after arrest, the proportion of arrests is about the same as that of the white population?—A. Yes, sir; but you must recollect that a great many escape. Chinese arrested may escape who are not marked; that is, they escape through this difficulty of obtaining testimony, and the unreliability.

Q. I am not speaking of the difficulty of proof after arrest, but I am speaking of the mere matter of arrest. I find the proportion about the same?—A. For that year, but for the last year the number of Chinese is a trifle in excess.

Q. The white population embraces women and children, of course?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You speak of the filth and unsafeness of the Chinese quarter. Would you regard that as somewhat inevitable in a very crowded population, whether white or colored?—A. No, sir; I do not think it necessarily follows that they must live filthily because they are crowded, probably a little more so; and the air would not be as pure in a crowded locality necessarily. They are filthy as a people; there is no question about it.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. The men about the streets and servants in employ look clean, do they not?—A. I say the Chinese boys, as a rule, who have been any length of time in white families, acquire very neat habits, so far as cleanliness goes, and they do look neat and clean as a rule; but once congregated together in their own localities the reverse of that is the fact.

Q. Are they in the habit of bathing frequently, do you understand?—A. I do not know how that is.

Q. Did you hear what their habits were in the course of the construction of the Pacific Railroad; that the company had to bring water some distance at considerable expense and furnish them a necessary supply

for bathing purposes, water used in washing their persons?—A. I was not aware of it.

Q. You speak of a bond being given in certain cases of arrest. Who do you require for surety on such a bond; a freeholder?—A. He may be a freeholder and he may not.

Q. A white person or a Chinaman?—A. Chinamen go bail.

Q. For each other?—A. Yes, sir. It requires two persons to go on a bond.

Q. You take their bonds?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. Do you ever recover on a bond?—A. I do not know of any recovery. I do not recollect of a case where there was even an attempt to recover.

Q. How large bonds do you require in ordinary cases; for instance, in an arrest for prostitution?—A. A bond of a hundred dollars usually, I believe, is the figure.

Q. What is the fine in case of prostitution?—A. It ranges from twenty-five to fifty dollars. It depends upon the offense, and how many times, and the surroundings.

Q. Is there any punishment of imprisonment?—A. Yes, sir. Almost all these women convicted of prostitution are sent to the county jail and serve their term out.

Q. Do you frequently arrest Chinese women?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember how many cases last year?—A. No; I can give you the figures.

Q. A large number?—A. I do not think the number has been very large. Probably there have been more Chinese prostitutes than whites arrested during the past year.

Q. What is the proof; keeping a disorderly house?—A. No, sir; we have an ordinance forbidding them to solicit prostitution. That is another offense. We usually fine them $10 for that. If they stand trial and it is proved, they go to jail for it, and they spend five days in jail for it, but we find it difficult to prove a case of prostitution among them.

Q. You find it difficult in the case of whites, do you not?—A. Yes, sir; the same trouble.

Q. Do you arrest many whites?—A. We arrest them occasionally.

Q. With us it is difficult to prove prostitution. We have to prove being under the disorderly-house act?—A. We cannot convict a Chinaman on any less evidence than we can convict a white person. One act does not make prostitution in the eye of the law.

Question. Is there any unfriendly or friendly action on the part of the police to confine these people within certain limits?—A. There is some effort made in that direction, to confine them and keep them off the main thoroughfares.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You have given the number of arrests in propertion to the population. Your number of whites includes the entire white population of the city, does it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It includes the infants, the women, the member of Congress, the clergymen, &c., does it not?—A. It is the adult population, I suppose, 270,000.

Q. If you take the same class of people of the whites that the Chinese are, will not the proportion of arrests be vastly in favor of the Chinese; that is to say, less in proportion of those classes?—A. I do not think I comprehend the question exactly.

Q. You give the number of arrests as the proportion of 30,000 Chinese. If you take that portion of the white population simply who are liable to arrest, the adults, and in the same class of life that these Chinese are, would not the proportion of arrests of the whites be much greater?—A. I should say no, I think not. I have an idea that a great deal more crime is committed among Chinamen than among the whites, according to the number, but the trouble is we do not get them all.

Q. If I understand your figures, you say there are 30,000 Chinese and two thousand arrests, and 120,000 white people and so many arrests. Certainly that sum of arrests would be a much larger proportion of half that number of whites than it is to the whole, would it not?—A. There are 240,000 whites.

Q. Any sum is a larger proportion of the half than it is of the whole?—A. You are asking me to give my opinion about it there. The figures speak for themselves. You have the entire number there, and the entire arrests.

Q. That is true, but if you should take out the persons who are not ordinarily subject to arrest, who do not generally come under your jurisdiction, would it not reduce the proportion of arrests at least one-half?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you state the proportion of the whole number of arrests that are convicted?—A. I can find the number of convictions for you.

Q. I desire to have the proportion of convictions to the whole number of arrests of whites and the proportion of convictions to the number of arrests of Chinamen.—A. If you will put it in writing for me I will try to get it for you.

Q. Is it not the fact that the testimony frequently fails to convict on the trial of white persons indicted?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not an every-day matter that perjury is committed in the police court by white people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On an average every day?—A. I think so. That is my belief.

Q. Is there one person convicted in a whole year of perjury?—A. One year with another, no, sir.

Q. Not on a average one person in a year?—A. No, sir.

Q. But on an average the crime is committed every day by white people.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is to say, in the police court?—A. Yes, sir,

Q. And the same in all the courts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has not the case occurred in the police court that twenty witnesses have come up to swear to an *alibi* that neither court nor officers believed in the case of a white person?—A. That happens very often among the Chinese, but not among the whites.

Q. Has not the same thing occurred among the whites?—A. I do not remember such a number among the whites?

Q. You have the Barbary Coast here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that place replete with crime?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it inhabited by Chinese?—A. There are some Chinese scattered through there.

Q. What is the indigenous population of that quarter?—A. I do not know. I cannot tell you.

Q. Do you not know what class they are?—Are they not generally people of foreign origin?—A. They are of all nations and all characters.

Q. An exceedingly bad lot, are they not?—A. In some localities, and some pretty good; part of Dupont and part of Kearney, including the Barbary Coast, is quite a respectable locality now.

Q. Those are points which project into the bay. Is there not another district called Tar Flat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By whom is that made notorious?—A. By what we term hoodlums.

Q. In this number of Chinese arrests, what proportion of those arrests are for violating the ordinances of the city, like the cubic-air ordinance, the basket ordinance, the laundry ordinance, ordinances aimed especially at the Chinese?—A. For the last three months we have been been quite active about that on account of the epidemic raging here; but heretofore it has not been so largely in excess of other arrests. I think I can get you the figures if you desire them.

Q. That has formed a considerable portion of those arrests at all times?—A. I think so, for the last three months.

Q. Before that the ordinances discriminated against the Chinese in many arrests of that character; the laundry ordinance and other ordinances, where a higher license was charged to Chinese than to other people?—A. The Chinese laundrymen pay no license.

Q. I know it, because the court decided it was not valid before that time. Your time extends back of that?—A. There was a test case made.

Q. Before that were there not many arrests of Chinamen made?—A. I think there were a few, but not very many.

Q. Is not the testimony of Chinese merchants usually reliable?—A. Among the better classes, yes, sir.

Q. Do you not consider them men of probity, and honor, and truthfulness?—A. In their private transactions and dealings, yes, sir.

Q. You say there was one case in which you were concerned where an attempt was made to settle the difficulty when you went to arrest a man?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you say you were concerned, you mean as a police-officer?—Yes, sir.

Q. What character of case was that?—A. Assault for murder; he was supposed to be murdered.

Q. They delivered the man over to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever know them to attempt to settle among themselves by arbitration any serious crimes?—A. Of my own personal knowledge this is the only case I know of.

Q. Is it not usual among benevolent associations of white people to settle among themselves small difficulties that might be made the subject of police investigation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not your understanding that the Chinese courts of arbitration confine themselves to the same matters; that they settle matters of a trivial character?—A. I do not know; the police have always understood that they had these tribunals, so-called, organized to try, arbitrate, and punish. I have no positive knowledge upon the subject.

Q. Have you any credible evidence of the punishment of a criminal character inflicted by any Chinese tribunal?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the case that Mr. Clarke has spoken of there was no legal evidence to convict, I understand?—A. What case is that?

Q. The Hip-ye-tung society. The evidence was insufficient to convict.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did not the entire charge in that case rest upon the testimony of one or two Chinamen?—A. I believe it did.

Q. Of the very lowest class?—A. I cannot say as to that. My impression is that one of the Chinamen was considered to be a respectable man among the Chinese.

Q. What was his business; of what class of life was he?—A. I could not tell you. I have only an impression about it now.

Q. He was not a Chinese merchant, was he?—A. My idea about it is that he was. I may be mistaken.

Q. Would you have considered that testimony reliable if charging crime against a white person?—A. White persons are arrested at their instance very frequently.

Q. I ask if you would have considered that evidence reliable upon which the charge rested against this society?—A. I thought so at the time. I had no doubt about its truth.

Q. Did you think it was countervailed by greater proof on the other side?—A. That is the usual result.

Q. The judge so decided, did he not?—A. He did; yes, sir.

Q. You say that you have heard of rewards being offered for assassination. Have you heard of assassinations of white people here who were witnesses in criminal cases by white men?—A. Assassination of Chinamen?

Q. No, white men by white men?—A. O, yes; we have had plenty of them.

Q. It is not confined to Chinese, then?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the twenty years you have been connected with the police, how many instances could you mention of persons whom you thought had sufficient evidence to satisfy you of Chinese who had been put out of the way by Chinese by that mode?—A. It would be more guess-work than anything else, but I should think a dozen cases.

Q. How many Chinamen in that time have been assassinated by whites?—A. I do not recollect of more than three or four cases of that kind.

Q. Have there not hundreds of them been assassinated in the mines?—A. O, I have read so, and I believe so. I thought you were speaking of the city here.

Q. No; in the city I think that thing would not be permitted. You say you have seen two notices posted?—A. I recollect two cases.

Q. That is all you remember in the course of the time you have been engaged here?—A. That is all I have been certain of; that is, of recent occurrence. I believe the thing has been common here, so common that not much notice has been taken of it.

Q. What class of people in the city give the police most trouble?—A. We have had more trouble with hoodlums of late than with any other class.

Q. What is the number of these hoodlums?—A. I cannot tell you. There are several thousand of them—supposed to be. I could not tell exactly the number.

Q. Is it not this class of boys exclusively who visit Chinese prostitutes?—A. No, sir; not entirely so.

Q. Have you ever known of any instance of other boys visiting them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are the principal customers, are they not, of the white class, the good ones?—A. I cannot say as to that. I have not been personally in Chinatown or about Chinatown for some years, and I cannot tell you from my personal knowledge.

Q. How large is the district that contains the Chinese prostitutes?—A. There are some six or eight blocks.

Q. Are there prostitutes in as many blocks as that?—A. I think so.

Q. They are confined to those blocks?—A. As a rule; the majority of them.

Q. Would it not be quite possible to exclude all white boys from those six blocks?—A. No, sir; we could not do it as we are situated, with our police strength, &c.

Q. You number 150, do you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the whole police force of the city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many police officers of the regular police force are detailed to this quarter for these 30,000 Chinese?—A. We have seven or eight officers engaged in that locality.

Q. Those have charge of these 30,000 Chinese?—A. We have a lot of special police for the Chinese.

Q. These are all the regular officers for that people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And sometimes you say the number of Chinese rises as high as 60,000 in the wet season?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you increase your number of regular police officers there at that time?—A. No, sir.

Q. How many police officers does that give you there on duty at a time?—A. Five or six regulars, and there is always a lot of special police.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the Chinese population being increased here during the rainy season perhaps as high as 60,000. Is that when they cannot work in the country, and come into town?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long does that last?—A. At the close of the harvest-season they begin to come into the city in large numbers; and they go out again from time to time as the work opens up for them.

Q. There is this increased Chinese population how many months of the year?—A. It might be two or three months.

Q. The 30,000 Chinese population you speak of are the resident population; they are permanent?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. This increased Chinese population during the rainy season you do not take into consideration in estimating the percentage of arrests. Your percentage of arrests, the proportion, was based upon the 30,000 resident population?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the increased proportion of 25,000 or 30,000 during the rainy season you did not take into consideration?—A. No, sir. The calculation for the last three months, though, would leave out the influx during the rainy season.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Could you compute the number of the white population corresponding to the class of the Chinese population?—A. I do not understand the question.

Q. Could you deduct the children of tender age, the old, and the higher classes, and the women, so as to compare them class with class?—A. No, sir; I do not think I could.

Q. There are no statistics by which that could be done?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Taking into consideration the children of tender age, not ordinarily subject to arrest, and respectable women who do not come in the criminal class, do they, added together, constitute one-half of the white population?—A. I can only give an opinion about it. I should say not.

Q. Do they constitute one-third?—A. I should think they might constitute about one-third. Our community here is unlike your eastern communities, so far as women are concerned. We have so many in proportion to the male population.

Q. You have a smaller population?—A. Much smaller.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You might compare them to the voting population. The voting class includes all the white males above twenty-one. Do you know what number that is?—A. It is somewhere supposed to be about 30,000 this year.

Q. About equal to the number of the Chinese population?—A. Yes; that is a larger number, however, than has ever been registered.

Q. Your arrests are chiefly, almost entirely, among that class of people in the whites, are they not?—A. Above the age of twenty-one.

Q. They are males, occasionally females, but mostly males and grown-up men?—A. No; there is a large number of our arrests made among the youth, the boys.

Q. What proportion of your arrests are made among that class?—A. I cannot tell you just now.

Q. Can you tell us how many white prostitutes there are in this city?—A. I should think there are about 1,500. I judge so, as near as we can get at it.

Q. How many Chinese prostitutes?—A. About a thousand.

Q. How many of other nationalties, of other colors?—They do not figure to any extent; not to count much.

Q. Are they virtuous?—No.

Q. Is there not a very low class of white and black prostitutes down the water front of town; the houses that are frequented by sailors?—A. They are mostly kept by white women, and frequented by white women.

Q. What is the character of the population on Jackson street, and Pacific street, and Broadway, that is not Chinese?—A. It is made up of all classes, kinds, and conditions of people; some people are very good and some very bad. They are of all colors and complexions.

Q. Has not the center of trade and residence in this city moved toward the south?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How far is the present center of Chinese population from the new city-hall?—A. Half a mile or upward.

Q. Has the Chinese population, and the region inhabited by them, extended as rapidly and as widely as the portion inhabited by the white population?—A. No, sir.

Q. During the time that this Chinese population has extended a few blocks, did not the white population extend for miles?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had not this part of the town, where the Chinese now inhabit, fallen into a sort of deserted condition before the Chinese went there; a second or third class place?—A. No, sir. It is a very lively locality there; but it is inhabited mostly by a criminal element.

Q. Was it before they went there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The respectable residents and the business had moved away from there?—A. As a rule.

Q. Does not the greater part of that quarter of the town consist of buildings built there at an early day?—A. I think the larger portion consists of buildings of later years, of brick.

Q. Is that true of Sacramento street?—A. North Jackson, Dupont, and Stockton.

Q. There are many wooden buildings which have stood there since 1850.—A. Not many.

Q. They have been pulled down and replaced by brick?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have there been many buildings destroyed by fire in that quarter?—A. No, sir; they have been remarkably exempt, considering the careless inhabitants.

Q. Is not that due to the fact that there are so many people there the fire could not get under headway?—A. Possibly that may explain it.

Q. You say you do not know of their using water for washing their persons?—A. You asked me about the gang upon the Southern Pacific Railroad. I do not know anything about that.

Q. I speak of their habits.—A. I have so understood, outside, among farmers and such like people; but here I do not know anything about it. I never heard such a thing.

Q. Have you ever observed that this Chinese quarter was encircled by a belt of unoccupied buildings?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever notice any unoccupied buildings adjoining them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that customary?—A. Take Washington street for example. When the Chinese began to creep up and down the street, both ways from Dupont, the whites would move out, and the places would be empty; and, if rented, they would be rented for a certain length of time.

Q. Do you find many such instances in this city now?—A. That was the fact until they got almost the entire control of that street.

Q. Do you not find Chinese occupying houses in nearly every part of the city?—A. They have wash-houses, I think, nearly all over this city.

Q. Do they not have cigar-houses and other institutions in the business part of the town?—A. In the business part of the town; yes, sir.

Q. Are not white persons occupying the same building?—A. In many instances.

Q. Are there not frequent instances where part of a store is occupied by whites, and it is partitioned off, and the rest is occupied by Chinamen?—A. I know some instances of that kind.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about wash-houses and cigar establishments scattered through the city. Do the Chinese, who carry them on, eat and sleep there?—A. Yes, sir; they have their women there.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You, of course, have looked into these Chinese wash-houses as you passed along; are they not generally very neat, and the persons in them very clean?—A. They are, as a rule. There is a striking contrast between the wash-house Chinamen and the people who congregate in the Chinese quarter.

Q. Take the class of Chinamen employed as servants in this town; are they not more clean, their clothes in better order, their persons more clean, than any other class of servants?—A. I could not say that they were in better order or more cleanly than white servants, but there is an improvement in them when they become servants. I have noticed that.

Q. You said, in answer to the chairman, that you did not seem to be aware of any reason that these men should herd together. Are Chinamen safe throughout this city?—A. They have been very badly abused here.

Q. How are they generally treated by the hoodlums?—A. They are treated most outrageously—stoned, beaten, and abused in the most shameful manner.

Q. If a Chinaman is found alone in a part of the city where the police are not in call, and where there are a number of hoodlums together, what is the result?—A. If he escapes with his life, or without being badly treated or maimed, or something of that kind, he is very fortunate.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. What do you mean by hoodlums?—A. We have a class of young men growing up here in the city who are what you call in the eastern country "roughs." We call them hoodlums. That is as near as I can get to it.

Q. Vagabonds?—A. Yes, sir; a large majority of them become thieves and criminals eventually.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What pursuits do the hoodlums follow besides the pursuit of Chinese?—A. They have no pursuit. They live in blocks.

Q. Do they not commit every crime known to the calendar?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have not several murders been committed by them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have any of them been punished for those murders?—A. Several of them.

Q. Have any of them been hung?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was not a Chinaman walking along Clay street met by a white man and stabbed to the heart?—A. There was a Chinaman killed up there and two hoodlums arrested. One was sent to State's prison for a term of years for it, and the other was sent to the asylum.

Q. And he escaped immediately afterward, did he not, and went unpunished?—A. He did.

Q. Does not the Chinese quarter pay a higher rent than any similar quarter in the city?—A. So I have been informed.

Q. Does it not pay a higher rent than the houses in the neighborhood?—A. I am told so. I believe that is the fact.

Q. Does it not pay a higher rent since it has been occupied by the Chinese than before it was occupied by them?—A. The Chinese pay a higher rent, as a rule; so I am informed.

Q. In the earlier times the portion of the town toward the north beach was a fashionable quarter for residents, was it not?—A. It was a very favorite place for residents at one time.

Q. And the plaza in front of the city hall was the original center of the Spanish town?—A. Yes, sir; the center of the entire town at one time.

Q. Since that time the business center has changed south and the fashionable quarter has changed to the west, gone back on the hills?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Chief Ellis, are you a housekeeper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have a family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You keep a house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you to tell the commission what you pay a year for water for family uses.—A. I think I pay four dollars and a half a month.

Q. That would be over $50 a year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you a large family, and how is it governed?—A. I have a wife and six children.

Q. Can you state to the commission about the rate of water used every month for families?—A. Two dollars and a half is the lowest rate, and it runs up to a hundred, according to the quantity used.

Q. It would cost you more here for water than for flour?—A. I think so.

Q. It costs fifty dollars a year for water, and that would supply you with twelve barrels of flour?—A. I do not know what flour is.

Q. Is it not almost an utter impossibility for these Chinese to purchase a sufficient amount of water for their ablutions? Would it not take more than their fortune to supply these Chinese with water at the same rate that you and I pay?—A. I cannot answer that question.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you know what it costs a hundred gallons under the meter?—A. I do not.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. It is a heavy tax upon every citizen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Whether he is a hoodlum, Chinaman, or what?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know any very respectable Chinese families here?—A. I know some.

Q. Merchants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We had our census taken a year or two years ago. Do you recollect that our congressional delegation was increased by the Chinese being counted?—A. I know it was so stated.

Q. Do you remember that we had an additional Representative in Congress in consequence of these Chinese?—A. I heard so.

Q. Have you not heard of the destruction of property belonging to firms by the incendiary after sending threatening letters to them?—A. Yes, sir; I know it to be so.

Q. Have you not received and had communications sent you of threatening letters to persons who employ Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have there not large fires occurred here that were generally believed to be caused by those incendiaries because employers employed Chinamen?—A. I suggest that Marshal Duffield can give the facts and figures about that.

Q. Was not that the case with this large fire below here?—A. Yes, sir; it was so understood.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is not the occasion of having hoodlums here in your opinion on account of the presence of the Chinese?—A. I think the influx of Chinese is decidedly detrimental to the white population growing up here.

Q. These are bad boys and they stone other people besides Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir; in fact they are idle and cannot be anything else but bad.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do I understand you to say that the presence of the Chinese makes them bad boys?—A. No, sir; I do not mean to be understood to say that. But I believe this to be the fact, that on account of the numerous Chinese in the State here it is unfortunate for the youth growing up in this city. I believe it is making these hoodlums, as we call them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Taking away from them employment?—A. Yes, sir; they become bad simply because they cannot get work. I know as a fact that they cannot get work.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you think there is a surplus of work here?—A. For boys to learn trades, I know that there is not. I have been trying to get a place at a mechanical trade for a boy of mine and cannot.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you not know that all these labor associations, these labor leagues, have articles in their government to prevent boys becoming apprentices?—A. Yes, sir; I so understand it.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. That has been in operation for twenty years?—A. For ten years at least.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you understand that these limitations upon the number of apprentices who may be taken to learn trades exists in all the leading trades here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Bricklaying?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Plasterers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Carpenters?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Printers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Foundries?—A. Yes, sir. I may be wrong in some of these trades, but I believe it prevails among all the trades.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. They are voluntary associations?—A. They are in the nature of unions.

Q. They are voluntary among themselves?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are not recognized by law?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. And they are not confined to San Francisco?—A. O, no.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are not these hoodlums generally educated; that is, they have received an education at the public schools?—A. Some of them have a fair education. A majority read and write.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the name of this tribunal?—A. Hip-ye tung.

Mr. PIXLEY. Mr. Gibson, what is the meaning of Hip-ye-tung?

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. Temple of united justice. Hip is strength, ye is righteousness, and tung is a temple.

By Mr. KING:

Q. You do not mean to state as a fact, that the trades unions, or any of them, have rules prohibiting the employment of young boys as apprentices?—A. Yes, sir; that is the way that I understand it.

Q. You do not mean to state it as a fact of your own knowledge?—A. I will not swear positively that it is so; but I believe it to be so. I think they allow so many apprentices to the number of men they employ.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. That regulation does not exist because of the presence of Chinamen, does it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is it independent of their existence here, or otherwise?—A. I do not think the Chinese have anything to do with it at all.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Do not these hoodlums out in the outskirts, scoundrels and rogues together, number about 350?—A. More than that.

Q. Between four and five hundred?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not a fact that these hoodlums stone other people, as well as Chinese, go in for a French baker, or German baker, or anything they come across?—A. Yes, sir; and commit all crimes, from petit larceny to murder.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You mention having received some assistance in the administration of your office from the Chinese?—A. From the more respectable members of the Chinese companies, societies, and merchants. We have had their assistance from time to time in apprehending criminals, and sometimes in giving evidence, and sometimes in the recovery of property. For instance, lately there was a police-officer shot in Chinatown, and I sent for some of the heads of the Chinese companies, three or four of them; they came down. I told them they must get the man. They said they would, and they did. They brought him down and delivered him up. That is the most notable case I recollect of lately.

Q. When these difficulties occur in Chinatown are you in the habit of sending for these men?—A. It has not been common to do so. In this case we did it, and in cases of importance we do it.

Q. When you call on them are they reluctant?—A. No; they always promise fair, and occasionally we succeed. I have not any reason to disbelieve in their good faith.

Q. It is simply a question of ability to perform?—A. Yes, sir. But here was an instance that I spoke of that happened only a short time ago, where they did give up the man.

Mr. BROOKS. We should like to have Mr. Ellis detail the riot in Dupont street. I think it would throw a great deal of light on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly; I have no objection.

The WITNESS. All I can tell about that is that there were two factions of Chinamen engaged in some shoe-factory. They got into a quarrel there, and used bars of iron and hatchets, and had a very fierce and sanguinary fight for a time. What the merits of it were I do not know. I do not know anything about that.

Q. (By Mr. Brooks.) A gang which had been employed by the manufacturer had been discharged and another gang taken on?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And then this first gang went up there to collect their wages, and insisted on a return of their deposits, and the proprietor declined to give them, and they attempted assault, and were assisted by hatchets and bars of iron.—A. That was so understood.

Q. They are generally pretty sanguinary in their fights?—A. Yes, sir; they are desperate fighters.

EZEKIEL B. VREELAND sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. State to the commission, if you please, how long you have resided in San Francisco.—Answer. I have resided in San Francisco for over twenty-seven years.

Q. What position have you held with reference to immigration?—A. I was deputy commissioner of immigration from 1873 to 1876. I went out of office, I think, in January last.

Q. What are the papers you have before you?—A. An exhibit from the captain of the vessel and a sworn statement of the passengers arriving by the ship Alaska. [See Appendix B and exhibits.] It arrived here on the 15th of February, 1875. It contains the names of all the passengers coming on that ship, their place of birth, age, occupation, sex, and the last place of residence.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is it just for one voyage?—A. Just one voyage.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is the exhibit you make from that an average of the general arrivals?—A. This is the manner and the mode of the report to the commissioner of immigration. It states all the facts connected with the passengers on that trip. Every ship that comes here makes a report of the passengers, just in this way. Accompanying that statement is another one signed by the United States consul at Hong-Kong, stating that they are free and voluntary immigrants, under the seal of the consul.

Q. Who is the consul who signs that?—A. Mr. Bailey. Then, also, in connection with that, is a certificate from the emigration office that they are properly provisioned and have a certain number of feet allowed for each passenger. [Exhibiting.] This is from the English emigration office at Hong-Kong.

Q. How many names does this list contain?—A. It contains, I believe, according to the report of the captain, 801.

Q. Are there any women among them?—A. I believe not; none were brought on that ship.

Q. Did you examine this to know what proportion of these are from the vicinity of Hong-Kong?—A. They all mostly come from Hong-Kong or the lower portion of China. All passengers coming to California, as far as my knowledge is concerned, come from Hong-Kong. They all come from Hong-Kong. They come from different portions of China and take ship at Hong-Kong. They take passage at Hong-Kong for this place.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You understand that they all embark at Hong-Kong?—A. All at Hong-Kong. I know of no others from any other part of China.

By Mr. PIXLEY;

Q. What are their average ages, as indicated by this exhibit of the general arrivals?—A. Their ages run all the way as low as eight, and even smaller than that, up to forty-five and fifty years of age; but their average, I presume, will be from twenty to twenty-five, along there. There are more young people than any other class.

Q. How are their occupations designated?—A. They are mostly classed as laborers. They are so classed on these exhibits.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Here is one, a "student."—A. Why they are classed as students I do not know. They are classed as laborers, the same as all women who come here are classed as seamstresses. I do not know what the students are. There is sometimes an invoice, if I may so state it, of Chinamen who come from there, and they are under the patronage of the Government, and they come direct here under the charge of some head Chinaman.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Those are students?—A. Those are students. They go east to some college in Massachusetts, I believe, but I know of no students to stay here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Under what designation or occupation do the women, as a rule, pass the consul at Hong-Kong?—A. As seamstresses.

Q. Do you know whether as a fact any pursue the occupation of seamstresses after their arrival?—A. I never heard of any.

Q. What occupation do they follow, as a rule?—A. Well, they are not all prostitutes, in my opinion. I think a large proportion of them are. There is one company here that are importing Chinese women. That is what they call Hip-ye-tung. There were six companies importing Chinamen, but this company, the Hip-ye-tung, imported China women.

Q. How are you advised of that fact?—A. In accordance with my duties I made a personal examination of them, through an interpreter, of their mode of life in China, occupation, and what they intend to do after their arrival here.

Q. Then you state to the committee that there is a company called the Hip-ye-tung, whose business is this kind of importation?—A. In the early part of my career in office this was their occupation. I do not think it is now, from the fact that this class of Chinese women have been stopped from coming here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say they have been stopped?—A. I think they have been stopped. I have not heard of any coming here lately, not at any rate since the United States Supreme Court has decided the case, and even before that.

Q. How long has it been since the last arrival of women?—A. I do not know. I think none have arrived here for nearly a year; at any rate, not less than a year, as far as my knowledge is concerned. What has arrived since I left the office I do not know.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. State to the commission any facts you know in reference to Chinese immigration, and the effect of their residence here. You have seen the drift of this examination.—A. The Chinamen in China come here through the agency of these six companies. They are representatives of those companies in China, and, as a general rule, I should say 80 per cent. of them are brought out under the auspices of these companies.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Eighty per cent. of all the immigrants?—A. I should think so. The remaining 20 per cent. are brought out through the agency of their particular friends or come personally. Those who come out under the auspices of the companies are generally attached to the companies on their arrival here, and, of course, they remain under their jurisdiction until the amount is liquidated which has been advanced to them. I made an examination of these men on board the vessel. For instance, they had 800 passengers on board. I would take a percentage of them, say 50 or 100 on the hurricane-deck, and, through the interpreter of the ship, I would ask them the question who furnished the money, how they got out, and all that class of information, and, generally, they made replies in that way. After they get here they are in most cases assisted into employment through the agencies of those companies, and sent off into the country, with somebody to look after them. I think the companies are very good institutions so far as Chinamen are concerned.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. They act in the nature of guardians?—A. Guardians and protectors of their interests generally.

Q. They procure employment for them?—A. Yes, sir. After they

have paid up their dues, then I do not think the companies pay much attention to them, although, notwithstanding that, they are attached to those companies.

Q. Do the companies collect the wages?—A. I think they do through a party who is sent into the country with them. For instance, a gang of one hundred or two hundred go up the country on a railroad, a party speaks English and collects the money and represents the society. I think it is done in that way so far as my observation is concerned.

Q. Are there complaints made in regard to the conduct of these companies, as to robbing them, or do they treat them fairly?—A. I never heard of any complaints of that kind.

Q. What is the character of the engagement under which the companies bring them? What are their contracts?—A. I never saw their contracts, but I am told verbally it is nothing more nor less than a matter of honesty between them, that is to say, if the Chinaman belongs to any particular company he will stay with that company until he has paid up his installments.

Q. The company advances the passage-money in China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And supplies them with provisions across?—A. The ship supplies the provisions.

Q. Their living on the ship is paid by the passage-money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is not merely a deck-passage?—A. Steerage-passage.

Q. Steerage-passengers across the Atlantic furnish their own provisions?—A. In the case of emigrants from China the ship furnishes the provision and cooks it for them. In sailing-vessels they furnish a Chinese cook for the purpose of cooking for the passengers.

Q. Is this contract simply to refund the money with a certain rate of interest, or that he shall serve a certain length of time?—A. No, sir; it is until the money is refunded. That is as far as I could get at it from the Chinamen themselves.

Q. Do these companies have contracts with the Pacific Mail or other steamship companies that they shall take none back without evidence that they have so paid their dues?—A. I have known that to be the case frequently. I have known of men kept from the gang because they owed money.

Q. Does that extend to dues to the companies for bringing them out or to other dues?—A. I do not know. My own impression is that it is debts due to the companies alone. The Pacific Mail, and in fact all those ships are under obligations to these six companies from the fact that they furnish the passengers.

Q. That contract, then, is in the nature of a security that the company takes for the payment of the money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That the man cannot get back until he pays them?—A. Yes, sir. The women are bought in China, I think, as near as I could come at the facts of the case, and brought over here and sold, at various prices, all the way from two hundred to a thousand dollars.

Q. Are they purchased by these companies in this case?—A. No, sir; the six companies have nothing to do with women. It is only the Hip-ye-tung company that I spoke of. The commissioner has stopped twenty-two of them and took the cases before one of the courts here, the district court, presided over by Judge Morrison, and he remanded them back to the ship to be sent back to China. The case was appealed to the supreme court of the State of California, and the supreme court of the State of California affirmed the decision of Judge Morrison. They

then got out a writ of *habeas corpus* and took it before the United States circuit court, presided over by Judge Field. Judge Field discharged twenty-one of them and kept one, so that an appeal could be taken to the United States Supreme Court, and the United States Supreme Court affirmed the decision of Judge Field, or rather sustained the decision of the United States circuit court in this city.

Q. That decision was to the effect that they were free persons and had a right to come and go as they pleased?—A. That no State had a right to prohibit the landing of passengers of any character whatever.

Q. Without any regard to their character?—A. Without any regard to their character.

Q. Did that decision go to the length of deciding that the State of California would have no power to prohibit a known criminal, or prostitute, or vagrant from landing?—A. It stated almost in so many words that the State had no such power; that that power was in the hands of Congress; that no State had a right to exclude any party from their shores. Consequently there was no further attempt to stop anybody.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. They do not go so far as that?—A. I think that is it.

Q. O, no.—A. The decision is here.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall have occasion to refer to that decision.

Mr. BROOKS. It is all matter of record.

(See Appendix C.)

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You are not occupying this position now?—A. No, sir.

Q. Still, you know in what direction the flow of Chinese immigration is at present; more coming or more returning?—A. They have their periods. For instance, at this season of the year a great many go back. There are more returning than coming this way. They go back, as I understand it, to celebrate their New Year.

Q. Is it not the fact that more are returning than coming?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not the fact that the six companies and leading mercantile firms sent dispatches stopping the immigration?—A. Yes, sir. The period of Chinese immigration, that is, when more are coming than at any other time, is May, June, July, and August. I have known as high as five thousand to come here in the month of June.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do these people go and come? Do they visit backward and forward?—A. Yes, sir, a great many of them do. Those who have staid here awhile and made some money go back and then return.

Q. So that all that come here are not new immigrants?—A. O, no; a great many of them come back.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the condition you usually found them in, for cleanliness, on the landing of the ship at the wharf?—A. The steamship companies exercise a great deal of care in taking charge of them; that is to say, enforce habits of cleanliness among them. They are driven on deck and their quarters are cleansed nearly every day. They do not want the ship to get the small-pox, as quarantines are a very expensive affair. On the arrival here the Chinaman generally puts his best clothes on and goes ashore in the best kind of style.

Q. Did you find much disease among them?—A. During the time that I was in office I knew of no case of small-pox among them on landing.

Q. No disease such as is usually the result of a long voyage?—A. No contagious disease. I will state that in China before they go aboard ship they are examined. They are stripped to the waist, and if a Chinaman is anywhere unhealthy, or liable to be an incumbrance upon the society, they will reject him. If he has an eye out or a lame arm, or if he is lame any way, they will reject him and not allow him to come. After he is passed by the American consul he is stamped with an India-ink mark and then goes to the office and gets his ticket.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How about the mark?—A. It is merely a mark by the consul.

Q. I will ask whether the six companies, in thus advancing money to bring the Chinamen here, do that generally after demand for employment here; as, if they receive an order for so many laborers, do they bring them here, or is it without having any previous arrangement made here for their labor?—A. If there is a large demand for labor here they will hold out inducements in China for them to come. The companies make money out of them, undoubtedly, or otherwise they would not encourage their coming here. And some of the agents on the wharf have complained to me that there are too many Chinese coming here; that they cannot get work for them, but that, notwithstanding, they come in large quantities. Too many Chinamen come, they say.

Q. They bring them without previous engagement often?—A. O, yes; they do not engage labor here and go to China. The labor is engaged after the Chinaman arrives here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. They do not import them here at the demands of any companies here?—A. No.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If the companies could not readily procure labor for them after they get here, they would not advance them the money in China?—A. No, sir.

Q. It would therefore make the influx dependent on the labor-demands here?—A. Yes, sir; that has a great deal to do with it. Notwithstanding, a Chinaman there will take his chances to come out here, because he has got an idea when a Chinaman comes back with some money that they can all do the same thing. It is their desire to get here to better their condition.

Q. But the companies make the advance to assist them on the probability of getting employment when they come?—A. Undoubtedly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In reference to the Pacific Mail and the Oriental and Occidental lines, in which a Chinaman cannot leave the country in debt, suppose a Chinaman owed you a hundred dollars, and you went to the party that represented him and said that this man was indebted to you $100, would they let him go on the ship until he paid it?—A. I do not think they would care anything about my hundred dollars. I think they would let him go. But, I think, if a Chinaman belonged to the same company and said the Chinaman who was going back was indebted to him a hundred dollars, it would be different.

Q. You do not know as a fact that they do include debts owed to

white people?—A. No, sir; but I know very well they would not let some Chinamen go on account of being in debt. The companies have that arrangement with all the passenger-ships.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Then that indebtedness must be to the company itself, or some member of it?—A. The company or some member of it.

Q. It is for the protection of the company or the members of the company?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose he was indebted to some other company?—A. I do not know how that would be.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do all act in concert?—A. All the six companies appear to act in unison.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. There is no conflict between them?—A. Not that I know of.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Are these people thrifty or unthrifty here?—A. Some of them get demoralized after they get here and become a portion of the criminal population. Some of them are as industrious and as honest as almost anybody. That is to say, they do not commit any crime. They are very particular in regard to that. But, then, there is a larger portion of them who cannot make money fast enough, and think that they can do better by stealing.

Q. Do you think contact with our people will make them worse?—A. I do not think it does make them any worse. A good many of them, I think, were rather low in morals before they left China.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Those facts are not exceptions among the Chinese? Other people who come here have low morals?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A great many of them?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know anything about the shipment of Chinese in Hong-Kong?—A. The information I have has been told me by officers and captains of vessels, and Chinamen themselves.

Q. Do you know the requirements of the British law there in regard to the shipment of Chinese?—A. The British are very stringent there.

Q. Do they allow any man to go from there that is not a free man?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do they allow any man to go from there who is helplessly diseased?—A. I do not think they do.

Q. Are not these six companies benevolent societies?—A. I should judge, according to my ideas of those things, they are to a great extent a benefit to Chinamen.

Q. Do they not take care of the sick?—A. That I do not know particularly about. I think if a man is in debt to the company, they would look out for him and try to get him well, in order to get their money back. If he was not in debt to the company, I do not think they would care much about him.

Q. Do you not know that the sick Chinamen are taken care of by the six companies?—A. Some of them.

Q. Do you hear of any of them not taken care of?—A. I have heard of some cases where they were thrown in the street and abandoned to die.

Q. I suppose you have heard of one or two cases. As a rule, are not the sick Chinamen taken care of by the six Chinese companies?—A. As a rule, probably they are.

Q. Are not the Chinese poor taken care of?—A. I am not familiar enough with their matters here to decide upon that question. A good many of them are in the pest-house and in hospitals.

Q. They are taken there by compulsion?—A. To the small-pox hospital, but not the county hospital.

Q. Are there any Chinese there?—A. I think there are. There have been some lepers here who were out at the almshouse or pest-house. They did not take care of them.

Q. Did you see any of them?—A. I did not.

Q. Did you ever pass any as commissioner?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Would you not know it if you had done so?—A. If they had been in an advanced stage, I might, but not otherwise. Leprosy is a disease which affects the body and not the face.

Q. Are you familiar with the disease?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you familiar with the Sandwich Islands?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know by report that it prevails there largely?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that it prevails in China?—A. I have heard that it prevails there, but to what extent I do not know.

Q. Is there any provision here to prevent its importation from the Sandwich Islands?—A. None that I know.

Q. In those islands there is a portion set apart expressly for them, where it is confined?—A. I am told that there is.

ANDREW J. BRYANT sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. Twenty-six years.

Q. What is your official position now?—A. I am mayor of the city.

Q. What is your estimate of the number of Chinese resident in the city of San Francisco, and does it vary from month to month during the year?—A. I thought during the fall and winter months last year there were from 60,000 to 70,000, and by going through the quarters it seemed to me there are not more than half now of what there was then.

Q. So that the number varies from 30,000 to 60,000?—A. I should say so.

Q. According to the season?—A. Yes, and business in the country. If railroads are building, some go to the country, and when railroads are not building they come back to the city.

Q. When what is called the excitement of last April occurred, was there abundant precaution taken by the municipal authorities to preserve quiet and order in the town?—A. There was.

Q. Did you have any interview with the Chinese companies or their delegates?—A. I had two or three times.

Q. What was the result of those interviews?—A. They conversed with me about their being protected. I told them they should be protected. There were 200 extra policemen put on the night of the mass meeting. They feared an outbreak. I told them the city authorities would do everything to keep order throughout the city at all times.

Q. And during that time state whether you did have any extra police officers.—A. I think there were 200 extra ones put on that day and night.

Q. Was the result of that to keep quiet, or otherwise?—A. It was in

case there should be an outbreak that it might be squelched. There were a good many people who thought that there would be trouble that night, and to take precaution I thought it better to have extra policemen.

Q. Was there any trouble that night?—A. Not at all. It was as quiet a night as we ever had in the city.

Q. Has there been any trouble since that time?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has there, since you have been a resident of San Francisco, to your knowledge, been anything like organized riot or attack against the Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. State, if you please, in reference to any knowledge you may have of secret Chinese tribunals.—A. In conversation with the Chinese six companies they told me that there was such a tribunal for a long time in the city.

Q. What was the jurisdiction of the tribunal?—A. They said it was to settle their own difficulties that occurred between Chinamen, either by fine or punishment among themselves, and they had been informed by the city officials in years past that it would be better for them to do it.

Q. Do you know whether that tribunal exists yet?—A. Not to my knowledge. I do not know that it does farther than what they stated, that it had existed. They also stated about the ordinance, about their regulations in regard to the laundries, that they only allowed so many on a block, and made each man get a license from one of their societies. I think the society is called the Laundry Society. Until he got that license he could not start a laundry.

Q. And when he obtained it he had to conduct the laundry according to their rules and regulations that they had established?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the leading feature of that organization?—A. They count the doors. For instance, I know one place where they paid a man $300 for the mere fact of cutting an extra door for two or three months into his building so that they could count one more door, and get another wash-house for a certain length of time.

Q. Mr. Mayor, as to the condition of what we call the Chinese quarter, or Chinatown, as to the habits of cleanliness, what is your observation in that respect?—A. It is very dirty, and has been so for years. I do not think it is so bad now. I think within the last few months it has been made cleaner than it has been for years. In fact I have instructed the police to keep it as clean as possible on account of the health of the city. Two or three years ago when I went through it, it was one of the worst-looking quarters I ever saw. It was late in the fall and it was densely crowded. There were a great many Chinamen then in the town.

Q. What observation have you to make, as the magistrate of the city, in reference to the difficulties of managing this population?—A. You can get no testimony from them. It is very hard to keep our fire ordinances or any of the city ordinances in force in their quarters. For instance, they will take a building, a room like this, and immediately go to work and erect two stories out of it by putting up studding. Of course in the case of fire the under floor will burn out and down will come the building and the firemen cannot go between. It is impossible to prevent that; they will build it up at night or on Sunday. It is impossible to keep those ordinances in force among them.

Q. What do you find to be the difficulty about enforcing the ordinance against gambling and prostitution?—A. It is all but impossible. The bars on their doors are such that no one can get into the gambling-houses. As to prostitution, I do not think it is as public now as it was

years ago. We have tried to keep it as quiet as we could, and to keep it out of sight as much as possible. Still I think it is carried on to a certain extent yet, in spite of the police, as also is gambling.

Q. You find it difficult to convict them?—A. We find it difficult to get testimony. White people will inform upon one another, and by that means you will find out where their places are, but these people do not seem to inform against one another. Their difficulties seem to be settled among themselves. I tried to get the six companies to take their sick. I told them I thought we would be able to furnish them ground to build a hospital upon if they would move them out and remove them from the heart of the city. I thought it better for the city to put up the building in the outskirts, and take them out there, but I could not get them to do it. I also endeavored to get them sent back for leprosy.

Q. State, if you please, if it was done, how many lepers were found existing in this city, what disposition was made of them, and how far you met the co-operation of the Chinese authorities in doing what you did?—A. We had no assistance from the Chinese at all. We found in the pest-house some eleven or twelve. There were one or two women that Dr. Meares, the health-officer, advised me to take to the pest-house. They were retained in the pest-house with those who were there, until about two months ago we got the mail company to take them back to China.

Q. Was that done with the consent of the Chinese authorities?—A. They had no knowledge of it until they were shipped.

Q. How many lepers were shipped?—A. Fourteen or fifteen; I am not positive about the number.

Q. Have there been any paupers or other classes sent that way?—A. We could not send them back.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you consider these people thrifty or thriftless?—A. I think the greater portion of them are working-people. A large class is gathered in this city who are gamblers, but, I think, as a general thing they are industrious working-people.

Q. From your observation, do you think they can be assimilated to our civilization at all?—A. No, sir; I think not.

Q. You think it would be impossible?—A. I think it would be impossible. I have never seen one Chinaman, in my judgment, assimilate in any way in our form of government and habits.

Q. They are totally distinct in their habits?—A. In every way.

Q. What is your opinion as to the surplus of labor on your coast?—A. I think we have a surplus of labor now.

Q. It exceeds the demand?—A. Yes, sir. We have a large quantity here in the city. I think the country is well supplied with labor.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. How do wages compare with former years?—A. Wages are about the same. Men get here $2 and $2.50 a day.

Q. Does not that indicate about the same relation between supply and demand?—A. Our labor is kept up. Laborers keep up the price at about that; farm-hands, at about $30 to $40 a month. That has been the run of prices for two or three years, and I do not know that we have any more surplus labor than we have had for the last two or three years. We also consider that we have more or less labor that can be used to go out into the country.

Q. Would you not be glad to have more?—A. I think if it was not

for the Chinamen we would have it. For instance, traveling around this year I noticed up at the sulphur-banks on Clear Lake they were doing large mining operations there, quite a profitable mine, and they were working nearly all Chinamen; and they told me they paid them a dollar a day and the Chinamen found themselves. Then, again, I visited at Mr. Hayward's works, in Nevada County, where he had a large number of men, either Germans or Italians; I think but two Chinamen.

Q. What kind of work was his?—A. His work was building a large dam there, and he had employed wholly that sort of labor. The foreman told me he had no trouble getting all the white labor he wanted.

Q. Will the whites work in these sulphur-mines?—A. Certainly. It is just as easy as any work. Of course they could not work for a dollar a day.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Take these sulphur-beds, which is a sulphur and quicksilver mine—how many Chinese do they work?—A. They were working over a large area. It is a sort of mining. They were cutting down this quicksilver and sulphur, and employing, I should think, probably a hundred men.

Q. If there were no Chinese in the country, what would have been the result, so far as that company goes?—A. They would have hired white labor.

Q. And paid them better wages?—A. And paid them better wages.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. If there were no Chinese in the country the price of labor would be higher?—A. I think not. I think larger labor would come here that now stays away. I think our Chinese labor has a tendency to keep laborers from the East and from Europe from coming here. They do not like to come here. I have often been told in traveling through the East, "There is no use going to California; there are too many Chinamen there for workingmen."

Q. Still you have a considerable influx of European labor and from the East?—A. Considerable.

Q. Every day brings some?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are any returning to the East?—A. I think some return.

Mr. MEADE. I asked the question because we have about the same number going to Europe from New York as are coming at present.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Quite as many return from here as come?—A. No, not so many return from here as come, but in traveling over the road and meeting an emigrant-train, I have noticed them returning, but not in equal numbers to those who come.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the character of the immigration now? Is it equal to what it has been in former years? Is your State growing as rapidly as before?—A. The State is growing, but I do not think immigrants are coming as fast as they did a few years ago. I have not noticed in particular, but I used to notice every day in the papers that a large number had arrived at Sacramento.

Q. Taking the last five years, has there been a steady and rapid increase of the State?—A. I think a steady increase. I think the city has been steadily growing.

Q. Where does the immigration stop? Does it come to the city or go to the country?—A. I think Sacramento is about the distributing point.

I think they distributed more of that class of immigrants and working people than from this city.

Q. Are they generally day-laborers, or people who go off on farms and buy land and make homes?—A. I think most who have come within the last year are people who seek land for homes—farmers.

Q. Are they Americans or Europeans?—A. Europeans more. I think a good many Germans. That opinion is formed from merely looking at them as they were coming in.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Why did you take these precautions in April during the time of this meeting?—A. There was a great deal of feeling in the city, and I thought that it was better to be cautious, and so as not to have an outbreak, to have a sufficient force to put an end to any little riot that might start down town, than to let it grow into a regular riot.

Q. Did you know of any armed bodies of men?—A. No, sir. I got letters that there were such, but could never trace it. I put two of the best detectives of the city police to work, and requested them if they could find any information of such a body of men to let me know, and they failed to give me any information of that kind.

Q. You say that there is a large number of gamblers among the Chinese?—A. I think there are.

Q. Can they be suppressed?—A. It would take a good deal of work to do it. I do not know that you could do it entirely.

Q. You have sufficient ordinances to do it?—A. Our ordinances are very good on that, and I have endeavored to do my very best to suppress it, but it is very hard work—as it is with white gamblers.

Q. There are white gambling-houses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Plenty of gambling?—A. Plenty of it.

Q. On Pine and Bush streets?—A. I think it exists on those streets.

Q. And Sutter?—A. I think twenty or thirty were arrested.

Q. It is known pretty publicly where these are—Briggs's and Roberts's, and McCullough's?—A. I have never visited them. I do not know.

Q. You see notices?—A. We generally see notices that they exist on those streets.

Q. You find the same difficulties in suppressing white gambling that you do in suppressing it among the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Want of honest, straightforward testimony, false swearing, perjury?—A. When we arrest a white man we generally convict him. He acknowledges the corn and pays his fine. They do not generally swear off. The Chinese are more careful.

Q. What is the price of miners' wages?—A. What kind of miners do you mean?

Q. Take the mass of miners in Virginia City and the mountains?—A. All the way from two to four dollars a day.

Q. Four?—A. Not as high as four.

Q. Could the sulphur-banks be worked profitably with white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have they lain idle?—A. I do not know. They have not been worked very long, but the superintendent of the works told me that the quicksilver was an entire profit to them; that the sulphur paid the entire expense of the working. Mr. Lightner told me that.

Q. I believe we have had about thirty-seven thousand immigrants to this State in the past year. I think that I am not exactly correct in that; but the balance in our favor is about thirty-seven thousand?—A. I should think that was a little large.

Q. I saw it in the paper the other day, but I do not think it includes Chinese?—A. No.

Q. Do you find any suffering among those people after they arrive here?—A. I have a great many complaints from quite a number of them.

Q. Those who frequent the city?—A. Not as much from those who arrive as from people who have been here for some time. They complain that they cannot get work. There is not a day that I do not have a great many complaints. Some I do not think amount to much, but others, I think, are really cases of charity.

Q. Is not this Chinese labor a desirable labor in many callings, from domestic servants down?—A. I am of the opinion if we hadn't it we would have white labor that would take its place better. That has been my theory. It is only my judgment.

Q. Do you employ Chinese servants?—A. I do not.

Q. Have you recently?—A. Never. I had a Chinaman in my employ once when I was keeping house at San Mateo. When Sunday came I had quite a number of visitors. He saw a number of wagons, and he informed me after breakfast if I would pay him he would go.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did he go?—A. He did not go until Monday morning. I let him go then.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have been a resident of California for some years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many?—A. Twenty-six.

Q. Did we do much manufacturing many years ago?—A. Very little.

Q. We brought everything we ate and drank from elsewhere?—A. Mostly all came from the East.

Q. Which manufacturer first started the woolen mills, and by what kind of labor?—A. I think the first manufactory was started with white labor, and they drifted into Chinese labor, if my recollection serves me.

Q. As other branches developed?—A. Yes, sir, as other branches developed. I have never been in the manufacturing business, but from observation when they first commenced to manufacture they commenced with white labor, and from that they drifted into Chinese labor. That was done in about 1867-'68.

Q. We consume now, do we not, large amounts of articles imported from the East; their agricultural implements, machinery, candles, starch?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Mayor, that there are openings now for all the white labor that we can get here that is idle on our streets, in manufacturing interests which are not in operation here?—A. If we had capital I have no doubt that we could employ a great deal more white labor than we do.

Q. Do you not know that the moment that a man undertakes to establish a manufactory here and becomes successful by Chinese labor, then this hue and cry is raised against them?—A. I think there is a prejudice against employing Chinese labor in manufacturing, but whether or no they would not be as successful without it as they would be with it is a question. There are some sorts of manufactures that we cannot manufacture here as cheaply as you can East. For instance, our iron manufacture. All such work as that can be manufactured East cheaper than here. In Pennsylvania, and other States where coal is so plenty, they can manufacture more cheaply than here. Here coal is very high, and it is a drawback.

Q. We carry on the iron business to a very considerable extent?—A. To a considerable extent, because we must get it done, and in the manufacture of iron our machine-shops are conducted wholly by white labor.

Q. Do you know many Chinese who are masons, house-carpenters, house-painters, plumbers?—A. I have never seen many Chinese at that. I do not think I ever saw one working as a plumber. I think I have seen them working at carpenter-work, but as plumbers and painters I do not think I ever saw them.

Q. You recollect at the time this beautiful building was being constructed, all the labor-leagues in this city, carpenters, masons, plumbers, held meetings in which they sent resolutions to the East, that this market was overstocked with labor, and they considered that no more need come here, with a view of getting labor. You saw that?—A. I think there was quite an excitement about the time this building commenced. Mr. Ralston, I think, brought out quite a number of mechanics from Chicago.

Q. Did the Chinese have anything to do with that?—A. I do not think they had.

Q. Do you not think there are a great many occupations which we have not entered upon which could be successfully carried on by Chinese cheap labor yet?—A. I think we are entering upon all sorts of manufacturing as fast as our State will permit it. We are a young State, and I think we are branching into manufacturing as fast as the State will permit.

Q. Can we successfully compete with the Eastern States when money is worth 1½ per cent. a month here?—A. I do not think money is worth 1½ per cent.

Q. One per cent.?—A. You can get plenty of money here. This building is built on 7 per cent. You can get money from 9 to 10 per cent.

Q. Can you get money to establish manufacturing employment in the city for 9 per cent.?—A. I think for 9 or 10. I think for 10 per cent. I can get money here as well as in the East. No man can get money without security. Money on Wall street, in New York, commands its high price, and higher than our interest rates here. I have often known them to pay one per cent. a day there for money.

Q. That is gambling?—A. We have that here when you speak of 1½ per cent. a month.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. The bank rates are 1 per cent?—A. Our bank rates are 1 per cent.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You are from New England?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is not 6 per cent. there a good return for an investment in manufacturing?—A. Yes, sir; it used to be so considered; 6 and 7 per cent., I think, was the usual return.

Q. Do you know of any capitalists who embark in manufacturing on this coast with that assurance of 6 per cent.?—A. I do not just understand your question.

Q. I want to know if you think we could induce any capitalist to establish manufacturing here upon a capital based upon a return of 6 per cent. per annum?—A. He can use his money much better.

Q. Then we will have to go without the manufactures?—A. I do not think in Massachusetts now they base manufacturing on 6 per cent. I have some manufactures in the East that bring me more than that—that bring me more than 10 per cent.

Q. Have you any objection to the manufacture of agricultural implements being established on this coast to retain in California $6,000,000 per annum?—A. I should like to see such a manufactory.

Q. You would not care particularly, as a man who desires the welfare of the country and coast, whether by Chinese labor or not, if there were a saving of so much money?—A. I think it would be much better for the State if you manufactured with white labor, to build up the institutions of the State permanently.

Q. That is a matter beyond our reach. We admit that, and so do you?—A. I do not admit but what manufacturing can be carried on by white labor.

Q. You admit we cannot establish that manufacture here because money is too dear. It is cheaper to buy in the East, where they are willing to take 6 per cent. How many candles do we burn on this coast; how many boxes?—A. It has been fifteen or sixteen years since I was in the grocery business, and I have not kept posted lately in that line.

Q. You are very well posted?—A. I know we burn a great many candles, but how many I cannot answer.

Q. We bring them mostly from the East?—A. I think the large bulk of our candles are shipped from the East. Some are manufactured here, but not as many as are shipped.

Q. Several million dollars per annum are shipped east. We will show it in figures; but you are posted, and I want to show it to you. Would it not be better if we could establish the manufacture of candles here rather than to send that amount east for them?—A. I think the degradation the Chinese bring us is so great, that it would be better never to have a candle manufactured than to have the Chinese turned loose upon us.

Q. That is very frank?—A. I think it would be better that all the candles should be manufactured in the East.

Q. Do you believe the treaty relations with the present Emperor of China had better be abrogated than endure this system of immigration?—A. Yes, sir.

DAVIS LOUDERBACK sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Judge Louderback, you have been for how many years a resident of our State?—A. Since 1849.

Q. Your position is what?—A. Police judge.

Q. And for how many years have you been connected with the police court as attorney and judge?—A. As prosecuting attorney of the police court and as police judge, since the beginning of 1864.

Q. Twelve years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your court is a court of criminal jurisdiction?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And a court for the preliminary examination of offenses against the law?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State, if you please, what is the result of your observation of the Chinese with reference to judicial proceedings, as to what proportion of the proceedings of that court, or whether large or small, is from offenses committed by Chinamen?—A. I cannot give any statistical account of this matter, but I do not know but what they are about in proportion to the reputed population of Chinamen and whites. I do not know but what there is about an average. I cannot tell about that. You see the Chinese opium-eating. They do not get arrested for it, and we have a large number of arrests made for drunkenness; we have, on an average,

about 650 a month, white men who are brought in for drunkenness, and there are other crimes connected with drunkenness, such as shouting and disturbing the public peace. By adding that number I think it gives about an average.

Q. Are there many of that class of criminal cases, embracing the crimes of petit and grand larceny, burglary and robberies, assaults, offenses against the State laws?—A. I do not know how that may be. I have not looked at it to see, nor thought of it much, to give a reliable opinion upon that point as to how they may average. It is difficult where Chinamen commit crimes upon Chinamen to bring them to justice or get the evidence to convict them. A great many crimes among themselves go unpunished.

Q. Why is that?—A. Because their veracity is exceedingly bad. They hardly ever prosecute, except when animated by malice and some conspiracy to convict somebody, or something of that kind.

Q. What is your form of administering an oath to the Chinese?—A. The form with us is simple. The witness is standing, and raises up his right hand, and the oath is administered to him.

Q. The same as to white men?—A. The same as to white men.

Q. Have any experiments been made with reference to binding their consciences with oaths in forms peculiar to their country?—A. Since I have been connected with the court there has not been. We never did it, because we had understood that all that sort of system had been tried, and absolutely failed; so it was never tried—this cutting the heads off of chickens, and burning papers, and things of that kind. We never tried it, for we thought it amounted to a farce and a disgrace to the court, and did not secure any better results than administering the oath in the usual form. That was the understanding.

Q. What estimate, then, as a magistrate, do you put upon the average Chinese oath?—A. Of course we are speaking of them as a class.

Q. As a class?—A. I think their want of veracity is horrible. They do not seem to realize that there is such a thing as sanctity about an oath. That is the general result of my observation and experience.

Q. You know the general scope of the feeling here in relation to the Chinese and the general scope of this investigation. If there is anything you desire to state you can do so.—A. I do not desire to state anything further.

Q. I will ask you one more question: whether these people show any disposition to become citizens and take any interest in the administration of the laws or the Government?—A. No; I do not think they do. I do not think they ought to, either.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you think it possible for them to assimilate with our institutions?—A. I do not know what might become of these parties here with their children born here and reared here, with the contact which is going on with the white race in the process of ages, such as was arrived at in bringing the colored people from Africa for the sake of getting cheap labor in the South. They brought them there and had the cheap labor. I cannot tell what result ages might have on these people. I do not know what effect years and years and centuries of contact with the civilization and intelligence of the white race would have on them.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Can you tell us what proportion of the persons arrested are convicted?—A. No; I do not know. I have not looked at that. I guess not much more than half of the people arrested are convicted.

Q. Do you not think that just as large a proportion of the Chinese arrested are convicted as there are of the white people who are arrested?—A. I do not know. It may be so where their crimes affect white people; but where it concerns themselves, such as a murder among themselves, there will be such infernal lying that the jury cannot tell who is telling the truth, and will let them go. That is the general verdict of their cases.

Q. In the lower classes of white people is there not an immense amount of perjury?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. Do they seem to have any idea of the sanctity of an oath?—A. Yes. You can always see, amid all their perjury, that they have some respect even for an oath.

Q. Do they manifest it in their contradictions of each other?—A. I think they do. I think with the white people an oath is a great security in the administration of justice.

Q. Is not perjury committed daily before you by white people?—A. Yes, sir; there are conflicting oaths given there constantly. There is no doubt of that. There is plenty of crime among the white race and plenty of perjury among the white race.

Q. Do you not know of white persons committing perjury before you?—A. Sometimes I have.

Q. Is it not customary?—A. There is a great deal of this conflict that comes from honest difference of opinion. Some see what another does not see.

Q. I am speaking of a case where you must be satisfied that one or the other commits perjury.—A. Yes, sir; somebody lying.

Q. Is not that, on an average, every day?—A. It is very frequent. That is perhaps the best way to state it.

Q. Do you have a conviction for perjury once a year?—A. I do not try them for perjury. We send them before the grand jury. That is felony.

Q. I mean in our criminal courts.—A. No. Conviction for perjury is a very rare thing. It is exceedingly rare; not because prosecuting attorneys have not tried, in reference to it, to secure convictions, but in perjury there is no physical fact about it like in most other crimes, and there seems to be an indisposition on the part of jurors ever to come to a conclusion in a perjury case. They will almost invariably disagree or acquit.

Q. Among these arrests that you speak of, are a great many for a violation of the cubic-air ordinance?—A. There are a great many arrests lately for that, but they do not begin to equal the drunkenness. That drinking business adds to the crimes of the white race immensely.

Q. Is a Chinaman ever brought before you for being drunk on the street?—A. It is very rare, indeed; a rare exception.

Q. Is he brought before you for creating a riot in the streets, by the use of obscenity, blasphemy, and profane language?—A. I do not remember any for disturbing the peace. That generally arises in connection with liquor. They do not complain of each other in the matter of language. All English-speaking people, as a general rule, use profane language a great deal, but you take other nations, like the Italians, they do not make use of obscenity. Chinamen generally use profane language. They are very obscene, and they exceed the Americans in obscenity, but they do not complain of each other.

Q. Are there not a great many crimes which are peculiar to the whites?—A. I do not know, except it is drunkenness. Chinamen seldom make a disturbance of the peace by shouting, hallooing, and things of that kind.

Q. Is there not a large class of crimes committed by whites which are not committed by the Chinese, such, for instance, as drugging and robbery in saloons, rolling on drunks, confidence-games, forgeries?—A. Yes, sir; there are some robberies and forgeries, and rolling drunks, as you call it. I think we have had Chinamen up for that thing. They have rolled on drunks and been convicted, and picked pockets, but as a general thing that is done by white men.

Q. Is garroting done by whites?—A. Garroting is done by whites.

Q. And a great many of these arrests of Chinese are made for violating ordinances peculiarly aimed at them?—A. I do not know about that. I do not think so. I think they are arrested about the same as anybody else, except this pure-air law passed by the legislature to secure pure air and promote public health.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You have a large class of boys who are culprits, a class known as hoodlums. What is the cause that has made that class in our community larger than in eastern communities?—A. I do not know that I can state that it is a larger class here than in eastern communities. This hoodlumism has been existing in London under the name of Mohawks, and so in every other big city. I have not made that comparison to judge whether it is a greater class here or not. I find these Chinese prostitutes often get boys. I suppose they initiate them into the ways of lewdness when white prostitutes would not. I have sent boys to industrial schools that have been affected by diseases by contact with Chinese prostitutes—small boys, fifteen or sixteen—just over the age of puberty.

Q. And those things are more from contact with Chinese than white prostitutes?—A. I think so as far as boys are concerned. Either they encourage the boys or the boys have courage to go there when they would not have courage to approach a house where there are white prostitutes. I suppose that the Chinese exclusion of boys from employment has been one great cause of producing hoodlumism.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Has not the chief cause of that been because the trades-unions exclude apprentices?—A. I do not know about that. They have excluded some apprentices, but this cheap labor and this consequent degradation, the Chinese occupying all these places, I think has had a great deal to do with it.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 25, 1876.

MICHAEL A. SMITH sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in San Francisco and in California?—Answer. I have resided in California twenty-seven years.

Q. And your position?—A. I am a police-officer.

Q. Now in service?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State, if you please, your idea of the number of Chinamen in San Francisco now and the number as it varies at different portions of the year.—A. Just at this time of the year they are beginning to come in. They begin to come now until the winter months and stay here through the winter. I should judge there are from thirty to thirty-five thousand

Chinamen here at the present time. They begin to come down now from the country, or mountains, as Chinamen say.

Q. How many do you think there were at a point of the highest number last year?—A. I should judge from fifty to sixty thousand, and maybe more, last winter.

Q. Have you special information regarding the condition of the Chinese quarter by virtue of your being detailed for special duty in that quarter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State, then, to the gentlemen of the commission, if you please, what have been your observations as to their mode of living, and generally as this investigation has drifted.—A. Chinatown last winter was very filthy. It is still filthy, but it is not near as filthy at the present time as it has been. Officer Bethel and myself have been there steady. I believe officer Bethel was sent in April. I went in January, and we have been steady at work making the Chinese clean up as much as we could since that time. But before that it was in a very filthy condition; that is, the lower quarters of Chinatown, such as the basements and lodging-houses. The basements and lodging-houses have been very filthy there, where the poorer class of Chinese live. Their outhouses are very dirty.

Q. And how in respect to their crowding in quarters?—A. They get in very thick. We have often arrested them under this cubic-air law. I know of one instance where we arrested thirty in a room, where there was only room for six according to the law.

Q. This room is about twenty-two feet square. How many Chinamen in their overcrowded quarters would inhabit or sleep in a room of this dimension? Just make a little mental calculation.—A. I should judge sixty would sleep in here—more at times, when they get very crowded. At the present time they do not get in so thick as they did before the cubic-air law was passed.

Q. Is that in the absence of any law, at times when crowded? Is that answer a fair illustration of the mode in which they would sleep together at nights?—A. Yes, sir; in what is called the lodging-houses, places that they have for that purpose, or rooms that they would rent.

Q. Do you know a place in the town called the Globe Hotel, and its dimensions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the frontage of that hotel?—A. I do not remember. Officer Duffield can tell that more particularly than I can. I never measured it. Still, that place was not crowded last year. When the immigrants were coming here from China formerly, they used to take a great many of them up there and keep them there until they could get work or employment for them. At the present time they are not in such great numbers.

Q. What was the highest number, as far as your judgment goes, ever gathered in that house?—A. I have heard different statements. I have heard some say four hundred, and some say as high as eight hundred there; but I never saw that many. I have heard parties say who have been in that neighborhood that there have been that many.

Q. What is your observation in regard to the existence of gambling-houses, and to what extent is it carried on in the Chinese quarter among the Chinese?—A. They have got a great many houses there. Some of them will say they play dominoes there, and that they smoke opium and such things. It is in fact a long table; and they have three doors. Each door will be from an inch to three inches thick; may be two inches thick, generally, the door is. They have three of those doors; and, when they wish to gamble or have a lookout, they can close those doors and

have big bars on them. There are quite a number of them in the Chinese quarters.

Q. Do they have any guards at their street-entrances?—A. They do not do it now, hardly ever. Last winter, and before we commenced making great raids on the Chinese, it was a common thing to see them guard the door. But at the present time I have never heard of it.

Q. Is gambling more prevalent among the Chinese than among the whites, according to your observation?—A. It seems they are very fond of it as a general thing.

Q. Can you tell the number of prostitutes plying their vocation in Chinatown?—A. At the present time I do not think that there are over four hundred. We have made general raids against the prostitutes, and they have been arrested time and time again; and a great many, from the information I have received, have been sent away from here.

Q. That is, gone to the country?—A. Gone to the country, or mountains, as they say.

Q. Were there a great many last February, in your opinion, before this raiding commenced?—A. I should judge one thousand or twelve hundred; maybe fifteen hundred.

Q. Describe, if you can, a Chinese brothel—I mean, now, the ordinary brothel.—A. There are two kinds of Chinese prostitutes. One is a house which is exclusively for Chinamen—no white men go there at all. The other is a house where white men go. Where the white men go the Chinamen do not visit. The Chinese houses of prostitution, that they have for Chinamen themselves, are generally on the second floor; where they have them for the whites, they are in alleys. They have a little wicket about a foot square. They get on the inside of it and keep that open; and, as a man passes, they say "Siss, siss," in a kind of way that they have in calling. Some of them can speak a little English, and most all of them can speak English enough to let you know what their vocation is.

Q. Do the women congregate together specially in one place?—A. In some of these houses there is the old woman, what we call the boss of the house, and two women, and sometimes five or six.

Q. What is the size usually of these rooms?—A. About four by six; sometimes five by eight. They are very small—just room enough. There may be a little bed in there.

Q. A bunk or a bed?—A. A bunk.

Q. In relation to their hospitals, describe any scenes you may have ever witnessed, or any information you may have touching hospitals.—A. At the present time I believe two of the companies have got two rooms in Aleck alley. There have been some sick men there. There are different places through the city where they have what they call hospitals and have their sick there. I found that in a great many of those places the sick seemed to want very much, and were not well taken care of.

Q. Go on and describe them, and tell what you have seen there.—A. Aleck alley is a very filthy place; some of these gentlemen have seen it. There is a little shed like, and the sick are generally in there.

Q. The hospital that you now have in your mind, how large is the room?—A. About 10 feet.

Q. Ten feet square?—A. I should judge about that, and 7 feet high.

Q. How many sick people have you ever seen in it?—A. Five or six; some time ago there were six in it. That is the highest number I ever saw.

Q. How are they accommodated? Have they beds?—A. They lie there on boards and on kind of racks.

Q. Have they any physician in attendance, or nurses?—A. None that I know of.

Q. How are they supplied with food?—A. There is rice there; that is all I have seen.

Q. A little cooked rice?—A. Sometimes it is cooked and sometimes it is not.

Q. Do you know anything about the existence here of leprous patients?—A. I believe there is one at the present time in Aleck alley.

Q. Do you know anything about those who were here and were sent away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State what you know about them.—A. Some of them were around in Aleck alley, and also I believe one place in Sullivan alley, where they took some from. They were sent to China by the city authorities.

Q. Are those lepers kept secreted, or are they kept open?—A. This one who is there now, generally almost everybody can see in that place.

Q. Do you know anything about the secret tribunals or their operations?—A. I know that there are societies here. The washermen have a society, the shoemakers have a society, and the cigar men have a society. There is also a society of men here called high-binders, or hatchet-men.

Q. Explain that more particularly. That is something the commission have not heard about.—A. They are a class of men who go around and blackmail both the Chinese merchants and the prostitutes; they go around sometimes and go in a house and demand money; if they do not get it, they will raise a fight. On one occasion here I knew them to go into a house and raise a fight; the man came to me, and I arrested one of the men and sent him to the county jail, for, I think it was, some kind of misdemeanor, either assault and battery, or carrying concealed weapons, or something of that kind. Shortly afterward the same house was visited by three of those high-binders, and one of them, when he got up to the door, pulled a pistol out and shot the woman in the head; the brain, so the doctor said, oozed out; the woman is living at the present time and well. We arrested all three of them, but could only convict the one who shot her; he is now serving ten years in the State's prison for shooting this woman.

Q. Do these high-binders blackmail gamblers also?—A. They, I believe, do every kind of idle business. I suppose they are gamblers, blackmailers, and thieves of all kinds. They have rooms to meet in.

Q. Why are they called hatchet men?—A. A great many of them carry a hatchet with the handle cut off; it may be about six inches long, with a handle and a hole cut in it; they have the handle sawed off a little, leaving just enough to keep a good hold. Those are called among the Chinamen bad men or hatchet-men. Chinamen will come to me regularly, and especially the business Chinamen, and tell me about where they sometimes have a room. We find out it is on Washington street, on the third story of a building, and then they will move, perhaps to some other part of Chinatown.

Q. This room you speak of is their rendezvous, their headquarters?—A. Their headquarters. Very often I go up there with two or three other officers, and get inside of the room, and search each Chinaman as he comes in, and sometimes arrest quite a number of these Chinamen for carrying concealed weapons, such as hatchets, knives, and pistols. It is done frequently by the police.

Q. You say these people are the terror of the Chinamen, some of them especially?—A. O, yes; business Chinamen come to me very often and tell me where they are, and sometimes new men get among them and they point them out; they are the terror of Chinatown. In the Chinese houses of prostitution for Chinamen there is no such thing as getting a conviction there; you cannot get a conviction in one of them. Last spring, on account of a note received from Rev. Mr. Gibson, sent down by a Chinaman, I went up and arrested a Chinese house of prostitution, and brought down 14 or 15, and it turned out that they were all married women when we got them in court; they all had husbands.

Q. That was their statement?—A. That was their statement.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. When this solicitation is going on, tapping at windows and calling to miscellaneous persons who go by, why are you not able to prove by testimony of white persons that that is the fact, and that it is a house of prostitution?—A. We do; we arrest them time and time again.

Q. Then why can you not prove by white officers that these things are going on?

Senator COOPER. The witness is speaking of two classes, stating that in the Chinese houses of prostitution he cannot convict the inmates.

The WITNESS. Those regular houses have been closed out in the last six months very much.

Q. (By Senator SARGENT.) You refer more especially to Chinese houses of prostitution kept for Chinamen; there you find it difficult of proof?—A. Yes, sir; you cannot find proof of it; but in regard to the regular houses, they are pretty much crowded out and left; once in a while we hear of them coming in, and when we hear of it we go up and arrest them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Those are the houses with the wickets and window-tapping?—A. Yes, sir. At the present time it is very hard to convict a house of that kind, because families also live in there, and there would be prostitution there for a month or more, and then when we find out what is going on we arrest them, and generally put down "soliciting" against them. We can arrest them for soliciting and convict them.

Q. How many houses of that nature were there last January and February, in your judgment?—A. From 46 to 50 I have counted up in my mind. There were from 45 to 50 at that time where these wickets were. In regard to convicting those people of buying and selling those women, I will relate one case that we had in the United States court last spring, under Congressman Page's bill, I think it was. It was reported that fourteen women came here on the Colorado, and we went up to try and find out about them. First Mr. Mills, belonging to the secret-service force, had been after them, hunting them up, I suppose, two or three weeks before we knew anything about it. We finally arrested a woman, Sum Choy, or got a boy to go up there, and she made a statement to him that she had been bought in China by a woman here and brought here for purposes of prostitution. About 10 o'clock at night Officer Bethel and myself went to this house. I took the woman out, took her down stairs as though I was arresting her for prostitution. I took her to the police-office, and Officer Bethel took the man of the house down and put him in jail. There we found out from the man that he had no hing to do with her, that she was only living in the house, but this mother, pocket-mother, he said, was up in the alley. I went up to the girl and asked her about it, and she also told me that her pocket-

mother was living in the same alley, and told me her name. I went up there, brought this woman down, and she acknowledged that she was her girl. The girl then made a statement, through an interpreter from Mr. Gibson's mission, that her mother had sold her to this woman in China for $185; that she had paid her passage to this country and bought her clothes, and altogether it was $300, and that she was to serve her five years. She came here as a prostitute to serve her for five years. We kept the woman in what is called the new prison, where nobody could see her, as a witness, and went before the United States commissioner and held them before the grand jury, and got an indictment before the United States court against Ah Sin and Ah Foo, that is the woman who brought her here and the man who kept the house. When we came to trial in the United States court this girl got on the stand and swore she did not know Ah Sin, never had seen her before that night, and did not know Ah Foo more than to see him in that house, and that she came here to be a seamstress, and that her sister brought her here.

Q. Is that an illustration of the general course of Chinese testimony?—A. In all that kind of cases that is the general result of their testimony. You can never get them a third time to make the same statement.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What influence is it, according to your experience, that operates upon them to prevent their finally telling the same story?—A. I think they are afraid. If you can get one of those women, perhaps, away before these parties get to talk to them, you can get the truth out of them; but the minute any one of these parties, the people in this business, look at them or say a word to them, they can get them to do anything or say anything. We got this girl out, and they had no chance to talk to her or see her until after they had sent her up to the county jail. Certainly we could not keep her in a cell where nobody could see her for five or six weeks until the trial would come on. We had to have her committed to the county jail.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You stated that the filthy condition of Chinatown is no comparison at the present time to what it has been heretofore.—A. It is not.

Q. Could not the authorities exercise the same vigilance heretofore to have kept it in the condition that it is in now if they so desired?—A. I do not know what others might have done.

Q. I mean the authorities?—A. Yes, sir; I suppose if they had kept after those Chinamen, and kept after the owners of these places, they might have made them clean it up.

Q. How long have you been on the police force?—A. I have been on this force now very nearly three years; about two years and ten months.

Q. You have had considerable experience in that line?—A. I have been in the Chinese quarters ever since I have been on the force.

Q. You say there were thirty arrested under the cubic-air ordinance?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say, also, you took them out of a place where they had three thousand feet of cubic air?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where did you incarcerate them?—A. In the city prison.

Q. What was the number of cubic feet of air in the cell you put them in?—A. I do not know the exact size.

Q. Was it a larger room or a smaller one than you took them out of?—A. I suppose a smaller one than we took them out of. About the same size, maybe.

Q. Inasmuch as you have been on the police force some time, I will ask this question. The statement was made by your chief, in which he gave the percentage of Chinese criminals, putting the population at 30,000. To make it plain to you, he took the Chinese population as bearing upon the white population as the ratio, and made his percentage in that way. You understood that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, in your experience as a policeman, we have white criminals here, have we not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In abundance?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it fair to take the ratio in the light in which your chief took it yesterday? What would be the ratio of criminals, taking the same number of white criminals? What would be the ratio of convictions in comparison with the same number of Chinese?—A. I could not judge of that. I judge if you took 30,000 white men up there of the worst class, there would be a great deal more. And if the better class, it would not be as much.

Q. You state that there are about four hundred prostitutes here?—A. Yes, sir; I judge about that many at the present time.

Q. How many white prostitutes are there in this city?—A. A great number. I would put it at from 1,200 to 2,000.

Q. Do they have an exclusive quarter where they ply their avocation?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of their crowding out the better class of society in order to occupy it?—A. The streets that they have got at the present time were occupied by them long before I came on the police.

Q. Do you know where Dr. Stone's church is located, on the corner of California and Dupont?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The worshiping community were driven away from that location, were they?—A. I do not know. They moved away. I do not know whether they were driven away or not.

Q. They have left that locality?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They do not hold service there?—A. No, sir.

Q. What species of gambling do the Chinese engage in?—A. Unlawful games; the only ones that I know are lottery and tan.

Q. Please explain to the commission what lottery and tan are.—A. Tan is played with buttons. They have a square plate in the middle of the table with numbers, like 1, 2, 3, 4. They have a large number of buttons on the table, and they have a little cup or bowl. They place the bowl over a number of buttons and put them out at the center of the table, and there the betters make their bets on the different numbers.

Q. Odd and even?—A. Odd and even in one way; but there is a percentage in favor of the dealer. I understand there is ten per cent. in favor of the dealer on the winnings. If you lose you lose it all.

Q. Do our white people—the boys about here—visit these places?—A. No, sir; no white men at all visit the Chinese gambling-houses.

Q. It is exclusive to the Chinese alone?—A. They exclude everybody but the Chinamen.

Q. You spoke about their exclusive houses of prostitution for Chinese and white people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They do exist here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they both equally patronized and profitably carried on?—A. I do not think at the present time that the Chinese houses for the whites make a very profitable business. We have watched these alleys pretty closely. I do not think it is very profitable at present. At one time here it was a very profitable business.

Q. I did not understand your testimony in reference to the difficulties of making arrests for prostitution. I want to make it plainer. You say they ply their avocation by making certain signs through a wicket?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do those exclusively for the Chinese make this same sign?—A. No, sir; they are up-stairs. There are only one or two houses exclusively for the Chinese in the city but what are up-stairs.

Q. Then they are not open and on the street, and they do not ply their vocation openly?—A. No, sir.

Q. How many houses are there that do ply their vocation openly?—A. Chinese?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. At the present time I could not say that there were hardly any. I suppose on and off they open up a place.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. When they do you arrest them, do you not?—A. Yes, sir; if we can find it out and get information. Lately the houses were broken up pretty well, and what they call Chinese families moved into these houses and some of these prostitutes moved out. Then it was difficult if you found a woman soliciting to prove prostitution. Generally we would arrest them and bring them to the city hall for soliciting and get a conviction for soliciting. There have been large numbers of them arrested in the last six months.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is a Chinaman's bed composed of in the higher and lower classes, as a custom and habit?—A. They have a kind of a mat, and have a little square block like for a pillow, covered around with flannel and sometimes velvet, and quilts.

Q. That is about all it is composed of, mats to lie upon; no spring-mattresses?—A. No, sir; in some of the Chinese merchants' houses here they have very nice beds.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. About these houses of prostitution where they are soliciting. Do I understand you that the soliciting is simply through a wicket, and to people who are passing on that street?—A. Passing through the alley. They have not been on a street for several years now; not on a public street.

Q. Is there any probability that they solicit the general public? Is it confined to those who go into the quarter itself?—A. It is confined to those who go into the alley.

Q. On the streets occupied by the white prostitutes, do they not solicit also; that is, do they not sit at the windows and by signs and looks testify to those who are passing what their business is; inviting them in?—A. Yes, sir; and they are brought down by large numbers sometimes from these houses.

Q. So it is not confined to the Chinese?—A. They are brought down in a great deal larger numbers than the Chinese, because there are a great many more of them. I think the records will show a great many more white prostitutes than Chinese arrested for soliciting.

Q. Then this evil is not confined to the Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any species of vice that you have been able entirely to eradicate in this city?—A. I suppose not.

Q. It will occasionally break out?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In your testimony in reference to women coming here bonded, I

want to ask you if there have not been numbers of those women rescued from these bond women and men and placed in the missions?—A. Yes, sir; there have been, at times. Sometimes the woman will come down to the city-hall herself for protection from these places.

Q. Do you get aid from the Chinese merchants in this matter?—A. Sometimes. A few years ago they used to beat these women considerably in these houses, but at present I do not think they do, for they would be brought down and very heavy fines imposed upon them. I do not think at the present time that they use them near as badly as they did.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You have been able partially to eradicate that vice, then?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In the discharge of your duties in Chinatown do you find Chinese families?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Merchants' wives and children?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Of respectability, in your opinion?—A. I should judge so. I do not know anything different.

Q. You never found them to be criminals?—A. No, sir; a great many of these women who have been prostitutes Chinamen will marry. Sometimes they have to buy them, I understand. It is the general understanding that they have to buy them from the owners of them.

Q. To liquidate this indebtedness?—A. To liquidate this indebtedness.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. And when they so marry they live as other families?—A. They live as man and wife.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know of cases where they sell these women again?—A. I have heard of such a thing. I have heard of men who made a practice of buying a woman, saying that they were going to marry her, live with her a while, and then take her up to the mountains, or up the country, (if you go to any place up the country the Chinamen say up the mountain,) and sell them and come back. I have heard that, but I have never seen any proof of it.

Q. You have heard it from Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is your experience in reference to the liberality of the Chinese merchants when called upon to contribute to any charitable purpose; for instance, such as the Chicago fire, and other things of that kind?—A. I cannot state in regard to that.

Q. You do not know?—A. No, sir.

Q. I will ask if you know that our legislature refused to give us any representation in the Centennial and any money to exhibit? Can you not call to mind that the Chinese sent $500 in gold to the committee to aid in California being represented there?—A. I believe I recollect something of that kind. I am not sure, however, at the present time. It seems to me there was something of that kind.

Q. Do you recollect of the six companies and the merchants using all endeavors possible to second the efforts of the officers here to return to China these women who come here for prostitution?—A. That was some years ago. I do not remember distinctly about it now.

Q. Do you know a leper when you see one?—A. They have been pointed out to me by physicians.

Q. As lepers?—A. Yes, sir.

FREDERICK A. GIBBS sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you been a resident of our State?—Answer. Over twenty-six years.

Q. What is your present official position?—A. I am one of the supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, and chairman of the hospital committee, which embraces the care of the hospital, the almshouse, and the pest-house.

Q. State to the commission, in succinct narrative, your observations of the Chinese that have passed under your official notice. What have you done as a member of the hospital committee, what success have you met, and what results have you attained?—A. I would state that, on becoming a member of the board of supervisors, (about a year ago the first of December I took my seat,) I found that there were a large number in the pest-house congregated there who was represented as lepers. The expenses then of that institution were very heavy; and, as it was set aside entirely for the use of the small-pox patients, and as there was no small pox and had not been for three years, I took measures to see what we could do in reference to it. There were then, I think, about forty-three patients, more or less, at the pest-house, under charge. I went with the health-officer and some physicians to examine them. We found a large number who were not really sick. They were going in and out there and getting their board and clothing, and they seemed to have a very good time generally there. We discharged those. The lepers, however, we retained.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many of them were lepers?—A. We retained fourteen at that time. Two then went out after that and we would not allow them to return. We told them they must remain inside the walls; that we would not allow them in or out, going in the city and back again. I found afterward that there were three women in the city afflicted with leprosy, who had been for some two or three years plying their vocation here and spreading the disease of leprosy throughout our State.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What was their vocation?—A. Prostitutes. On inquiring of the health-officer and other physicians, I found that it was a contagious disease, obtained by contact with the person; that all who came in contact with one in that condition would have the leprosy. I saw the result would be in two or three years that we would have five or six hundred lepers in our State, as I assert here will be the case, and physicians will bear me out in that assertion. I then gathered these women together and sent them to the pest-house. We had a great deal of trouble there with them. Several times Chinamen came out and claimed two of these women as their wives, and tried to get them back again for purposes of prostitution. I called the Chinese companies together. We first met in the mayor's office. We represented to them that there were a number of lepers there, and we considered that as they had brought them out, they should also send them back again to China at their expense, or assist us in doing so. The companies seemed to laugh at the idea; they said it was not any of their business. The mayor asked them, moreover, "Did you not bring all the Chinamen and Chinese women to our State?"

They said, then, in answer to the mayor's question, that they had brought all but about a thousand to this State; that about a thousand were not under their control. They said then that they had not the power; that they did not know anything about it; that they paid taxes. The mayor said "You pay very few taxes, indeed." They said they paid the duties on imports. We, however, agreed to meet them on Saturday. They were to come again. This transaction was all going on through an interpreter. We met at the mayor's office, but no Chinamen came. I waited, I know, two or three hours, and none made their appearance. These were the representatives of the six Chinese companies. I then, afterward, consulted with the board of supervisors. They agreed with me that it would be much cheaper for the city and much better for its health to have these lepers sent away, as there was danger of their spreading it even by contact, by their shaking hands, and so on, among the people. The Chinamen seemed to be very much afraid of them, indeed. Several Chinamen told me at the time and the Chinese companies said that it was not only by contact with them, but by association with them, being in the room with them and sleeping with them, that they would get it. They seemed to be very much afraid of the leprosy. I then had another meeting with these Chinamen. I went up with one of the health officers. The chief health officer deputized Mr. Cole to go with me. We went up to the Chinese quarters on Clay street. We met there and sent out our interpreter, and he gathered the representatives of the six companies, whom they called inspectors, there. I laid the matter before them again; I told them it was their duty to do something to help us. They agreed to help me all they could. There was then a vessel going to China, chartered by Macondray & Co. It was to take the Chinamen at twelve dollars a piece. A number were to be sent back to China. I then told them the city would pay the expenses of these lepers if they would assist in getting them back, and that they should see Mr. Macondray about it. I went down to see Macondray, a day or two after, and I found that the Chinamen had been there and made representations that it would be impossible for us to get them on. I then met these Chinese companies again, and told them that we would take them on the next steamer. I wanted them to assist us all they could; that they had influence with the companies, and we wanted to get them away; that we could not keep them in this way; that they ought to go back to China. I went down to Mr. Goodman, of the Oriental Line of steamers, and saw him in reference to it. I took him aside, and he told me that the Chinese companies were interfering with my arrangements very much; that I would be unable to ship them; that he would not dare to take them; that they had threatened that they would not ship passengers or freight by him if he did, and advised me to exercise a little caution in my maneuvers. So I dead locked it for a month, and gave out to the Chinese that I had determined to keep them. I then went quietly to Williams, Blanchard & Co., who have a line of clipper-ships, with which we have a great deal of business and with which my firm shipped many thousands of tons of flour. I persuaded Mr. Williams to take these lepers.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. That is on a Pacific Mail steamer?—A. Yes; these parties are agents of the Pacific Mail as well as the line of clippers. I then sent Mr. Coe out. He brought them in two wagons, just before the steamer sailed. I told them to come as near as possible the time of the sailing of the vessel, as I was afraid of writs of habeas corpus, as I was led to believe such would be the case. They came down just before the

steamer sailed, and, with a great deal of difficulty, we got them on board the vessel and started them off. There were fourteen of them, three of whom were women. They were all very bad cases of leprosy. There were six of them who had to be carried on board. We had men there who carried them on board and the police assisted us. There were several special policemen there, and I kept the Chinamen away and would not allow them to communicate with them, and as each Chinaman went up the gangway I handed him five dollars in trade-dollars, and we put them on the deck, and the vessel sailed out of the harbor.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Was any effort made for a habeas corpus writ?—A. Some started off saying that we had no right to send them, but the steamer sailed immediately.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did you ever hear anything of them afterward?—A. I never heard a word since they sailed.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Can you give the date that you shipped them?—A. It must have been about six weeks ago.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I thought it was longer ago than that?—A. I think it was about six weeks ago. I have never heard from them.

Q. What objection could the Chinese have to sending these people away from the coast?—A. I cannot tell.

Q. They were afraid of them themselves, were they not?—A. They seemed to be, and I did not know but what they would be afraid of the authorities in China; that their sending them back might react on them, or something of that sort. They threw every obstacle in my way of shipping them. Everything that could be done, every possible manner, way, and form, was done to prevent the shipment of these people.

Q. You refer to the officers of the six companies?—A. Yes, sir; the officers of the six companies. They are the directors. I would, moreover, state that it was brought up, I see, in the testimony here in reference to the queue ordinance—the cutting off the queues of the Chinamen. After coming into the board of supervisors, I found our jails were very crowded indeed. I also found that our ordinances were not effective. They were not enforced. I called on the chief of police and on the different officers, and asked, as the mayor was very strenuous in endeavoring to enforce these ordinances, why they were not enforced. They told me it would be impossible to enforce them; that they would have a thousand Chinamen in the jails if they did; that our jails were overcrowded, and that there was a large number of Chinamen. I went to the different jails and saw what was going on, and I saw it was impossible unless something was done. I then drew up this ordinance. I made it general, applying both to whites and to the Chinese in reference to it, and it was as a sanitary measure solely, applying both to the whites and to the Chinese.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have you got the ordinance? Can you refer to it in language?—A. I have it not with me.

Mr. PIXLEY. I will produce it as an exhibit. (See Appendix D.)

The WITNESS. It had the desired effect. Then our cubic-air ordinance was enforced, the laws against Chinese gambling were enforced, and a

large number were brought up. They would be fined by the police court $10, for instance, or $20. The fine was generally $10, and before they would pay their fines they would go to prison and serve five days out where they had lodging. The chief of police, or rather the officers in his office, informed me that they did not care in winter, but would as leave board it out; that they were accommodated there with better accommodations than they had in their own dwellings, and they were fed there. This had the effect of making them pay their fines and relieve our jails.

Q. Did this ordinance for cutting the hair provide for cutting the hair before or after conviction?—A. It was brought up after conviction. I think it read—I forget the exact language—that all those convicted by the police court, after conviction, the sheriff was directed to cut the hair of all prisoners within one inch of the head. Then, afterward, I found that they were appealing from the police court to the criminal court, and I then made an amendment, making it applicable also to the criminal court.

Q. Did that ordinance apply to all who were convicted?—A. To all who were convicted.

Q. Or only those who refused to pay their fines and went to prison?—A. O, all who refused to pay their fines and went to prison—any person.

Q. If a Chinaman was convicted and paid his fine he would not have his hair cut?—A. He would not have his hair cut, and nobody else would. I was informed that the first whose hair was cut was a white hoodlum in town here, and it seems to affect them about as badly as Chinamen. They seem to be as much annoyed as the Chinamen do on their hair being cut. I would state, moreover, that from the Chinese whom I found in the hospitals, by information I received from Dr. Bryan, in charge of the hospital, there was a large number of cases from paralysis resulting from Chinese syphilis. As far as possible I tried to obtain the estimate at our hospital. I found there was, as there is now, a very large number who were there under treatment for this Chinese syphilis. I found also in the alms-house the same state of things. I found, even in the industrial school, little boys who did not know in fact whether it was right or wrong, who were not old enough to understand the passions of the race, had been enticed by these women into their dens for the mere purpose of inoculating them with the disease. Captain Wood pointed out to me boys there ruined for life—little boys in our industrial school. I would state, moreover, when I came in I was rather in favor of them. I thought that this prejudice against Chinese was uncalled for. My prejudices, if any, were in favor of the Chinese. Since I have become a member of the board and have seen what I have, my prejudices are very strong against them, and I would do almost anything to get rid of them from our city. I think they are a perfect curse to our State.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know anything about this disease of leprosy?—A. Only what I have seen. I have inquired very thoroughly in reference to it. I have made quite a point upon that matter.

Q. How long does it take to run its course?—A. They tell me about three years. I have conversed with gentlemen from the Sandwich Islands, and they tell me how it originated there. It originated, some from Africans, they say there, and some from Chinese.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is it the same as the Sandwich Islands leprosy?—A. Yes, sir. It

is the same, as the parties who have been there say. I know about a week ago I met with a captain at San Rafael, and he lived there a long time, and he described it very thoroughly to me, and I have talked with other parties.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. I had an idea it ran much longer; that persons might pass from infancy to old age with it?—A. I think not; I think that in three to five years it generally makes its appearance; it did in the Sandwich Islands, they tell me.

Q. How long had these women been afflicted with leprosy?—A. I cannot tell.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Let me understand you. Do you mean it kills a person in from three to five years, or that it develops?—A. No, sir; that it develops after inoculation. They live for years.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. That is what I meant.—A. I misunderstood you.

Q. They live for years?—A. O, yes.

Q. Did you learn how long these women had this leprosy?—A. I cannot tell; they would say, "Me no got leprosy."

Q. Could you not judge from appearance?—A. It developed in different ways. It came out in large projections on their necks, and on their cheeks, and on their noses. There seemed to be a white swelling there; and a good many of them had their nails to tumble out. The body dries up, as it were.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did they suffer pain?—A. They did not seem to. I know one was a terrible case we got on board the vessel. I had some Irish expressmen who lifted them and carried them on board. Two were entirely blind from it, and could not see.

Q. Do you understand that this disease can be communicated otherwise than by actual flesh-contact?—A. I think not. That is my impression; but the Chinese seem to have taken it by sleeping in the room with them.

Q. By their presence?—A. Yes, sir; by their presence. I derive my information from the Chinese; they seem to be afraid of them; they said, "You go on steamer, all get leprosy."

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Dr. Meares gave it as his opinion, the other day, that leprosy was transmitted only from generation to generation; that the child of a parent having the leprosy would have the leprosy. I questioned him pretty closely about that. Have you heard that matter discussed by physicians?—A. No, sir. I think, however, if the parent has the leprosy that his child will have leprosy undoubtedly. I think there is no doubt whatever of that. I think it goes from generation to generation in that way, and, in fact, in different parts. I was reading an account of a lady in Scotland, where it broke out in Scotland, and she got together a number upon her place and walled them in and kept them, and they killed it in that way. I know in the Sandwich Islands they have set apart an island for it, where all the lepers are sent, so as to have them out of communion with the rest of the people. I have studied the thing.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you seen leprosy anywhere else?—A. Never in my life. I have only seen it within a year. I have studied it up pretty thor-

oughly. I have tried to get all the facts I could in regard to it as a public officer.

Q. Who saw this leprosy anywhere else?—A. Several gentlemen had seen it, and they told me it was the same in the Sandwich Islands.

Q. Were they medical gentlemen?—A. No, sir. There was one gentleman from China who had been in the Sandwich Islands. He was there. He saw several of them ill, and he told me that it was exactly the same here as it was in the Sandwich Islands.

Q. People who visit the Sandwich Islands, ordinarily, unless they are medical men, do not go near enough to the lepers to be able to determine the symptoms again when they see it?—A. I have seen, I suppose, twenty persons from the Sandwich Islands, and all seem to know all about leprosy and described the symptoms as being the same there as here.

Q. I think the symptoms you have described are not those of leprosy. This swelling of the neck is not a symptom. That is not leprosy?—A. It is what we call leprosy.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the appearance of the skin?—A. It is sort of whitish. They did not seem to have pain. They told me they suffered none.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. About the time these people appeared to have it, had not these women already been afflicted in this way for a great many years?—A. I think they were afflicted with it a great many years. I think they were brought as lepers from China.

Q. You say in two or three years there will be 500 white persons with the leprosy in this State, and yet these people who have been playing their vocation have been lepers for many years?—A. A couple of years.

Q. Did you ever hear of a white person in this city with leprosy?—A. I could not say positively that such was the case. I heard of a distinguished lawyer from the Sandwich Islands who died of it.

Q. He brought it with him?—A. Yes, sir. The health officer told me here that something must be done; that these women were plying their vocation and that they were receiving a large number of visits every night, and they had for a long time.

Q. But you never heard of one of those having the leprosy?—A. It would hardly have time to develop; that was my idea of it, that the time had not arrived when this would be developed; but, from my information and from the information of the health office and consulting with gentlemen here and consulting with the police as to the number who were visiting these places, I have no kind of hesitation in saying, and I think the facts will be carried out in time, that we will have a colony of lepers resulting from these Chinese.

Q. Does leprosy exist in North America?—A. I have heard of isolated cases. They tell me that there have been isolated cases in the United States on several occasions.

Q. Is there any place where it prevails?—A. Not where it prevails, but it is isolated, as I say.

Q. Is there not one place in Canada where it prevails?—A. I believe there is.

Q. I remember something of that kind.—A. I think that is the only place. I understood there were two cases at one time in Philadelphia, and that they were set apart. That is my information. I state this from information and belief, not, of course, of my own personal knowledge.

Q. The agents of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company understood the opposition made at that time?—A. I do not think Mr. Williams did at that time. I told him afterward I had a few more to ship. He said "No more;" that he could not take them under any consideration.

Q. How do you account for these people being passed at Hong-Kong by our consul?—A. That is a conundrum which I cannot solve. I do not know. I suppose with such a large number as there is on every vessel sailing, with a thousand Chinese, when there will be twelve and thirteen hundred on a vessel, he cannot go in and examine every one. These men are shipped, as is well known, by these companies. They are shipped in a squad. A Chinaman cannot leave this coast on his own account; they will not take him on this commutation. I believe they take them for 12½ dollars. We paid full passages. I paid, I think it was, 52½ or 53 dollars for these fourteen. I told them I would pay full passage. They were put and corraled on the deck behind the capstan.

Q. Is there any restraint on people coming from the Sandwich Islands?—A. Not that I know of. The mayor and board of health gave orders, however, to the quarantine officer to be very careful not to admit any lepers.

Q. Heretofore there has been no restraint?—A. None whatever.

Q. Is not the percentage of lepers in the Sandwich Islands to the population fifty times as great as it is in China?—A. I do not think it is as much as that. I understand that there are colonies of lepers in China. With the large population of China I presume the percentage is greater in the Sandwich Islands.

Q. In the Sandwich Islands they have an island or portion of an island completely peopled with them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There have been a great many people here from the Sandwich Islands going backward and forward, have there not?—A. Not a great many. The travel between the Sandwich Islands and this coast is very small indeed.

Q. In early times did we not get all our potatoes and all our sugar from there?—A. Yes, sir; that, you remember, was in very early times. I do not think we got it after 1853. I know I paid a dollar a pound for potatoes from the Sandwich Islands in 1850.

Q. There would have been ample time for leprosy that came from there to have developed?—A. I do not think that leprosy broke out in those early times.

Q. It has been there for a century.—A. I was not aware of that. They are only confined lately, I believe, to this island. I was talking with a gentleman and his daughter. The daughter is a daughter of the minister of finance there, and I received a great deal of information from them.

Q. In early times did we not have a great many Kanakas here?—A. We had a few seamen, but not a great many.

Q. Precisely; that is just it. The seamen of the vessels were Kanakas?—A. We had some Kanakas. I think the number was very small.

Q. Those seamen are in the habit of finding women in the ports where they enter, are they not?—A. Yes, sir. There were very few women at that time here. They were very scarce.

Q. And they were of poor quality, such as sailors would probably seek out?—A. I do not think they were at that time. There was a very high character of prostitution here at that time. It cost so very high to get to this country.

Q. In regard to this cubic-air ordinance, you say that the jail was crowded. Did you have 1,000 in the jail?—A. No, sir; we had 400 and odd.

Q. Will you please describe that jail, and give its dimensions?—A. I cannot give it to you exactly.

Q. It is very small, is it not?—A. Our jail is small.

Q. And all these cells are on one story?—A. No, sir; on two stories.

Q. The cells occupied by Chinese?—A. The Chinese were mostly kept down in the other prison—that is, the branch prison down below. They were in an upper story. There is a cellar underneath; they were crowded mostly there. That is when I came in. I do not know how it was before I came in office.

Q. They were crowded into a space where they had much less air than that allowed by the ordinance?—A. I do not know that they were; they do bundle together so closely in Chinatown.

Q. I mean to say that they had not 500 feet of cubic air to a man?—A. No, sir; they did not have 500 cubic feet.

Q. Have the white men who are imprisoned in the county jail anything like that quantity?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have they half of it?—A. No, sir; I do not think they have.

Q. Are not those cells very close; that is, have they not very little ventilation indeed—a small opening in the rear wall and a square hole in the door?—A. They have a window in the rear with a large grating, so that they have a great deal of air. There is no trouble about the air. It is very well ventilated, I think, in the lower prison. Our upper prison is a very bad one, and a disgrace to our city, I must acknowledge; but we are building a new city hall, and that is why other arrangements have not been made for them; it is temporary.

Q. We do not consider this part of the city to be long occupied by city business, do we? The center of the city is moving south.—A. It is pushing itself that way; but these buildings will have to be used in addition to the others.

Q. You say the first person whose hair was cut in the county jail was a white man?—A. I understand so.

Q. You say a hoodlum had his hair cut there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was his crime?—A. I do not know. I suppose breaking one of the ordinances. These are mere ordinances.

Q. Those who are confined in the county jail are confined for offenses against the common law, are they not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Criminals?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Not for mere breaches of ordinances?—A. No, sir.

Q. The Chinamen are merely there for breaking this 500 feet of cubic-air ordinance?—A. This is in the police department too. It is just the same as the whites down-stairs.

Q. I am speaking of the county jail.—A. O, yes; the county jail.

Q. It is in the county jail that this ordinance is enforced by the sheriff?—A. No, sir; it is enforced all through; in the county jail upon those guilty of theft, and also in the city prison, upon all convictions in the two courts. Where the fines are not paid, the prisoners are liable to have their hair cut off.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What proportion of the arrests of Chinese, say for the year ending the last of June, 1876, were for violations of the cubic-air ordinance and for prostitution?—A. I could not answer that definitely, or approximately either.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. The hoodlums who are imprisoned are generally confined for crime, are they not?—A. No, sir.

Q. What ordinances do they break?—A. There are several ordinances which they break; general ordinances. There is a certain ordinance in reference to rows and assaults, &c., general drunks, and all that class.

Q. Those are not ordinances. Those are laws.—A. I consider that an ordinance is a law.

Q. But we make a distinction.—A. I dare say lawyers do; I am not a lawyer.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The question is, do your ordinances duplicate the State laws? If the State law, for instance, punishes grand larceny or petit larceny, do you put that also in the shape of ordinances?—A. No, sir; these ordinances are mere municipal regulations.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Your charter confides to you certain subjects on which you may legislate?—A. Yes, sir; we generally legislate on those things which are not covered by the laws of the State.

Q. What is the number of people in the hospital at the present time?—A. About three hundred and forty.

Q. How many of those are Chinamen?—A. None.

Q. Not one?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were you the author of this ordinance to cut off the tails of the Chinamen?—A. I was.

Q. Why did you pass that ordinance?—A. As I have stated here, to free our prisons from criminals.

Q. Was it not because you thought that would be a punishment to them?—A. A punishment to the Chinese?

Q. Yes.—A. It would be an extra punishment.

Q. You intended that it should be an extra punishment?—A. To the general class of people; for the whites the same.

Q. It would not be any punishment to a white man to cut his hair to the length of an inch of his head?—A. A very great punishment.

Q. A great many do that voluntarily?—A. There is a class confined there who do not wish to go around with their short hair. It has made a difference, I understand, among this class of people. They have left their hair grow out because short hair has become to be a mark of disgrace.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If I understand your first statement, it was the failure of the Chinese to pay their fines, and their crowding the prisons, that induced you to draw that ordinance. It was in reference to the Chinese?—A. It was more particularly directed to the Chinese; yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. The object of the law was to prevent the Chinese from submitting to imprisonment?—A. It was to prevent any one from submitting to imprisonment.

Q. You had the Chinese particularly in view?—A. I do not exactly like to answer that question. I know there is a legal point pending on that, and I do not wish to answer it if I can help it.

Q. I understand you to say that there would be a thousand Chinamen in prison, and therefore you devised this plan?—A. There would have been more than a thousand in prison, and I devised the plan to prevent the overcrowding of the prison.

Q. By Chinamen?—A. By Chinamen or any one else.

Q. Do you know how many Chinamen have had their queues cut off there?—A. I could not state, or how many white people.

Q. Have there not been four or five hundred?—A. No, sir; there have not been a hundred.

Q. Have there not been between three hundred and fifty and four hundred?—A. No, sir; not a hundred of them.

Q. Do you think there have been eight or ten white men's hair cut off?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was not that first white man's hair cut as an exhibition rather?—A. That, I believe, is not pertinent to the subject. I understand what you are driving at, and I want to dodge you if I can. This is another case. There is a legal question answering upon this. It is as to whether this applies to Chinamen generally, and I do not care about going into anything like that.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Does the same law exist in your penitentiary?—A. The same in the penitentiary; they cut the hair of a Chinaman and of a white man in our State's prison here. I looked into the law and found it applicable there. There was an ordinance drawn up formerly in reference to the Chinese, cutting off the Chinese queues. That was declared unconstitutional by our State law, as I understand, because it applied to Chinese alone. I think I am correct, and I drew this up so as to apply to all.

Q. Do I understand there is a difference between the penitentiary and State's prison here?—A. No, sir; there is a reform-school.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know the extraordinary cost our city has been to in cleaning up Chinatown lately, or can you approximate in figures the disinfecting and abating the nuisances there, which have been charged upon the city?—A. I do not know; we have paid large bills, I know; the mayor could answer that. It has gone out more of the urgent-necessity fund.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. That is done through the board of health?—A. Through the board of health; not through the board of supervisors.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do the State laws allow you any money to appropriate for that purpose?—A. No, sir; we use the urgent-necessity fund, but I believe the health-office has the power.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the health of Chinatown compared with other parts of the city?—A. That we can hardly answer; we cannot tell when they are sick; if we could, we would like very much to have them in our hospitals to be taken care of, but they have a dread of our hospitals and will not report when they are sick. They will die as in cases of small-pox, and we will find them. I went to the Chinese companies and told them that in our pest-house I cleared one place, and told them they could go there, and have their own doctors, and have everything, if they would only report the cases, so that the cases could be isolated, but we could not do anything about it.

Q. Still you have an opinion as to the comparative health of the Chinese?—A. I cannot tell. They are not reported. I think that the Chinamen are more cleanly in their persons. They bathe every day. The ordinary Chinaman takes a wash every day, and I think in that

way they are comparatively healthy. If it was very unhealthy there we could not tell. The cases of death are very large. I think the numbers reported are much larger than the number of deaths according to the report. I think the health officer's report, if you will look over the statistics, will show that there are more in proportion among the Chinese than among the whites.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Dr. Meares testified to the contrary.—A. He would know better than I do. I say, if you will look over the number of deaths reported it is alarmingly large here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You state the ordinary Chinaman bathes every day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then in point of cleanliness they compare favorably with the Americans?—A. As far as cleanliness of person is concerned, but in their crowding together they breathe foul air, as they always get together and seem to be in herds.

Q. How do they keep the rooms where they live in point of cleanliness?—A. Filthy. There is a stench arising from them. If you go into any Chinese house, or around there, you will find a perfect stench, with the exception of some of the better class of Chinamen. Although I have had very little to do with them, and no intercourse with them, but judge merely from going in that quarter. I have been in several times to look at these buildings they had fitted up, and my attention has been called to it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Have you had your attention called to what they call their hospitals?—A. I have not been there.

Q. Did you accompany Dr. Meares on this fumigation inspection?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know how many convalescents he found there?—A. I do not know. It is the health-office only who have charge of that.

GEORGE W. DUFFIELD sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. What is your connection with the city government, and how long has it been?—Answer. I have been connected with the police department for the last ten years.

Q. Have you been detailed to special duty in the Chinese quarters?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State to the commission the result of your observation and experience as an officer in the Chinese quarter; as to their cleanliness, order, and such matters as have been spoken of here in this investigation.—A. The lower classes of them are a bad class of people. There is a class of Chinamen up there who are very clean—merchants, men who keep store up there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You can state generally your observation among the Chinese.—A. With some of them, the lower class, we have a great deal of trouble; but a portion of them, who keep stores, the merchants, are a very good class of people.

Q. Have you ever had occasion to arrest Chinamen in your profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For what class of crimes?—A. For all classes; larceny, grand larceny, &c.

Q. Crimes of violence?—A. Fighting—cutting one another.

Q. Have you known of their making any assaults on white people, or are the offenses of that kind among themselves?—A. Among themthemselves, principally.

Q. Some time since I noticed in the papers about the running through of a white child by a Chinaman. Do you know anything about that?—A. No, sir; I did not have anything to do with that case.

Q. That did not come under your observation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you find any difficulty in tracing Chinese criminals?—A. Yes; a great deal, sometimes.

Q. What do these difficulties arise from?—A. From others trying to shield them.

Q. Are you able to procure convictions upon Chinese testimony?—A. Sometimes.

Q. As a rule, are you able to do it?—A. They will shield one another a great deal.

Q. Suppose it is a crime of violence against a Chinaman, how about the injured parties—do they testify?—A. As a general thing, if they can get out on bail, they will try to fix it up among themselves.

Q. No matter what the offense may be?—A. No matter what the offense may be, unless it is murder.

Q. Who gives the bail, the Chinamen?—A. As a general thing.

Q. In those operations have you ever been brought in contact with the officers of the Chinese six companies, to know of their intervening to protect criminals?—A. Not a great deal.

Q. You have not had any communication with them on these matters?—A. No, sir.

Q. You do not know what action they take?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the comparative value of Chinese and white testimony in courts, under your observation?—A. It is in favor of the white men, of course.

Q. What is the condition of the Chinese quarter?—A. In the lower class of them it is very dirty.

Q. What do you mean by "the lower class of them?"—A. The poorer class of them.

Q. How large a proportion of the whole?—A. I should think over two-thirds.

Q. Do you know the Globe Hotel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that now largely occupied by Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; it is all occupied by Chinese.

Q. What was that building formerly used for?—A. As a hotel.

Q. Do you know about how many guests it would contain on the American system of hotel-keeping?—A. I do not think over 150.

Q. Are there 150 rooms in it?—A. I do not think there are.

Q. You know how Americans stop at a hotel or a boarding-house. How many rooms are there in it?—A. I never counted them. I should think 100 or 110; something like that.

Q. Are those large rooms or small?—A. Some of them large rooms and some small rooms.

Q. Have the Chinese changed the character of the rooms in that hotel?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How has that been done?—A. In a high-ceiling room they will build a kind of platform and sleep on this platform and make a kind of two stories of it.

Q. Occupy both floors?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About how many will occupy that hotel when it is full, in the

season of the year when there are most Chinese here?—A. I should think there are three or four hundred in it sometimes.

Q. What is the condition of that building as to cleanliness?—A. It is very dirty.

Q. What is the condition of its stairways, floors, &c.?—A. They are dirty.

Q. How about the walls?—A. They are all very dirty.

Q. Black with dirt?—A. Yes, sir; black with dirt.

Q. What is the nature of the dirt around about a place like that and in the alleys leading to it; merely old rags?—A. It has accumulated there for years, since they have been living in it. There are no rags; they have it swept up. They never wash it or clean it. They have men at the Globe Hotel to sweep it up.

Q. Do they scour it?—A. No; they only sweep it up; they never wash it.

Q. What is the condition of the vaults, the out-houses, necessaries, whatever you may call them—the privies?—A. They are very dirty. They have regular pumps and these patent water-closets, where it runs into the open sewer in the street.

Q. What is the smell there?—A. Very bad.

Q. Is it a stench?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What does that arise from, merely from opium, or from excrement and offal?—A. I suppose it is from the filth and dirt that accumulate there.

Q. Mixed with the smell of opium?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you smell opium-smoke there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How extensively is opium smoked in Chinatown?—A. A great deal of it is smoked there. Some Chinamen do not smoke it at all, but a great many do.

Q. What is the proportion of those who do?—A. I can hardly tell that. The smoke of opium is not a bad smell. I like the smell of it myself.

Q. You do not use it yourself?—A. I never took a whiff of it in my life.

Q. I suppose not. But the other stenches you refer to, are they as agreeable?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the occupation of the women in Chinatown?—A. Some of them are prostitutes and some of them are married to Chinamen there.

Q. What proportion are prostitutes, in your observation?—A. I should think about two-thirds.

Q. Are these prostitutes employed otherwise than in that vocation by day?—A. No; I think not.

Q. Are they utilized to make slippers and things of that kind?—A. Some of them lately, since Mayor Bryant and Chief Ellis have got after them so hard, are making button-holes and pantaloons; these shop-made goods the Chinese make.

Q. Do I understand you that that is a cover for prostitution, or is it auxiliary to it?—A. No, sir; they have closed up all their houses principally since Mayor Bryant and Chief Ellis have been in office. I do not think there are over one-half the prostitutes that were there when they came in office.

Q. What has become of them?—A. They have gone to China, and gone to the country.

Q. How many Chinese women have returned to China within the last few months?—A. I cannot tell exactly that. A good many have gone up the country, and a great many have gone to China.

Q. You say a great many. How many do you know of having gone to China?—A. I cannot tell exactly; I was down to a Chinese steamer night before last, and I saw some sixteen of them going on board.

Q. How many are arriving now?—A. None at all.

Q. They go up the country?—A. Some of them.

Q. The larger proportion of them?—A. I cannot tell whether the larger proportion go to China or up the country, but a great many have gone away.

Q. In what sort of places do the Chinese prostitutes live?—A. Very small.

Q. Describe them. Give us their dimensions.—A. Some of them live in rooms 10 by 10, some 12 by 12; they are small rooms; some of them smaller than that.

Q. Are there many of them in a house?—A. In some houses there may be five or six, sometimes only one or two, or two or three.

Q. Do you know, as a policeman, from the information you have had, whether these women are free agents or whether they are property?—A. That I cannot tell.

Q. Did you testify in reference to that before?—A. No, sir; not that I know of.

Q. You gave no opinion as to whether they are bought or sold?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know anything about whether these women ever try to escape and whether they are brought back?—A. I have known them to try to escape.

Q. Do you know of their being brought back?—A. Very seldom. They go away. They go to Mr. Gibson's place very often or come down to the station-house for protection.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Did you not testify before the legislative committee in these words: "I don't think there is any doubt about the women being bought and sold like sheep?"—A. I did not say that.

Mr. BEE. I now enter a protest against calling the witness's attention to any evidence given in this investigation before the senate committee known as the star-chamber committee, in which only one side could be heard. It can be shown here that at the time the testimony was taken pressure was brought to bear, and I think it is no more than right that we should enter a protest right here and now. As this is an entirely different investigation, in which the committee claim their desire to go to the bottom of it, I protest against any witness who has been before this star-chamber investigation being prompted from this book in any manner whatever.

Mr. KING. I should like to state that under all rules of evidence pursued in our courts here it has been customary to call the attention of the witness to statements he has made at any time theretofore, asking him whether he made such statements.

Senator SARGENT. And even statements not made under oath, made on the street or anywhere else, where he admits they were made. I do not know that I ought to allow a grave investigation carried on by our legislature to be characterized as a star-chamber investigation. It is hardly decorous to the gentlemen who represented the committee, or the State legislature.

Mayor BRYANT. The investigation held by the senate committee was held in open session by a board of supervisors from day to day, and every citizen who chose to come forward and testify, or question witnesses, had that right.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Was any pressure brought to bear on you at the time you testified?—A. No, sir.

Q. You testified free and voluntarily?—A. Yes, sir; I do not recollect saying that they were bought and sold like sheep. There is another place where it says that I said they were a nation of thieves. I do not recollect making that remark. I said there were "nests of thieves" among them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are a special police officer, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And paid by the Chinese, and not by the city government?—A. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I would remark in regard to the former investigation that it is not evidence before this committee, but I see no impropriety in referring to it in order to refresh the memory of the witness, or even to call his attention to an answer that he made before, but it would not be proper to refer to that or to any other statement for the purpose of inducing a witness to give the same answer before this committee.

Mr. BEE. Our objection was to Mr. Pixley taking the book and showing it to the witness while he was under examination.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know what they do with their sick and helpless?—A. They have hospitals. The different companies, I believe, have their hospitals.

Q. Do you ever visit these hospitals?—A. Very seldom; not lately.

Q. Do you know how much care they take of them when they are sick?—A. Some of them, I believe, take very good care of their sick, and some do not. I have found them on the street; I have taken them to the city-hall sometimes.

Q. Where they were left by the Chinamen?—A. I do not know whether they got out by themselves, or whether anybody had taken them out.

Q. I suppose you found them sometimes lying on the street?—A. Sitting on the door-steps.

Q. The Chinamen around paying no attention to them?—A. Paying no attention to them.

Q. Have you ever seen the Five Points in New York?—A. It is a long time ago. I was there some twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago.

Q. What do you say as to the portions of Chinatown, occupied by the lower Chinese, as compared with the Five Points?—A. The Five Points never was so bad as Chinatown.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Do you know that the condition of the Five Points has been very much improved of late by the action of the authorities of New York?—A. I have heard so, but I have not been there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You are referring to it as you knew it before, and you say Chinatown is dirtier than that?—A. Yes, sir; dirtier than it was twenty-six or twenty-seven years ago at the Five Points.

Q. What regard have the Chinese for oaths?—A. I do not think they have much regard for oaths.

Q. What is the method of swearing them in court?—A. The same as any other witness.

Q. Have any other means been tried?—A. In 1852,-'3,-'4, they used to burn papers to swear them in court.

Q. Did they use any kind of animals or birds?—A. They do among themselves, I believe.

Q. Has that ever been resorted to in our courts?—A. I have never seen it.

Q. You are a special policeman?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you detailed by the city for that purpose? Have you any connection with the city government?—A. Yes, sir; the same as any other police officers, only I am paid by the Chinese.

Q. You are not paid by the city?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you paid by the Chinese?—A. I collect from the stores up there, on the beat on Jackson street.

Q. Chinese stores?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much from each?—A. Some a dollar, from some a half-dollar, and some two bits.

Q. By the week or day?—A. In a week.

Q. How much does it amount to in the aggregate?—A. I cannot tell exactly. Sometimes I get more.

Q. What is about the average?—A. I cannot exactly tell the average.

Q. How long have you been collecting it?—A. Within the last five years. I never kept an account.

Q. Does it amount to $25 a week?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does it amount to $50?—A. Sometimes.

Q. Does it amount to a hundred?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you receive any salary or pay from the city itself?—A. No, sir.

Q. It all comes from the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As to the amount that you collect from the Chinese, how is it assessed? Do you fix the amount yourself which each one is to pay?—A. No, sir; they pay me just what they think fit.

Q. Do you make any demand upon them?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are they under any obligation to pay?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do they have any voice in your election as a policeman, or are you appointed without consultation with them?—A. Generally I have a petition signed by them.

Q. Were you appointed upon such a petition?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why is this arrangement made in regard to Chinese by which they pay you?—A. It has been the custom for years, for the last twenty-four or twenty-five years—ever since the Chinamen have been here.

Q. Are there special policemen for other parts of the city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they paid by white people, in the same way?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is not, then, peculiar to the Chinese at all?—A. O, no, sir.

Q. How many policemen in the city are there who are dependent upon the contributions of the people for their support?—A. I think two hundred and fifty or two hundred and seventy-five.

Q. Who are dependent upon contributions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who get no salary whatever from the city government?—A. No, sir.

Q. And you say there is no ordinance or law that makes it obligatory upon either the whites or Chinese to pay these special policemen?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is a voluntary matter, for their own security?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I think they are generally night-watchmen.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are your duties both day and night, or confined to night?—A. Both day and night.

Q. You spoke in regard to the condition of Chinatown, its filth and want of cleanliness. How does it compare with other parts of the city?—A. The streets in Chinatown are just as clean as they are in other parts of the city.

Q. How is it with regard to the alleys?—A. The alleys are dirtier than the alleys in other parts of the city.

Q. Are there other parts of the city which are dirty and low and in bad condition, as well as the Chinese quarter?—A. I have never seen any as bad as they are.

Q. Are there other quarters of the city inhabited by a low order of white people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there some parts of the city where streets and alleys are given up to white population?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do those streets and alleys compare with Chinatown?—A. They are a great deal cleaner.

Q. In those quarters of the city is the population dense? Do they live a good many in one house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you tenement-houses here which are greatly crowded by white people?—A. I do not know of any.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you been on the Pacific docks when a Chinese steamship was leaving for China, frequently?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you not know that officers stand at the gang-plank and collect a poll-tax from these men leaving for China?—A. I have seen it done.

Q. Have you seen them collect the tax from any white passengers going on board?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where do these Chinamen go when a cargo of a thousand or twelve hundred arrive? Where do they distribute them, around among these houses generally?—A. Each man goes to his own company-house.

Q. Is that company-house kept vacant to receive them, or do they simply mix in with the others?—A. They mix in with the others. They go to their stores, and one place or another.

Q. Where do the women go when they arrive, four or five hundred at a time?—A. Sometimes they take them into their stores, and sometimes into their houses.

Q. Is there any special house for them?—A. No, I do not know that there is.

Q. Is there any regular depot for them?—A. No, sir.

Q. They are distributed around through their houses?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many special policemen are there besides yourself in Chinatown?—A. Some six or seven besides myself.

Q. They are supported in the same way?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By voluntary contributions on the part of the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will ask you if special policemen are more numerous in Chinatown, for the population, than in other parts of the city?—A. They are.

Q. If the Chinese did not support them voluntarily, would they be there at all?—A. No, sir, they would not.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Do you render any account or statement to the department of the moneys that you receive?—A. No, sir.

Q. You collect what you please?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you not received as high as five hundred dollars some months?—A. No, sir; I think not.

Q. Well, about that sum?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the largest amount that you have ever received?—A. I cannot exactly tell; I have never kept an account. I collect every week and never keep an account.

Q. I do not want to press you if you cannot remember, or if it is really a matter of business that you would not like to explain.—A. No, sir; I never keep an account. I collect every week, and do not keep an account of what I collected by months.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Would it not be in the power of a policeman to oppress these people; that is, to make exactions upon them by threats and otherwise, and make large contributions?—A. No, sir; I do not think it would.

Q. Is it not a position capable of being greatly abused?—A. It might be if the party saw fit to do it.

Q. It depends, then, very much on the character of the policeman, whether he uses it for the purposes of oppression or not?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. A bad man might oppress them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there not a place called the barracoon, some depot for these women that arrive?—A. I cannot state. I probably saw it in the paper.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You never saw the place?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Were you appointed at the solicitation of the Chinamen living in the neighborhood of your beat?—A. No, sir; I went on that beat because another man resigned off of it, and I went on in his place.

Q. At your own solicitation?—A. The police commissioners appointed me for the position.

Q. At your request?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you purchase the beat from the man who went off?—A. No, sir.

Q. You paid him nothing at all?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Is not that considered one of the most profitable beats in the city?—A. I do not know that it is.

Q. What is the regular pay of a policeman when paid by the city?—A. $125 a month.

Q. Those who are usually employed as special policemen are employed as watchmen; they are only on at certain hours of the night, are they not?—A. Some are not and some are.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Can you not state to the committee what your probable receipts are for a year?—A. No, sir; I cannot.

Q. Can you not come within four or five hundred dollars of it?—A. I do not think I could.

Q. You keep no books; make no entries?—A. No, sir.

Q. Nothing of that sort?—A. No, sir.

Q. You think you could not come within four or five hundred dollars of your probable receipts?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Are you engaged in any other business or occupation from which you derive any income or profit?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are engaged in cleaning the streets?—A. I pay for that from what I get from the Chinese. It costs forty to fifty dollars a month to clean the street there.

Q. You get pay from the Chinese for that?—A. I pay for it out of what the Chinese pay me.

Q. Do you own a cart?—A. No, sir.

Q. How do you clean the street?—A. I have a white man to clean it.

Q. With a cart?—A. Yes, sir. He goes around every morning and cleans it.

Q. Who imposes that duty upon you, the Chinamen or the city?—A. The Chinese of course want somebody to take the dirt away, and I employ this man and pay him himself.

Q. You agreed to perform this duty?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you faithfully perform that duty?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, if the street is unreasonably dirty the fault falls on you?—A. It would fall on me, and the men who clean the streets. I generally look after that myself.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Why do you not extend that care to the alleys where the Chinese live?—A. I do. I attend to all of it.

Q. I understand you to say that they are very dirty?—A. They are dirty, but they are swept every day and kept clean.

Q. I have seen, in some of those alleys, vaults overflowing into the alley, so that there is great danger when a white man is going by that he will lose his breakfast or dinner.—A. That does not belong to the police department. The health-officer looks after that.

Q. The Chinese pay for doing it, but what is the use of sweeping under such circumstances?—A. I have nothing to do with the vaults, back-houses, and things of that kind.

Q. Where they overflow into an alley?—A. I have never seen them overflowing into an alley.

Q. Where is your beat?—A. On Jackson street.

Q. Do the alleys run out on Jackson street?—A. Yes, sir.

Senator SARGENT. That is the locality I referred to.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is the rest of the city cleaned in that way?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. How is the rest of the city cleaned?—A. By the superintendent of streets.

Q. Does the superintendent of streets perform this duty on your beat?—A. I have seen corporation carts up there but twice in five years since I have been on the street.

Q. Then the corporation neglects its duty and you perform it on your private arrangement with the Chinamen?—A. I have seen a corporation cart there but twice in five years since I have been on the street.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. There are no means provided by the city up there for removing the dirt?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is the street-cleaning here by the corporation carts paid for out of the general tax levied by the city?—A. I believe it is.

Q. Why would not duty apply as well in Chinatown as to other parts of the city?—A. I suppose they come up there and see that the street does not want cleaning, and that is the reason why the street is not generally cleaned by them.

Q. It is because the Chinese pay for cleaning up the streets themselves?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose these alleys are dirtier than any other parts of the city, would they not still require the attention of the corporate authorities?—A. They are dirty, but there is no garbage, or anything like that. Where a man can sweep them up, they sweep them up and clean them.

Q. You spoke about the alleys being dirtier than any other parts of the city. Why does not that require the attention of the corporate authorities?—A. I do not know, I am sure.

Q. Are there any officers here required to go around and see the condition of the different streets and alleys?—A. I believe there are.

Q. If they should visit these alleys and find them in the condition you described awhile ago, why would they not give notice of it and have them attended to?—A. I do not know, I am sure.

Q. Would the Chinese attend to cleaning up the streets themselves, pay you for it to have it done for them, if the corporate authorities attended to it?—A. I do not think they would.

Q. Do they not save their money when they can, generally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would they voluntarily spend their money to do this if the city would do it for them?—A. I do not think they would.

Q. Then they pay you for having it done because the city does not do it?—A. I guess that is the reason.

Q. If you are thus authorized to have the streets cleaned for the Chinese, and they pay you for it, why do you not see that these alleys are kept clean?—A. I do see that the alleys are kept clean as well as the streets, but they sometimes will bring the dirt out and pour it on to the alley, while they will not pour it out on the street because they would be afraid of getting arrested.

Q. When put on the alley, why do you not have it carried off?—A. I do.

Q. Then these alleys are kept in as good a condition as other alleys?—A. As a general thing; but they will bring dirt out and put it on the alleys.

Q. And when you find it out you have it taken away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then this thing of placing dirt in alleys is not peculiar to Chinatown?—A. I do not know about that.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did you ever know of the city cleaning an alley any where?—A. I do not know that I have.

Q. If these Chinamen should carry it out to the sidewalk and put it in receptacles, would the city provide means for taking it away?—A. No, sir.

Q. If they carried it out into the alley and put it in iron tubs, would the city provide means for removing it?—A. No, sir; they could not do that when I have seen their carts there but twice in five years.

Q. Have the city any authorities up there?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. Coo has been up there every day.

Q. Who is he?—A. A health-officer.

Q. Has that been the general practice, or only lately?—A. Since Mayor Bryant has been in office it is done more regularly.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there a certain part of Chinatown which is within your jurisdiction, so to speak?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Certain streets and alleys which you attend to?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the rest of Chinatown under the supervision of other special policemen like yourself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they perform the same duties in other parts that you do in yours?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean to say that you have seen these corporation-carts in any part of Chinatown but twice in five years?—A. I am only talking about my own beat.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. How much have you seen them in other parts of Chinatown?—A. I cannot exactly tell you.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What is your beat?—A. Jackson street, from Dupont to Stockton.

Q. Just two blocks?—A. One block.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. You were an old police-officer before you were a special?—A. I was on the police in 1853 and 1854, and I think I have been a special policeman for ten years.

Q. Are you aware of the ordinance that requires people to keep their filth from being thrown on the street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you aware that it requires every citizen throughout the city to keep the street clean, and not throw dirt on the street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know by what mode the streets of the whole city are cleaned?—A. They are cleaned by the corporation.

Q. In what mode?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you not know that there is a contract by a company to sweep the streets by machines?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that they go and sweep them out and cart and haul off the dirt?—A. Yes, sir.

ARNOP BAINBRIDGE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are a police-officer of the city and county of San Francisco?—Answer. I am, sir.

Q. For how many years?—A. About seven years and eight months.

Q. Have you any special knowledge of the Chinese and their quarters?—A. I think I have.

Q. State first to the committee the general condition of Chinatown as to cleanliness?—A. As to the internal portion of Chinatown—that is, the interior of the buildings—they are generally filthy. The streets are kept as clean as they can be under the existing population, I should judge. As Mr. Duffield stated, and as I know, the streets are cleaned under the system that he speaks of three mornings in the week before daylight, or just at daylight. The Chinamen bring their filth and dirt that has accumulated during the interim out in baskets, and dump them in the streets, for the carts to bring away.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say the dirt is taken out in baskets to be carried away?—A. The Chinamen bring it in baskets to the gutter. They generally put it out probably between 12 and 3 in the morning, and the carts come at half past 3 to 4, according to the season of the year, and work until they have carried it all off. I do not know that the amount of filth brought out lessens the amount of filth inside; hardly, I should judge, from the indications and appearances.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the fact in reference to the numbers inhabiting their quarters? Are they crowded or otherwise?—A. They are very much crowded. They pay less rent individually, probably, than any other class of people in the world, and still they pay a greater rent for a building in the aggregate, by probably one hundred per cent., than any of our poorer classes of white residents.

Q. As to their dormitories or sleeping-apartments, how many in the more crowded population—that is, in the winter season—would be put into a room of this size, say 22 feet square?—A. I have seen as many as 40 and 50 in a room of this size. Usually in a room like this they would have an upper deck—a second floor. They would make two stories of this place, raise a floor, elevated enough to be able to walk underneath, and have sleeping arrangements above, too, in the whole distance across the room.

Q. Would these people also cook in the same rooms?—A. Generally. In some of the more crowded places, where the smoke would be a little more than they could stand, they would take their cooking out into a general hallway. Their cooking appliances generally are composed of a coal-oil can, or something of that kind, and a brick in the bottom. That is about the extent of their cooking-stoves generally, but of course some of them are a little better arranged. The common rabble generally make a furnace of a coal-oil can, or something of that description.

Q. What is their principal food?—A. The staple is rice. There are a great many other articles that I have not been able to find out, and it is impossible to describe them.

Q. Is dried fish an article of their food?—A. Dried fish is another of the ingredients of their living.

Q. Rice, dried fish, and desiccated vegetables?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And tea?—A. Tea is a staple with them as a beverage—that is, with the better classes. I cannot say as much for the lower class. It is very seldom I have seen tea used among the lower grade to any extent. The better grades have nice comfortable tea-pots to keep the tea warm, and they will keep a tea-pot standing continually almost in that condition.

Q. Have you any opinion or judgment as to the cost of supporting, say, fifty Chinese of the kind you speak of, in a room of the kind you mention? What would it cost to board fifty of them a day under such circumstances?—A. Including their lodging?

Q. Including their lodging.—A. I think in the style of living that I allude to—that is, for the lower grade of workmen Chinamen, or thieving Chinamen, or anything of that kind—probably $10 a day would cover the whole institution.

Q. That would be the cost for fifty Chinamen?—A. For fifty men—that is, provided one individual had the purchasing and disbursement of the money.

Q. That is twenty cents apiece a day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are this class of which you speak the adult working male population?—A. They are—that is, I speak of working-men. A great many idlers or vagrants, whom I should term thieves among them, live in about the same style.

Q. Does not this embrace the character of the people who go out to work in our factories, shoe-shops, tobacco-factories, tailor-shops, and things of that kind?—A. That is, when they originally start into work. They improve when they work well, and accumulate some of our silver coin, and occasionally they live at restaurants. There are a great many in the Chinese locality, where for five or ten cents a Chinaman can get a bowl of soup, according to the grade of their custom.

Q. Then it is your opinion that an adult Chinese male laborer, such as work in boot, or shoe, or tobacco and other mercantile establishments, can be supported in point of food and lodging at twenty cents a day?—A. I think it is done in the manner I speak of—that is, for one person to have the disbursing of all the money, providing the provisions, and paying the rent.

Q. State to the commission the result of your observation of the gamblers, prostitutes, and criminals of the Chinese population and quarter.—A. As to prostitution, in my capacity, when patrolling on the streets in Chinatown, I have often been called in to suppress disturbances in places I should term houses of prostitution. I have found men in their dishabille, and women in the same way; and they are very low. They have no shame as to exposing their person, or explaining or talking about the act that they were about to consummate, or had consummated. They never seem to display any shame at all; it seemed to be a natural thing to them, as if they had been educated from the cradles to it, and knew nothing else but that style of life.

Q. What is the general size of their rooms and their accommodations? Describe the ordinary small brothel which stands upon one of these alleys.—A. Taking an individual room, a single room that is used for the purpose, probably the very extent would be 6 by 8, and some of them even less, just room enough for a small narrow bed and its length, and room to turn the door and get in.

Q. How many women would be in that place?—A. I am speaking of one room that would be occupied, but usually they have a little front. For instance, they would hire premises half the width of this room and the depth of this room. They would apportion a small space for a kind of reception-room, which the madam or the boss lady of the house will use as her reception-room, and the girls will congregate around her. If a customer would come in, they of course would attend to him. Probably this space might be 10 feet in frontage, and then they divide the balance of that space into three rooms, or if it is wide enough, three on either side, probably 6 by 8 feet in dimensions. The partition scarcely ever runs more than 6 or 7 feet above the floor. It never goes to the ceiling except in extraordinary cases, where they have these places upstairs in buildings.

Q. Give us some idea about their gambling and opium-smoking. As to opium, is there anything here known as an opium-den?—A. Latterly, since the ordinance went into effect, I have not had much chance of observation on the outside; but from my experience when I was on the outside, before this ordinance came into operation, I saw a great deal of it. I never entered a Chinese domicile of any kind, or a store, but what I saw the signs—that is, the platforms they have for lying on, and their pipes, and sundry other signs or symbols of the practice. Every watch, probably, that I ever served on upon the street at the time, I saw them

under the influence of it. On various occasions I have had visitors that I have shown around, and invariably I could take them in and show them any amount of Chinamen under the influence of opium. As I suggested to the gentlemen yesterday, if all the Chinamen who were drunk were on the streets, we should have more Chinese arrested for drunkenness under the influence of opium than white people under the influence of whisky; but they draw on it until they become insensible and go on and lie there and slumber it off, probably two or three hours at a time.

Q. In relation to their gambling-rooms, what are their games, and how are they conducted?—A. What is termed tan is the principal game. I cannot go into special details of the game, but I can give a general idea of it. It is played with small cash pieces, a small brass Chinese coin with a square hole in the center. They will have a large pile of them, probably three or four hundred. The dealer sits at the end of the table. He has an inverted bowl that he uses—a tin bowl usually. These pieces are all scrambled up together in a heap, and the dealer places a cup on the top. While the cup remains there they make their bets, and the moment he gives the word the bets are closed. He has a piece of whalebone stick, a little tapered, brought down to a little bow on one end. He rakes out the pieces by one, two, three, four. They are all counted except the last four. They make their bets as to whether one will be left, or two, three, or four, or whether it is even or odd on the four last counted. He takes all those at the edge of the bowl first, and when he raises the bowl the betting is stopped, and he counts those under the bowl. If one is remaining, and a man bets that one will remain, he gets four. If he bets that it is even, and it comes two, he gets the amount—that is, two—or if he bets odd and it comes one, either way.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many persons can play at once?—A. I have seen as many as sixty sit around a table at once.

Q. Is it a game of chance or skill?—A. It is ostensibly a game of chance, but it can be made a game of skill. By seeing the amount of money on the table, if quick with his fingers, which most of them usually are, a man can make it odd or even.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Does not the dealer always know the amount of cash in the bowl?—A. I imagine he could tell.

Q. So that if the bets run for odd he could make it come out even?—A. He could have a piece in his sleeve, or somewhere else, that would come down among them while he was handling the pieces.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. What is the object of this bowl being placed on the table?—A. That is a merely preliminary measure to their betting. The pile is too large, of course, for the bowl to cover the whole quantity, but it covers the center portion, which is the beginning of the heap.

Q. Are the coins under the bowl counted?—A. Everything is counted finally. The betting stops the moment the dealer gives the word that the bowl will be taken up. While he is taking the marginal pieces they are putting down their coin, but the moment the bowl is to be lifted the betting has to stop.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Can more than one person win at the same game?—A. Fifty or sixty at a time might win if it came their way—that is, provided they all bet one way, and it comes their way.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Is the betting with the dealer?—A. It is similar to any ordinary game. The dealer is the banker. Generally, if it is a large game, there is a kind of paying-teller, who sits beside the dealer and attends to the cash, I presume what Frenchmen would call a croupier, to rake in the money and pay out the debts.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. It is pretty much rake it in, I suppose?—A. That would be the general consequence. Moreover, I believe there is a certain percentage that I never could get at thoroughly. A great many Chinamen claim they can tell you all about it, but they always retain the better part of the information. When they undertake to give any information of that kind they will tell you enough to satisfy you apparently.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is the betting large or small?—A. Generally from ten cents to half a dollar. I have seen some Chinamen who appeared to be better off in funds than others betting from $5 to $10.

Q. Have they many professional gamblers who make that a business solely, or is it an amusement for the people?—A. It is a natural passion with them, I think.

Q. Are there professional gamblers among them?—A. I think there are more professional gamblers in proportion to the population of the Chinese than of any other class of people in the world except Indians; but Indians are not professional, they are general gamblers. Really, more Chinamen seem to live off the receipts of gambling-houses, and by being connected with and attached to them, seeming to have no other business, than any other class of people.

Q. Is this gambling open? Can anybody go into these places?—A. No, sir; I think it would be very hard for any white man to get in under any circumstance, within the last year or two. I know that I have often attempted it. I believe I made the first arrest in the tan business, where I convicted the dealers, that was made here within the last ten years. That was some five years ago. I struck a portly Chinaman, and I walked up briskly close to him, and got by the doorkeeper before he saw me. No one saw me until I was standing alongside of the dealer. If I had been seen, the door would have been closed in my face immediately, and a bar, probably stronger than an ordinary Gibraltar, would have been placed across it in an instant. They now have doors three and four inches thick, that would take a corps of army engineers to get through.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is there more than one door to their rooms?—A. Sometimes there is an outside door and then an inner door, but generally if they get the first door closed on you that is all that is necessary under the circumstances, for that gives them all an opportunity to get out through a scuttle or window, and by the time you get there you find nothing. My opinion is, if the authorities would authorize the police to use battering-rams or grape and canister in order to enter these gambling-houses the Chinese would get upon the roof and have their games there. I do not think it could be stopped under any legal restriction at all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do they carry on a system of lotteries here?—A. They do.

Q. Do you know anything about that particularly?—A. Generally I

know about it. I know that they have a system of lotteries, and it is in practice, as near as I can understand it, (and I have seen a great deal of it,) on the same principle precisely as the policy business in the Eastern States when I was there a boy. I can recollect something about policy-shops in New York City, and the Chinese lotteries seem to be upon the same principle.

Q. Is there a general passion for gambling on the part of the Chinese?—A. I think it is a natural passion with them—that nothing could cure them. I do not believe that there is a Chinese individual in the State of California to-day who does not gamble more or less. I may be mistaken as to one or two.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You were speaking about their cost of living. What is the general result with Chinamen who work them? Do they lay up money? Do they accumulate?—A. Hardly. You may find a few in the washing business here who may accumulate a little money, but gambling is such an inveterate passion with them that it nearly all goes that way. Very rarely will you find any of them who can raise any considerable amount of money, unless it is some of our merchants who handle all the money. You may say it eventually goes to them; I believe the most of it.

Q. The mass of the workingmen, you think, do not accumulate?—A. I think not—that is, especially the city population. In the country Chinamen who work occasionally bring down a few dollars, and if they get away to China quickly, or if allowed to go, they take it with them.

Q. What do they do with their accumulations? Have they banks of deposit, or how do they keep their money?—A. I know some of them keep it with Chinese merchants. They act as bankers.

Q. Do they deposit with the six companies?—A. No; each individual generally intrusts his funds to the inspector or head men of his own company. Of course the six companies hold their meetings to adjust their own matters, but individually the Chinese generally intrust their funds and all their business-matters into the hands of the more intelligent portion of their own company.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What do you mean by their own company?—A. For instance, each of the six companies, we will say the Le Yung Company, has its inspector.

Q. You mean one of the six companies?—A. Yes, sir; the company which they claim to belong to, and which they are apparently subject to.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That would be depositing with the officer of one of the six companies?—A. Yes, sir; that has been the result of my observation among them. They do not go outside to intrust it to any one.

Q. They do not use your banks of deposit here ordinarily?—A. No, sir; the merchants of course have to use our banks as business-men, but not the working-classes.

Q. You have no small savings-banks which the Chinese use here?—A. No, sir; nothing of the kind that I am aware of.

Q. You spoke about the interior of the dwellings. How are they as to health?—A. Actually I do not see how they retain their health in the atmosphere they live in. I have had occasion to visit sick or wounded Chinamen interested in cases I was connected with. I recollect one case where a Chinaman shot another through the shoulder and shat-

tered his shoulder-blade into small pieces with a heavy navy revolver. I had him taken to the city-hall and cared for there by our own physicians, but that did not suit them. His friends were continually urging to get him away and to get him home. Eventually they bothered me so much that I got the consent of the prosecuting attorney to let him go. I was very much afraid that I would not see him again, but they promised very faithfully that I should know his whereabouts. So I called up to see him one day, in Sacramento street, under one of the large stores there, in a basement. I went down probably eight or ten steps. The basement on either side was built up with small compartments about the size of an ordinary steamer state-room, not as large as a family state-room, not much larger than a compartment in a sleeping-car. The atmosphere in the passage-way was so terrific that I almost lost my breath, and I had been used to a great many places that were not very agreeable. When I got to the room and around it I found this Chinaman lying there with his sore covered up with a large patch of some kind of medical stuff that these Chinese doctors cover over all wounds. It was suppurating and festering, and it seems this thing was merely to keep the matter from getting out of his system. The only inference I could draw was that the whole thing ran into the man's system and permeated it all through. I asked him, "How do you live here?" He said, "Very good." I told him, "I am surprised that you can live in this atmosphere, in the condition you are in, for I do not see how a healthy man could survive." That is about a fair average of the places the common class reside in.

Q. Are there Chinese hospitals under the supervision of these six companies?—A. There are three or four places in the city that are called hospitals or asylums. The Kin Yung Company has one on Broadway. That is called an asylum or hospital, but I have been there several times and have never seen any indications that there is any medical attendance or anything of that kind there. I have seen them lying around on the floor, but I never saw anything that would denote that there was any medical attendance given them whatever. I have been in the old Se Yup buildings on Pine street. That was the first one of the kind, I believe, built here. I have had occasion to go there at late hours of the night. I have been there several times and never could see any sign of medical attention given to any one. I have seen them there apparently under the weather and sick.

Q. Have they professional physicians here?—A. They have men who advertise and call themselves physicians.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the nature of the medicines which they use?—A. Really, I could not give any idea. I know that several of the doctors here claim to cure almost anything with herbs and roots, vegetable products of different kinds.

Q. Have you ever seen any snakes or things of that kind imported for medicines?—A. I have heard talk of such things, but I have never seen any of them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. When the Chinese are sick or wounded do they themselves desire to be conveyed to Chinese hospitals or quarters?—A. I know that in a great many cases they have so desired, but I think it has been under pressure, where the trouble has been among themselves. It is a matter of dollars and cents. You can break a Chinaman's neck for a few dollars, or do anything of that kind. That is the result of my observation.

It is all dollars and cents. If he is wounded or cut, or anything of that kind, and the other party can approach his friends, they will try and settle the matter up with money, and get him away so as not to be able to reach him for the purpose of testifying, and that will be the end of the case.

Q. Do they appear to have more confidence in their own medical treatment than in ours?—A. Really, I do not think they do—that is, the longer their residence here, the better they understand our usages, and they learn to have more confidence in our physicians.

Q. Do the Chinese merchants, those in good condition, never employ American physicians?—A. Yes; I think they do. I do not recollect any special instances now. I have a general idea that I have known some of our noted physicians here to have Chinese cases among the merchants and better classes of Chinese.

Q. Is it a common thing?—A. No; I do not think it is a common thing.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you not seen in Chinatown a great variety of vegetables that you do not have at all?—A. I have.

Q. Good-looking?—A. Good-looking.

Q. Are there not many markets there?—A. There are.

Q. Very well supplied with vegetables and meats?—A. A great many vegetables used in making soups.

Q. Do not the Chinese use a great quantity of pork?—A. A great quantity. The better part of the pork is sent to white butchers in the market and cured by them.

Q. I have seen large four-horse teams, the wagons filled with carcasses of hogs. What are they intended for?—A. They are intended for the pork-shops there, and if you stay until 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning you will see the hams and sides taken down to our curers here for sale.

Q. Do not our white people do the same thing?—A. But that is the end of it with the Chinese. They keep the offal, the rough parts.

Q. The viscera?—A. I am not learned in Latin, or in classic language.

Q. I suppose you have seen white people use the same thing for making sausage?—A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. Do not the Chinese use smoked hams, and sell them in the markets and stores?—A. I do not recollect ever seeing a smoked ham—that is, smoked after our style—for sale in the Chinese market.

Q. Are there not many in the Chinese restaurants?—A. There are a great many.

Q. Are not these Chinese restaurants well supplied with a variety of food?—A. Yes.

Q. Wines, champagne?—A. You can have any thing you call for in some of them.

Q. You referred to the subject of gambling. As I understand you when the bowl is put down upon the pile no one can tell how many pieces are under the bowl?—A. No one can tell.

Q. The pile is much larger than what the bowl covers?—A. Yes, sir; it would take two bowls of that size to cover the pile usually.

Q. Then the bets are made as to what pieces are under the bowl?—A. The betting closes them. The betting is going on while the dealer is counting the marginal pieces on the outside.

Q. Does he count those?—A. He counts all those. The whole pile must be counted; and when he says stop, and raises the bowl, no more money is to be put down after that.

Q. What are the usual stakes?—A. As I said before, I have seen as high as five and ten dollars bet on occasions, but very rarely. The bets are from ten cents to half a dollar, usually.

Q. What becomes of the money finally? You say it is lost in gambling.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who gets it?—A. The Chinese gentlemen who back the game, as a usual thing, I presume.

Q. The bank?—A. The bank gets it.

Q. The bank only gets ten per cent.—A. Then it is distributed among the supporters of the bank.

Q. What becomes of it finally?—A. Probably it goes into merchandise. My general belief is that nearly every one of them is interested in more or less gambling or more or less houses of prostitution.

Q. Then the laboring class, according to your idea, do not send much money out of the country.—A. I do not think they do.

Q. Do not the companies take care of all the sick that belong to their companies?—A. I do not think they do. A great many of them are put out in the street, and found helplessly in the street.

Q. Is there not a considerable number of Chinamen who do not belong to the companies?—A. There are some poor unfortunates who come from a different province in China, and do not seem to have any friends among them.

Q. Can you say that the sick who were left uncared for do not belong to that class?—A. I know in several instances, where they have belonged to companies here, they were left uncared for where they were past being producers hereafter. I presume that was the cause of their being neglected.

Q. Do you know whether they had paid their dues to their company, according to the rules of the company?—A. I do not know that. I do not know whether they have any dues to pay, of my own knowledge.

Q. Do you not know that each member is required to pay an initiation fee into the companies?—A. I do not know of my own knowledge. I have heard that they have to pay a great many fees, which generally saps up most of their earnings; but the truth of it is I cannot verify it by my own knowledge.

Q. They pay fees to the companies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do the companies carry on any business as companies?—A. Not that I know of. I do not think any of them do; only as individuals.

Q. When yeu say they are in the habit of depositing money with the officers or members of their company, you mean that they deposit money with them as individuals?—A. No, I think not.

Q. Do you mean to say that they deposit money with their company?—A. For general security, thinking it is safer for them, probably, than it would be in turning it in. I presume it is almost incumbent upon them to do so. The presumption I have in the matter is that they are compelled to do it; that if they have any money to put away, they must do it or keep it themselves.

Q. You think they do not know any better than to put it there?—A. I think it is probably a kind of fear that they have of the powers above them that would incite them to deposit their money under care of the company.

Q. Have the Chinese doctors had considerable practice among the white population here?—A. One of them has.

Q. Who is that?—A. Li Po Tai. At one time there was considerable demand for him here.

Q. How many Chinese doctors are there regularly practicing as doc-

tors?—A. I think I know about a dozen, but I cannot name them, because none of them are so celebrated as Doctor Li Po Tai.

Q. Is it not quite customary for these Chinese doctors to advertise in American papers?—A. Yes, sir; I have seen four or five advertise for several years.

Q. Do not the Chinese generally call in the attendance of a Chinese physician?—A. Generally.

Q. When they call in an American physician it is exceptional?—A. It is.

Q. Is it not a general rule that the Chinese doctors do not amputate?—A. I never knew of a Chinese doctor performing the operation of amputation since I have been connected with the department or board.

Q. And when they want a surgical operation performed they send for a white physician?—A. Generally. They seem to be averse to losing any portion of the frame if they can help it.

Q. As a general rule have not the Chinamen who are brought here from China, the laboring classes who come in, generally more confidence in their own physicians and in their own medical treatment?—A. They have, most undoubtedly; they were born to that.

Q. It is only those who have been here some time who would prefer other physicians?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you seen the better class of merchants, and we will say the scholars and students in these mission-schools, gambling?—A. I cannot say that I have.

Q. You have stated that they are, as a nation, as a community, all gamblers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you base that statement on your opinion. You say you have not seen this class gambling?—A. I base it on my opinion, from a general knowledge formed of the whole class of people. I have seen men I have known to be connected with the missions in the vicinity of gambling-houses and around such places, but I cannot say that I actually saw them gambling.

Q. Are you acquainted with the character of the Mexican people?—A. I think I am.

Q. Did you ever see a Mexican, high or low, who was not an inveterate gambler?—A. I never did, to my knowledge.

Q. Then there is another nationality on earth equal to the Chinese?—A. I class the Mexicans among the darker races—with the Indians. More or less of the same trait runs in their veins.

Q. Are there not cases of buying for purposes of prostitution among whites?—A. There are some cases.

Q. Do not the Chinese butcher supply all the white butchers with pork exclusively? Have they not monopolized that business?—A. I do not know that they furnished enough to supply all, but I know that they supply the best part of the animal to our butchers. They buy from the killer and they sell to the curer.

Q. You stated that you thought there was an improvement going on among this class of people. Upon what do you base that opinion?—A. The Chinese generally?

Q. The Chinese.—A. I think there is an improvement by their connection and association occasionally with white workmen, where they are employed and associate with white workmen.

Q. Their condition is becoming better?—A. They become a little more civilized in their manner and a little more cleanly in their habits.

Q. They have a great reverence for their queues, have they not?—A. They seem to have. What it is based on I could not say, but I know they consider it almost an indignity for one to touch their queue.

Q. Do you not look upon it as an indignity to cut off their queues?—A. I would not do so, unless it was a thief.

Q. They cut off their queues for infringing upon the cubic-air ordinance?—A. I have heard so. I believe they cut off the hair of all prisoners incarcerated in the county jail by conviction and sentence.

Q. Do you not know that this gambling-game is simply a game of odd and even? They bet on the pieces under the bowl?—A. That is what I said. They can bet on the single 1, or on the 2, 3, or 4, and the winnings will be proportionately greater as they take the greater chances.

JAMES R. ROGERS sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are a police-officer of the city of San Francisco?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you a special or regular officer?—A. A regular officer.

Q. How long have you been in that position?—A. About six years.

Q. State, in answer to interrogatory four, what you know in relation to Chinese women, their condition of freedom or servitude, and as to the pursuit of their calling here in San Francisco?—A. As far as the Chinese women are concerned in San Francisco, with very few exceptions, I look upon them as prostitutes. The exceptions are very rare where they are not prostitutes.

Q. How as to their being free women?—A. I do not look upon them as such.

Q. What are they?—A. I look upon them as slaves, sold for such and such an amount of money, to be worked out at prostitution. I understand them to be such. As to particular terms and circumstances, I do not know. That is generally understood to be the case by police-officers.

Q. How many of them are plying their vocation in the city of San Francisco? How many of them were there in January and February last?—A. I think there were from eight to twelve hundred in the city.

Q. What evidence have you that they are held and bound to this service?—A. Evidence that has been produced in the police-court with regard to written contracts of their purchase, and also by their own statements.

Q. In reply to interrogatory twelve, what do you know in regard to the mode in which the Chinese live in San Francisco, as to the number in a house, and especially state what you know in reference to the Globe Hotel as a sample of Chinatown.—A. The Globe Hotel was formerly a first-class hotel in town, and there are a great many rooms there. Those rooms are now occupied by different parties of Chinamen, each one distinct and separate in itself. One Chinaman hires the whole building, and then sublets. The Globe Hotel is not a fair sample of Chinatown. There are not as many Chinese massed together in that hotel as in various other portions, although there are a good many Chinamen in the Globe Hotel.

Q. There are not as many now as formerly?—A. I have not been in the Globe Hotel for a year, perhaps.

Q. What do you estimate the population of Chinatown proper to be?—A. I consider the whole of Chinatown, including the domestics around the city, because they all congregate there nightly, at about 30,000.

Q. They congregate nightly?—A. Yes, sir; whenever they can they

return there and go back home at two or three o'clock in the morning. Some, perhaps, are not allowed to leave the families they belong to, but as a general thing Chinatown is headquarters for the Chinese.

Q. Is it also headquarters for the people employed in trades, the skilled mechanics?—A. That is generally considered their headquarters. Chinese at the woolen-factories and at other pursuits generally get to Chinatown some time during the night.

Q. Do you know anything in regard to the existence of tribunals among the Chinese; and can you state any instance in which you had a right to suppose that the transaction was governed by these Chinese secret associations, if they exist?—A. Some two or three years ago we had an institution (whether it exists to-day or not I do not know) called the Hip-ye-tung Society; and we used every means and exertion to break it up, and tried to find out the bottom of it, but failed. That that society did exist at that time there is no doubt; but we were met by so many obstacles that it was impossible to ferret it out.

Q. Do you think that institution has been broken up?—A. I think it has been broken up under that name. I cannot recall the name. It was given to me yesterday. I think the same institution exists under another name.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You cannot recall the new name?—A. No, sir; it is a Chinese name.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Can you name to the commission any incident where crime has been protected, or money has been exacted, by this or any other secret tribunal?—A. Only from rumor; nothing that I could give of my own knowledge.

Q. Do you remember the instance of a Chinaman on Jackson strect who had a knife stuck in his back?—A. I do.

Q. State that to the commission.—A. That man's name was Look-Chung. He kept a drug-store on Jackson street, between the Globe Hotel and the restaurant. He had a knife stuck in his back near the corner of Dupont and Jackson streets. I saw him a few moments after the knife was in his back. He had a partner, also, who was in the restaurant. His partner had to leave and go to China, or he would probably have met the same fate. That partner has now returned, and is in the city. That was, I think, some three years ago. That was the result of the raid on the Globe Hotel, when we were enforcing this cubic-air ordinance.

Q. What do you say in reply to interrogatory five, as to their regard for our laws, and whether they obey them or not; and, if so, from what motive?—A. They do not obey the law if it can be evaded; that is, our municipal law. That is plain to be seen by any one who is acquainted with our city.

Q. In reply to interrogatory sixteen, what is your opinion as to the influence and presence of this population on the morals of this community?—A. I think it is very disastrous to our young men who visit those houses. A great many young men do visit them; and there are a great many old men, and there are a great many men in pretty good standing in this town, to my personal knowledge. I do not say they do now, because I have not been there for some time; but I know that they used to visit them.

Q. As witnesses, have they regard for our oaths, and are they governed by them?—A. No, sir. I have had Chinese cases in court when

one side would come and ask me how many witnesses the other side had, and when they found out that the witnesses on the other side had the most, they would go out and gather in sufficient to counteract it in numbers.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You have had that done in white cases, have you not?—A. You can catch them in white cases. When a man goes on the stand and does a little swearing on his own account in white cases we look out for that and do not allow it; but in Chinese cases it is impossible to detect it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Were you detailed by the chief of police at the request of the State investigating committee to collect statistics regarding Chinese in San Francisco?—A. I was detailed for a very short time only. About six days I was busy at it.

Q. Did you make your report in pursuance of that order?—A. A very short one.

Q. [Producing a printed paper.] Look at that and see if it is your report, and, if it is your report, say if you are willing that it shall go in now as an exhibit connected with your testimony in this case.—A. [Examining the paper.] Certainly; that is correct.

(See Appendix E.)

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You spoke of the Globe Hotel as having been once a first-class hotel and now being given up to Chinamen. How many hotels are there which have been absorbed by the Chinese?—A. The Mansion House is one, the Globe Hotel is two, the Washington House, on the corner of Dupont and Washington, is three; St. Francis is four. There are half a dozen of them.

Q. Have any churches been taken by them?—A. Yes, sir; the First Baptist church in San Francisco has been taken by the Chinese, right on Dupont street.

Q. Are there any others?—A. I am not positive about Dr. Stone's church on Dupont street.

Q. Dr. Stone's church, on the corner of California and Dupont?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The large brick church?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are not positive whether that is used now or not?—A. I am not.

Mr. PIXLEY. [To the former witness.] How is that, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. It is shut up altogether at the present time.

Q. (By Senator Sargent.) To what use have they put this First Baptist church?—A. A portion of it for prostitutes and the general use of Chinamen. They sleep there and live there. Whether there is any gambling there or not I do not know.

Q. How large a church is that?—A. It a large building, a very large building.

Q. Formerly the place of worship of a large congregation?—A. A very large congregation. It was the First Baptist Church of San Francisco. Many a long year ago I was in there.

Q. Something was said with reference to the commonness of assaults upon Chinamen walking peaceably along the streets of San Francisco. I do not refer to the case of large numbers of them landing, but when pursuing their usual avocations. Is that a general occurrence, or is it

occasional?—A. I do not know that it is more common than would naturally be expected. I do not think it is a common occurrence, although it may be frequent. Still, it comes from a class of young men who are out of employment and have nothing else to do.

Q. Are such things done on the outskirts of the city or in the heart of the city?—A. Not directly in the heart of the city.

Q. Are Chinamen molested who ride in the street-cars when so doing?—A. I never saw them molested in the cars, or heard of an instance of the kind. It might occur from a drunken man in the car, but not otherwise.

Q. Do the police aim to protect any class of persons who are assaulted?—A. That has been the understanding.

Q. Do you think they arrest the offenders where such cases occur?—A. Certainly; very promptly, too, I think.

Q. Have you observed whether or not Chinamen daily walk our streets unmolested?—A. O, yes; and not only by day, but at all hours of the night.

Q. And cases of assault upon them are exceptional?—A. Yes, sir. A gang of boys, perhaps, get together, and if a Chinaman passes them they may do something to him. I do not think they assault or beat them, but perhaps insult them.

Q. Occasionally?—A. Yes, sir. If those boys had employment, they would not be out at that hour of the night; they would be in their beds, probably. The boys who have nothing to do around this city, and have no means of employment, generally work off their steam on the Chinamen. If they were employed in factories they would be at home in their beds at night.

Q. Who work in the factories?—A. The Chinese. I know there are a great many idle young men in this town, who, if they could get employment, would work.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What do I understand by your statement that these outrages committed upon Chinese are exceptional?—A. In what respect? With regard to the cars?

Q. No, sir; with regard to assaults made upon them when quietly walking upon the streets.—A. Because I do not hear of them as frequently as I should if they were common.

Q. Are arrests always made when these assaults are made upon the Chinese?—A. If it is possible to do so I presume they are. Of course I cannot tell what another police-officer would do, but I would arrest such a man instantly.

Q. Is an arrest made in one in ten of these assaults?—A. I have no doubt about that; as I look upon it, every police-officer would suppress a thing just as I would.

Q. Do you read the newspapers?—A. A trifle; yes, sir.

Q. You see almost weekly and daily accounts of assaults upon these people denounced by the press?—A. I see them denounced by the press, and I see arrests made and convictions upon those arrests.

Q. Occasionally?—A. Wherever the arrests are made.

Q. Was there any arrest made a few weeks ago when a political club was going home and they demolished all the Chinese wash-houses on their route?—A. I do not know that there was.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Were there any arrests made the other night, the night of the reception of Governor Booth, where there were only white or colored

republicans in the procession, and stones were thrown at them?—A. Such things happen and still arrests do not follow. The mayor of this city had a stone at the side of his head and no arrest was made for that, and I worked for it probably three weeks. Many cases occur in which it is impossible to ferret out the offender.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you known of any Chinamen being assassinated here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you known of any case where the criminal was convicted and the extreme penalty of the law inflicted upon them?—A. Where it occurs among Chinamen?

Q. Where Chinamen were killed by white men.—A. There is a man serving a sentence for life at this time for killing a Chinaman.

Q. What case is that?—A. I cannot call his name.

Q. Where did it take place; on Clay street?—A. I do not know.

Q. Was he sentenced for ten or twenty years?—A. I think it was for life.

Q. What became of the case on the corner of Garden or Brannan street, where a Chinaman was killed—his skull split open by a piece of scantling?—A. I do not know what became of that case; it was not my case; but I know an officer traveled all over the country trying to ferret it out.

Q. The arrest was made on the spot?—A. No; the entire arrest was not made on the spot. I know an officer went to Reno and all through the upper country. He was up there a long time, (I have this from himself,) and he did make an arrest, but whether it was prosecuted to conviction or not I do not know.

Q. Do you not recollect at the inquest held over that Chinaman the murder was proved, and a young man was arrested and his name was published at the time as being the party who committed the deed?—A. Call the name and it will refresh my memory, probably.

Q. I cannot catch it exactly; Mahan, or McMahan, or Manihan?—A. Something like that. I think that was the party arrested up the country.

Q. Have you seen them assaulted coming from the steamers any time in the last ten years?—A. I never go to the steamers.

Q. Have you heard of their being assaulted coming from the steamer?—A. I have heard of it.

Q. Do you know of any arrests at the time?—A. I do not know. I do not interest myself about the question. I am speaking about the general routine of our city matters, things which occur every day.

Q. Have you during your official career heard of a case of a white man getting a knife stuck in him by white people?—A. Any amount of them.

A. And you know of one case where a Chinaman had a knife stuck in him?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know of any other cases where Chinamen have been injured or mutilated?—A. Any amount of them.

Q. You spoke of one Chinaman on the corner of Dupont street?—A. Any amount of them.

Q. How did they become possessed of their Baptist Church?—A. I think they purchased the property out and out.

Q. They bought it?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you think this class of hoodlums and Arabs, as we call them, would go to work in our factories and shoe-shops and machine-shops if they had an opportunity?—A. I think a large proportion of them would go to work if they had the chance.

Q. What is that class of people—do they frequent our public schools and attend our Sunday-schools?—A. The class I speak of are too old to go to school.

Q. Have they ever been at school?—A. I could not say that they ever have been. I think many of them would go to work if they had an opportunity.

Q. Are not our boys, as a general thing, as well-behaved and as intelligent a class of lads as any you have ever met with in any other city? Are they not as a mass as law-abiding? Do they not attend our public schools? Do we not pride ourselves upon our public school-houses, and the number who attend?—A. No.

Q. That class here does not compare with other cities?—A. I do not think that our young men—a great many of them—compare with some other cities. I am not speaking of the whole of them, for there are a great many young men here who are at work. I am speaking of the ones who are out of employment.

Q. My question was directed to the class of young men and boys growing up outside of the hoodlum and Arab element. I ask you if they do not stand as well in our city as those of the same class in other cities?—A. They do; outside of the hoodlum element they certainly compare very favorably.

Q. Does that class of boys stone Chinese?—A. I do not think they do.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Are there not great numbers of Chinamen arriving in the Chinese quarters here and departing, coming from the interior, from the works, and going back?—A. I think so.

Q. They do not tarry here long, if they cannot get work—they leave the city again?—A. I do not know about whether they tarry here long or not; I know they arrive here and depart here.

Q. In squads?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been engaged in arresting any of them under the cubic-air ordinance?—A. Some time ago; yes, sir.

Q. How many have you arrested at one time?—A. I arrested, I think, fifty or sixty on the corner of Sacramento and Stockton streets.

Q. How many cubic feet of air did you take them out of?—A. The rooms were small.

Q. What size was the room?—A. Different sizes.

Q. Please designate the size you took these particular people out of.—A. These fifty or sixty were taken out of the building.

Q. From the different parts of it?—A. From the different parts of it.

Q. Where did you put them?—A. I took them down to the city prison.

Q. Did they have a greater area of cubic air in the city prison than they had in the place from which you took them?—A. I think there was more room in the prison. They were placed in the corridor, and not in the cells.

Q. How long did they stay in the corridor?—A. Until the next morning, when they were brought up-stairs. I arrested some eleven hundred under this ordinance, altogether.

Q. How many were convicted?—A. I think all, with one exception; that is, with the exception of those taken from one room.

Q. Did they pay their fines, usually?—A. A large proportion.
Q. About what proportion?—A. Three-quarters of them paid.
Q. The other quarter went to jail?—A. I think so.
Q. Were their queues cut off?—A. On the other quarter they did not enforce this ordinance. That ordinance was not in effect at that time.
Q. You had another cubic-air ordinance before this one?—A. That ordinance did not stand. It was brought before Judge Stanly and he declared it unconstitutional, and then we stopped cutting off their queues.
Q. Did not the city fathers enact another?—A. I think there has been one recently enacted.
Q. Do you know of any white men who have had their hair cut off after arrests for living in less than five hundred feet of cubic air?—A. I do not know it.
Q. You would know it if there had been such a case?—A. I presume so. No arrests of whites have been made.
Q. They do not arrest any but Chinese under that ordinance?—A. I do not know of an instance where it has been required to arrest a white man.

JOHN T. TOBIN sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Have you ever resided in China?—Answer. Six years and a half.
Q. In what part of it?—A. In Hong-Kong, Canton, and Shanghai.
Q. In which city have you resided most?—A. Shanghai.
Q. What was your occupation there?—A. Detective for the police-force.
Q. Under what government?—A. The municipal government.
Q. Of Shanghai?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long were you in Shanghai?—A. I was in Shanghai three years and ten months.
Q. Is Shanghai a city of Chinese?—A. O, yes; Chinese inhabitants; several cantons.
Q. Are there any English or European merchants there?—A. Outside of the city, English, French, and American.
Q. Where were your duties—inside?—A. Outside. My duties lay through the country, but the police-force was engaged in general duties outside of the city.
Q. As a detective police-officer on duty in that department, what did you observe in relation to the habits of the lower classes of the Chinese?—A. I observed that they were the most despicable race I ever came across, and I have traveled nearly the whole world through. In three cases out of every five I would arrest they were perjured and committed for perjury after my arrest being made; that is, the witness for the defendant.
Q. How do they live?—A. They live in a very poor way. The cooly inhabitants of the city there labor for from twenty to twenty-five cents a day.
Q. When they can get employment?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. What does it cost them to live?—A. About fifteen cents a day.
Q. What do they live upon?—A. Generally rice and a kind of greens, cabbage, they call it in that country; they salt it down; and a little fish and salt pork; that is, Chinese pork.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the difference between Chinese pork and our pork?—

A. Chinese pork is fed off everything that is refused by any other animal or anything at all in any other country. I have seen them eat things there that would be disgusting for me to mention to the commission.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. The pigs or the Chinese?—A. The pigs. There is a particular breed of hogs there for the use of the Chinese. They have not the appearance of any other hog I have seen in any part of Europe or America.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What part of the hog do they eat?—A. Every part.

Q. The viscera, the interior?—A. Every part. The poorer people take the offal and the richer people take the meat.

Q. In what estimate do they hold Chinese female children in that part of China?—A. My experience of them is that all the females who keep brothels and opium-houses in every part of China go into the country and buy up small children from the age of from two to five years and bring them into cities, and there keep them as servants for the older girls employed as prostitutes until they become of age to make them such.

Q. Of whom do they obtain these children?—A. Of the country people, who are very poor. They receive from five to ten dollars apiece for them, according to the appearance of the female child.

Q. They take them from their parents, then?—A. Yes. They get them from the country, and bring them into those cities that I have been visiting.

Q. Do you state, then, that females are bought and sold for this traffic of prostitution?—A. I do.

Q. Is that a matter of open notoriety, or is it secret?—A. It is open notoriety where I have been in China.

Q. What are the morals of these people?—A. They are very low.

Q. Low in what particular?—A. In regard to general uprightness, in speaking the truth, and in every shape or form that I had anything to do with them. Among the middling and lower classes there I never found two honest people out of ten in regard to truth or honesty.

Q. How is it about the crime of larceny or offenses of that character?—A. Larceny is a continual thing there from morning to evening. There is nothing but arrests being brought in for that crime.

Q. What are the punishments inflicted for these crimes?—A. What they term the cangue in China is the most particular kind of punishment. It is by two boards locked together around the neck of the prisoner, who is fed twice a day from rice-water, outside of the place where the crime has been committed, the house or factory.

Q. He is confined with boards and exposed there?—A. The boards are put around the neck and locked together—the shape of the neck; and the bill of the crime that has been committed by the prisoner is the shape of the board.

Q. Are there any other punishments for more serious crimes?—A. There is what is called the cage in the city. They put them in there in a position for every passer-by to see them; and for piracy and burglary they behead them.

Q. What is their process of trial? Is it quick or otherwise?—A. It goes through the regular form of law there; it is a kind of mixed court. There are American, English, and Chinese interpreters in every court there, and they try them by the mixed court.

Q. Is that Chinese law?—A. It is the municipal law in Shanghai, of which I am speaking.

Q. Do you know how they try and how they dispose of their criminals before the Chinese tribunals outside of this commercial port of Shanghai?—A. I have seen on several occasions, when I have been in cities outside of Shanghai, where prisoners have been taken for robbery or piracy and executed in two days.

Q. How executed?—A. By beheading. I never have seen any other execution in China but by the heads taken off.

Q. Can you name some of these towns or cities outside?—A. Ningpo is one.

Q. How large a city is that?—A. A city, I think, of about 200,000.

Q. Do they have anything there that is equivalent to our trial by jury?—A. Yes; they have something like a magistrate they call a tippoo, the under magistrate, and the governor of the city, and four other smaller mandarins.

Q. They constitute the court?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is a final decision? There is no appellate decision from that tribunal?—A. I have never seen any.

Q. Are instances common, such as you speak of, where the offender is arrested, convicted, and executed within two days?—A. I do not know. From what I have seen during my stay of four years there around the province of Canton, it was that way.

Q. Is there anything else that you desire to state?—A. Nothing more than the filthiness of the inhabitants. Even in the streets of Shanghai, where there are English, French, and Americans, they are continually sitting on the sidewalks, and arrested every day for the most filthy habits. They are sent away, and come back in two days afterward.

Q. How are their houses of prostitution conducted there—openly or secretly?—A. Openly.

Q. Can you describe one of those places, and tell how they are managed?—A. The opium-houses are houses of a different description from the regular houses of prostitution. They are houses where men go in to smoke opium; and they each keep a certain number of girls in the houses for those men to go with when they feel like it; and such places are open day and night.

Q. Are they upon the public streets?—A. Upon the public streets. In the other houses there is no opium-smoking in them, but they keep from fifteen to twenty girls in some of the largest places.

Q. These houses are supplied, you say, generally, by the purchase of their women from the country?—A. I never knew of any other case where there were women supplied except by purchase. They are brought in young, and the child is brought up in the house, except on some occasions, where girls from the age of fourteen to twenty are brought in also, and disposed of to these houses.

Q. How do they marry, and what is the domestic relation among this general class?—A. Among the lower and middling class of people there I never experienced, during my four years, above ten weddings or marriages. That was all done among the higher class—the merchants.

Q. The higher classes marry?—A. Yes, sir; they buy the bride in the first place, and then have a wedding, with a priest.

Q. That is an open, public ceremony?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As to the lower, what you call the middling classes, how do they get their women and raise their children?—A. The middling class of people generally go together—just a mutual understanding. On some occasions you might find one out of ten, where they go to a joss-house and get the services of a priest.

Q. But, as a rule, they form these liaisons on contracts among themselves?—A. That is what I have seen.

Q. Are the women true to that relation when they assume it?—A. Never, that I know of.

Q. If tempted by money, would they, or would they not, sell themselves?—A. They would sell themselves, according to my experience.

Q. Are there any that emigrate from that part of Shanghai to the port of San Francisco?—A. I have seen several in the port of San Francisco from Shanghai, but not natives of Shanghai; natives of Canton, Hong-Hong, and Whampoa.

Q. They came here by way of Shanghai?—A. No, sir. After living there some years they left and came here.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is there any mode of torture auxiliary to Chinese justice? Do they use torture at all to produce the truth from witnesses in Chinese courts?—A. Not in the mixed courts.

Q. I do not mean in the mixed courts.—A. I have seen it done in the city of Shanghai.

Q. What are their methods of torture for that purpose?—A. Screws applied to the wrists, and a place between two boards. I have seen them where the two boards were set together by screws.

Q. Is there any torture of prisoners before execution, after conviction?—A. I never saw any.

Q. Is there any mode of execution except beheading?—A. I never saw any other mode of execution in China.

Q. How numerous are the victims of execution at any one time?—A. I saw sixteen one morning.

Q. Is that done at a public place?—A. In a public square in the Chinese city. No executions take place out of the Chinese city where there are Europeans or Americans living. The beheading is done inside of the city. On one occasion, the last I had anything to do with it, I arrested a man for killing an English paymaster in a British vessel of war there. The Chinaman shot him, and he was sentenced to be beheaded. They kept him back for three months, and then they brought out another man, stupefied by opium, on the day of the execution to put in his place, a Shanghai man that they had stupefied with opium. On this occasion I knew it was not the right man. The man who committed the murder was a Canton man. When this man was brought out he was tortured terribly. I did not see the torture. They took his head off in the public square. There were American marines there and also English marines to see the execution carried through.

Q. They executed the wrong man?—A. They executed the right man, but they were going to execute the wrong man. The Canton man was worth some money in his own country, and they were trying to get his money, and they brought out the Shanghai man stupefied with opium. The gentleman who was murdered was Mr. Dore, paymaster in the British navy.

Q. Is it not the fact in China that a wealthy culprit sentenced to death can procure for a sum of money a substitute?—A. I cannot swear to that. I have heard of such things during my career there. I have known prisoners committed for piracy and burglary to get out through sums of money, and never brought back again, but had persons brought in their room.

Q. In this Chinese court, where there is a principal presiding officer and three or four smaller mandarins that you speak of, do these mandarins serve in every case, or are they selected for a particular case?—A.

They do not serve in every case. They chooset hem by the tribunal for that service.

Q. Are they permanent in that tribunal or changed, as we change a jury?—A. They are changed.

Q. In every case?—A. I do not know that, but I have seen them changed on different cases.

Q. How do they swear witnesses in China?—A. They swear them in their own form of oath. In the mixed court in Shanghai they swear them by an oath on a piece of paper read to them, and then lighted from a light on the magistrate's table, and burned, repeating the words that are on the paper until the paper is burned up, and then he breaks it in ashes. The oath is on a paper, generally red paper, printed in black letters. They read that oath to them, and then set fire to it with the light that is on the table, and they make use of the words of the oath during the time the paper is burning.

Q. Is that oath sufficient to cause them to tell the truth?—A. It does not cause them to tell the truth. I tell you in three cases out of five in my arrests they have been convicted afterward of perjury.

Q. How could you tell that they committed perjury afterward; by the testimony of other Chinamen?—A. By the testimony of others and the facts being brought out clear against them.

Q. Circumstantial evidence?—A. That is in cases of burglary and piracy.

Q. Is there any other form of oath? Did you ever see the cutting off of the head of a chicken?—A. No; not in the provinces where I have been.

Q. Is there much regard for human life in China?—A. There is to a certain extent a great deal of regard for it.

Q. Is there humanity to the sick?—A. Not in the least. I have seen cripples and sick people turned out upon the streets to die there, and they have died. There is a certain number of sick people there that they take to the joss-houses and leave them outside of the doors, and any passers-by can give them the money they like to give to them, and others are left out on sidewalks not near any joss-house at all, and left to die. I suppose I have taken up over 300 dead Chinamen during my stay there, and got coolies to bring the coffins from the municipal government to take these dead bodies in the morning.

Q. Does your observation here show you anything about the exposure of female children to die?—A. No.

Q. Are there cases where new-born children are left out on the streets?—A. I have never seen that; I have seen male children, though.

Q. But not female children?—A. Not female children?

Q. Have you seen it occasionally or commonly?—A. Not commonly.

Q. What are the habits of the Chinese, if you know anything about it, so far as sodomy is concerned, the connection of man with man?—A. I have never seen that, but I have seen it with beasts and detected them in the act—with hogs, dogs, and ducks. I have detected them in the act myself, but never man and man.

Q. In a number of cases?—A. Not in a very great number.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is that an offense against Chinese law?—A. They were never tried by the Chinese law; they were committed by the municipal law, and sent to the city. We would never see any more of them afterward.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the state of morals generally in a Chinese city among the Chinese?—A. Very low; that is, according to my views.

Q. Is there much gambling carried on among the Chinese in these cities?—A. Gambling! Every house is a gambling-house.

Q. Do you mean every house of business or every residence?—A. Every house of refreshment is a gambling-house.

Q. Are these places openly and notoriously carried on?—A. Why, they license them. They pay a license; they are all open.

Q. Are there many of such establishments?—A. Wherever there is an opium-house the next door is a gambling-house. The opium-houses comprise about one-sixth of the houses in every city.

Q. So that about one-sixth of the houses in a city would be gambling-houses?—A. In the commercial parts of the city.

Q. Is prostitution looked upon as a degrading occupation?—A. No; I do not think it is. They make a business of it.

Q. When a Chinaman goes into such places does he go by stealth or openly?—A. He goes openly.

Q. You speak of their buying women they marry. Do you know of their selling the same women after marrying them?—A. I was acquainted with two or three rich persons in Shanghai, bankers, who bought the wives they married.

Q. Do you know of cases of selling them after marrying them?—A. No. I have known of people leaving their wives to people they are in debt to in lieu of the debt they owed the other persons. I have known of cases where men have left their wives and left also the bill of sale of their wives with people they owed money to.

Q. That is in payment of the debt?—A. Yes, they would take the wife in lieu of the debt.

Q. Do the Chinamen marry the occupants of houses of Chinese prostitution out of the house?—A. Yes.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Describe the city of Shanghai, if you please.—A. The city of Shanghai is a walled city. I suppose about three miles around the wall outside—from three to three and a half miles.

Q. What is the part called that is inside of the wall?—A. The city of Shanghai.

Q. The inner city?—A. The inner city.

Q. Where were you employed as a policeman?—A. In Shanghai.

Q. In the inner city?—A. In the outer city.

Q. What is the outer city composed of in the way of population?—A. It is composed of about 50,000 of the northern breed of Chinamen and about 20,000 to 25,000 Cantonese and Southern Chinamen; that is, from Canton around the river and down from Whampoa, and those places.

Q. Are they not a collection of the lowest class of people that the Chinese empire can turn out who reside on the outside of the walls?—A. No, I do not think so. I have seen far superior Chinamen there than I have seen in the city of Canton.

Q. How many such people did you see there in proportion to population?—A. One-third of the population.

Q. How superior were they?—A. They were cleaner in their habits than they were in the city of Canton.

Q. Merchants?—A. No, sir; not merchants; I am talking about the working-class of people.

Q. How many were there?—A. I tell you, the Canton population there at that time was from 20,000 to 25,000, male and female.

Q. They were respectable?—A. No, sir; they were not. You asked me if there was any difference in them. I have said there was a little difference in them, but they were very bad, indeed.

Q. Have not the political disturbances in the interior driven this class of people to settle in this outer city of Shanghai? Is it not principally inhabited by rebellious people who sought refuge there?—A. When I first went there they, the imperialists and rebels, were at war. I was in their army and afterward settled there; but I never saw any who were in the army down in Shanghai settled. I was a major in the army.

Q. Are the class of people inside the walls of the same degraded nature as those outside?—A. In some instances they are worse.

Q. As a general proposition, how are they?—A. As a general thing they are worse, because the municipal authority outside of the walls keeps them a little cleaner than if left to themselves inside.

Q. Then the better class do not live inside? It is just about the same class that live outside?—A. I think they are about on an equality, only they are forced to be a little cleaner on the outside than inside of the walls.

Q. You had free access to the inner city?—A. Everybody has access during the hours between sunrise and sundown. The gates are closed at sundown.

Q. How did you manage to convict for perjury when you could not convict for the offense in regard to which the perjury was committed?—A. In most cases they convicted themselves, and we could not prove until afterward that they had perjured themselves. We always had to take the witnesses as they said on their oath, and if they contradicted themselves on the stand we got witnesses to prove that they had perjured themselves.

Q. There was no difficulty in doing that?—A. Not very much.

Q. Do you know of Europeans intermarrying with Chinese people?—A. Never.

Q. You never heard of a case where they intermarried?—A. I have seen them live with them, cohabit with them, and buy them on certain occasions.

Q. Have you ever seen any half-breed children there?—A. A few in Shanghai, and some in Canton also.

Q. What is half of the nationality generally in that case?—A. Half of the nationality of half-breed children is German, a part English, and the rest American.

Q. Do they license gambling in Chinese cities?—A. Yes.

Q. Shanghai is a foreign city?—A. Shanghai is a native city.

Q. They license gambling in all the cities?—A. I do not know only where I have been. I have been in four walled cities, and they have licensed gambling in them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Name the four cities.—A. Canton, Shanghai, Pekin, and Tien-tsin.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do they administer swift justice for crime in China?—A. In case of piracy it is very swift justice. It will be from two to three days from the time of the trial until they are executed and their heads are in a basket.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long did you live in China altogether?—A. About six years and eight months.

Q. Where did you go from when you went to China?—A. I went from Rio Janeiro.

Q. Are you a native of England?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where were you born?—A. I was born in Ireland.

Q. Did I understand you that you were in the Chinese army?—A. I was in the Chinese army.

Q. How long were you in the army?—A. Eight months.

Q. In what capacity did you serve in the army?—A. I joined as lieutenant and was discharged as a major.

Q. Were you in the royal army?—A. I was in the imperial army.

Q. Was this employment as policeman, in which you were engaged, under the imperial authority?—A. No, sir; under a municipal government composed of every nation; American was the leading part of it when I was there. The Americans, English, Russians, Prussians, and the people from Denmark composed a municipal court there to keep the place clean. They supplied themselves with a police-force and taxed the inhabitants thereof to support the police-force. They have got a gas-factory there. They made a regular kind of city outside of Shanghai city.

Q. Did you receive a fixed salary from this authority?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say they taxed the city to pay the expenses?—A. They taxed every inhabitant in this outside city, Chinese as well as white people.

Q. Was that tax levied by this mixed government?—A. It was levied by this government. It is divided into three towns, that they call English, French, and American towns. It is divided by two creeks, but they combine in regard to the police-force. Each place flies its own flag. Mr. Seward was consul-general there. He gave up all authority over his place for the other people to supply him with a force and grade the streets and keep them clean. They supplied him with a police-force.

Q. Were the Chinese taxed for improving the streets?—A. Every man, no matter who he was, Chinaman, white, or colored, was taxed.

Q. Did the imperial authority authorize these French, &c., to do this?—A. No, sir; this place was allowed to the white population, under the treaty of 1857, as a residence for all the white population, and they had to look after themselves and make their own government.

Q. They were authorized by imperial authority to tax Chinese and all others?—A. Yes, they were allowed to do it. In the case of Chinese prisoners being taken, they were tried in this same place, but by a mixed court composed of a mandarin, an American, and an Englishman.

Q. I understood you to say that in three-fifths of all cases of arrest the witnesses were prosecuted and convicted for perjury?—A. In three cases out of five.

Q. You speak of Chinese witnesses?—A. Chinese witnesses.

Q. What is the population of the city of Shanghai?—A. About 190,000.

Q. What are the industries carried on in the city; what sort of manufactories, if any?—A. Silk and cotton manufactories are the principal ones.

Q. Do the people generally work, or are they idle?—A. The general part of them are idle except any work they have got to do in discharging native junks and carrying goods from wholesale houses.

Q. Do I understand you to say that the greater part of the inhabitants of Shanghai are idle?—A. They are idle.

Q. How do they live?—A. They live by stealing mostly, the lower class of people.

Q. Whom do they steal from?—A. They go in the fields at night and steal rice, padi, or whatever they call it, and different other articles; sugar-cane.

Q. The greater part of the people live by stealing, do they?—A. The greater part of the poorer class of people, what they term coolies.

Q. I understood you to say that the greater part in the city were idle and did not work?—A. I said they were idle.

Q. I ask you how they live?—A. By thieving off of their richer neighbors.

Q. Then the greater part of the inhabitants are thieves?—A. The greater part of the cooly tribe are thieves. I am speaking of coolies.

Q. I am speaking about the body of the people in Shanghai. I asked you whether they worked or were idle. I understood you to say that a majority are idle.—A. In all the shops of course they are not idle; they support themselves by their business; but the coolies in the city are generally of an idle disposition, and they are thieves.

Q. Do they constitute a majority of the people in the city?—A. I think they do; that is, the male population, of course. The females are in opium-houses and houses of prostitution, excepting the merchants' wives and their families.

Q. You say that they go out into the fields and steal rice at night for a living?—A. They steal rice and everything else, and go aboard lighters outside of the city walls and steal.

Q. The gates of the city are closed at sundown, so that they cannot get out?—A. O, yes, they can get out. In many instances they have got out and got in again through bribery of the soldiers on guard.

Q. Your certificate shows that you left their employment in 1868?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you come to California then?—A. I did.

Q. You have lived here ever since?—A. I have been backward and forward.

Q. What business have you been engaged in since?—A. I am an engineer in the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do they use Chinese sailors on vessels belonging to the Pacific Steamship Company?—A. Yes.

Q. What sort of sailors do they make?—A. They do their duty very well except in regard to any danger, such as fire and the ship getting in a gale of wind, when they go down below in almost every instance.

Q. You say they are good?—A. Yes; they do their duty. In the absence of any danger they are very good.

Q. You state that in time of alarm of fire or a storm at sea, then what?—A. They generally go to their quarters.

Q. And refuse duty?—A. You cannot get them up. They do not refuse it, but say they cannot do it. That is the case in many instances. I have not seen it in all cases.

Q. Then what opinion have you as to their quality as sailors? Are they reliable sailors?—A. I think if a ship was in very great danger she could not be saved by them. I know in one instance the Great Republic was saved by the passengers when she was caught in a gale of wind outside of Japan, and went on her beam-ends. But for the passengers, I do not think she would have recovered herself. She might, and she might not, but I do not think she would.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do this class of people whom you describe as living in the outer city of Shanghai emigrate in large numbers to California?—A. The Cantonese population of that part do, but it is very seldom that you can get a Shanghai man to emigrate. They seldom go out of their place. I have known some, but very few.

Q. Have you been long at sea?—A. About nineteen years.

Q. Have you ever known of American ships being saved by passengers where the crew refused duty, or an English ship, when the crew were European?—A. I never heard of a case of the kind.

Q. Are the authorities in China prompt in their administration of justice for outrages committed on foreigners?—A. In every instance, no.

Q. As a general proposition?—A. As a general thing, they have been forced to it by the municipal government, where I have been, provided the man is wealthy in property or money. If he was a poor man, justice would be administered right away.

Q. In the case of this man who was beheaded; was all that the government of England asked, his execution? Was there any further demand made on the Chinese government?—A. No, nothing at all. I was the man who made the arrest.

Mrs. SOPHRONIA SWIFT sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Mrs. Swift, you are an old resident of San Francisco?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long?—A. I have been here twenty-three years.

Q. Have you observed, and, if so, have you any opinion upon it, the effect of Chinese immigration as it bears upon the labor question in regard to women and girls and the lighter class of industries? If so, state to the gentlemen of the commission what your means of observation are and the result of your observation.—A. Do you wish me to be quite brief and direct, or to state what my experiences have been?

Q. Answer as directly as you can, but you may be as diffuse as will enable you to give the commission an intelligent idea of your views.—A. I have long been interested in the many industries of San Francisco, especially with reference to my own sex; and seeing the immigration of Chinese labor coming in here, I have often looked at the matter just as it has been published many times in the papers, but I have felt that our side of the question has never been reached by the press of San Francisco or the people at large, and particularly by eastern people. My views may be quite different from what you have heard, but I will start at New York City. I have been interested here in the industries of this State, on the female side of industries, where women have themselves to support. I have a large circle of acquaintances East, and I often receive letters from them asking in regard to coming here for employment. I can only answer them by saying that the avenues which were once open here to immigration from eastern places are all filled up. In our factories, which once were filled with working-women, as, we will say, the shoe-factory, the work is now entirely done by Chinese labor. At one time there was a large number of young girls in the shoe-factories. Many of them, under my supervision, went into Wentworth's and different places, and learned to fit shoes. Immediately after that, the Chinese came in, taking the labor from the women as well as from their fathers and brothers. The same is true in regard to shirt-making. In the early days here all the work was imported. About ten years ago they com-

menced manufacturing here by women. There was a large profit to those ladies who bought their own material and did the work at home, taking orders from stores. Very soon the Chinese came in, the wholesale dealers furnishing the material and the Chinamen making the shirts for forty cents that we had a dollar apiece for. Then the button-hole work, the finishing, was given to women, which they get from twenty to thirty cents a dozen for, and sometimes as high as sixty-five cents a dozen for finishing up. That was the first of the Chinese taking our work. From that they went to sewing on machines, and now the fluting that is made to put on ladies' dresses, the hemming, the heavy work in dress-making, is done in separate rooms in many instances by Chinamen. The same in regard to fluting that ladies wear around their necks; that is done by Chinamen. All the avenues that they can step in and fill they have filled. Where a man used to do the work, having a small family, the wife doing her own work, perhaps educating three or four children, the Chinaman does the work, and the man is thrown out of employment. The wife comes to me; she wants something to do. I attempt to assist her. I say, "Get a place for your little boy and little girl." I many times have gone to different places for situations, and they have got a Chinaman there who fills the place, and the little girl or boy cannot get it. The woman attempts to see if she cannot do something, but all those little industries that used to go to women are occupied by Chinese labor.

Q. How is it in washing?—A. The Chinese do the principal washing of San Francisco.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are the Chinese washermen patronized generally by people of all classes?—A. I think not, this year. I think that there are a great many young ladies who have learned to wash this summer. We could not get white help to do our work, and we have been compelled to teach our daughters how to wash and iron, for we dare not send our washing to Chinese laundries. They have suffered materially this summer from families having their washing done at home on account of the small-pox. A great many families that are unable to hire their washing done and are unable to keep servants to send to laundries, have taught their daughters to wash this summer. I know of a number of very respectable families who do their own washing.

Q. Do the wealthy families get their washing done by the Chinese generally?—A. A large number of them do. They are patronized very largely by the Protestant people, who have been taught by their minister that to make a Christian of a Chinaman was better than to send the same missionaries around among white people, their own native people, and find employment and heaven for them. The effort for the education of the Chinese to Christianity has taken the bread from our little girls and little boys, and from our husbands and fathers.

Q. You say that has been done by the Protestant clergy?—A. I say that the Protestant people here have encouraged it by their prayers and by the committees of the church organizing to teach them in Sunday-schools, sending their daughters and sons out afternoons to see how many Chinese they can get to represent their Sunday-schools on Sunday. I think that has been a growth in itself.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the effect then of Chinese, in your opinion, as an observer, upon the morals and upon the moral condition of our boys and girls, our younger people?—A. I think their bad moral condition is purely the result of slave labor. We are in a city where what is termed by

educated people the lower industries are filled by slave labor, or cooly labor, as you may term it, for that is slave labor.

Q. And the effect of that labor has been to deprive our young people of their lighter industries?—A. The lighter industries have been occupied by the Chinese. I speak particularly now of the working-girls of San Francisco, what are termed working-women. A large number of people emigrated here in early days without means. Some have been fortunate and some have been very unfortunate. Their elder children have grown to manhood and womanhood, and they have three or four smaller ones. It is necessary to make a living. Those children say, "I am not going into anybody's house and work with Chinamen." When their parents want them to go into some factory to work, you will hear them say, "Well, I guess I am not going down there to work for Mr. So-and-So; he keeps two or three Chinamen for me to compete with." He, comes home to his mother and says, "Mother, I am not going to work with these Chinese; I am willing to help you." I could refer you to several families where they have needed this assistance; the boys are willing to do, and beg for work. There are two on my knowledge in the industrial school because they could not get a situation to work, unless they would work with a large gang of Chinamen in picking hops. If you will look at our criminal cases you can see the effect. In regard to the women, the mothers, a large number of the women here have attempted to step out into outside employments, known avocations which have been occupied by men only, and by an intelligent class of men, not what you would call hand-work, but brain-work. Those women have found it very hard to find employment outside when they could not find employment at home. They have received assistance from various establishments to help them to make a living until they are heart-sick, care-worn, and distressed. You can find them now in many places where I presume you would not wish your sisters, or mothers, or wives to be. To-day you can find many of them there, not because they are any worse than yours, but circumstances have driven them there from want of employment. In your cities east, the larger cities, they suffer in proportion, for they cannot send the number of persons west that they would do if it was not for the Chinese. We are the West. They cannot come any farther than here, and there is no encouragement given to a poor man with a family to come here. If the man buys twenty acres of land and tries to support his family, he expects after buying the land to have his children earn something to clothe themselves, as they do back in the farming communities east. When they come here, they find that the crop is harvested in haste by Chinese labor. Even our native Indians of this country cry aloud on account of this population of coolies. The Indians used to come into Sonoma, and Marin, and Napa, and those counties where large potato crops are harvested, and get work to do, and take wheat and barley, and carry it back to the hills for the winter. They cannot have that work now. I am speaking from experience and from what I have observed in traveling through the State.

Q. As to the question of hoodlums, which is the designation, as you know, of our vicious boys and girls; state the causes that lead to this class?—A. I consider that it is all owing to the idleness, the lack of employment, of the boys and girls here; and I think one of the greatest causes why they are in the street is because we have Chinese here. Every place that you go you can find the Chinese at work. The mother says, "I am not going to make my son a workingman; I am going to have him a professional man." She educates her son for a

gentleman; and, to fill that, he must go above this degradation. Necessarily he is out of employment. That is one of the first causes among our boys, and the same cause reflects upon our girls. They are not half paid for what they do.

Q. Take the great multitude of sewing-machines, which is generally women's work. By whom are they worked in this city?—A. By Chinese.

Q. In what pursuits?—A. In the making of overalls, worn by men; in the making of stockings, knit at our factories; in the making of undershirts and drawers, made at our factories. The looms which were occupied once by women are occupied now by Chinamen. The trimming of all that work, the preparing and counting, is done by Chinamen. The sewing-machine work is all done by Chinese. They make all this work that is done on sewing-machines. You can find sixty in one building where they are making the gray work. You can find thirty on Montgomery street in one building making gentlemen's white shirts.

Q. What was the price which women obtained in early times here for making an ordinary gentleman's shirt?—A. In early days it was as high as two and a half and three dollars a piece; but we will say ten years ago it was a dollar and a half. Eight years ago you could contract by the hundred at a dollar a piece and then furnish your own material, which was a margin, a manufacturing business itself, to the woman who understood cutting and buying her own goods. We simply supplied the merchants the same as though they had purchased in New York ready made.

Q. What can be obtained for manufacturing a shirt now, and by whom is it done, as a rule?—A. By Chinese.

Q. What can the white woman get for this work?—A. She cannot get it. The contracts are already contracted for by this labor. She can get the finishing up.

Q. How much money can a woman earn, provided she can get the employment of finishing in making shirts?—A. A very smart expert at making button-holes and trimming could make sixty-five or eighty cents a day.

Q. Are you yourself the mother of a family?—A. I am.

Q. What is your family?—A. I have three daughters and one son.

Q. The testimony you have given here is the result of your own observation, residence, and reflection, from what you have seen in the town?—A. It is. I have been a great deal of my time, for the last eight years, strictly devoted to woman's industries. To speak it in an independent form, (I feel quite independent in the position which I have taken,) I have been at the head of the woman's industries that I could see to help my sex to make an honest living. I have gone at night and at day at their calls to see what I could do to better their condition, and to find employment that they were adapted to do, but I have given it up for the last six months or year. I said there was nothing for us only to step out into wider fields, and, if we had to compete with men, compete with men of brains, and at least with white men. That has been my idea, and I have stuck to it pretty closely.

Q. Are there any other statements which you desire to make? You understand the scope of this investigation?—A. I wish to say one thing so as not to be misunderstood in regard to this religion question about Protestants assisting Chinese. I do not charge them with attempting to do us a wrong, but it has been so long understood that the church was organized for the simple idea of saving souls, that they stepped out to save these poor heathen souls, which these heathen do not appreciate, while, at the same time, they are taking bread from their own children.

If the church had never taken a step to assist these Chinese they would never have occupied the position in private residences that they do now. It has been an encouragement on the part of what is called a higher order of society, forgetting the lower classes of their own nation. That has been my experience.

Q. Do these Chinese largely attend what are known as Sunday-schools under the patronage of the churches?—A. It is like this: they attend. A Chinaman will say, "You take my boy; you learn him to read; you learn him to write; you send him Sunday-school." When a Chinese boy comes the question is, how is he to get a situation? They say, "You learn him read and write; send Sunday school; he work cheap; he work one dollar week." As soon as he has worked one week he will pick up every utensil around our houses. The next week they take him from that place. "He work two dollars and half week; he understand very good;" and with a class of poorer people who cannot keep servants competent of doing their work, where the husband is out of employment and the children cannot get employment, the mother cannot do her work, because she was raised what is termed a lady and does not know anything about work, she is compelled to spend her whole time teaching these young Chinamen, so that they may go into another family and get better wages. Still to keep herself a home she has to teach little fellows, so that they can go to another house and get better pay, and drive another family out of employment. It has been done from year to year.

Q. Do you understand that these Chinese who go to Sunday-school go to acquire the language, or to become Christians?—A. They go to learn the language and be considered good boys, so as to get good pay, and learn who are the people who pay them the best, who are the best people, and have a chance to steal. They do not like to work for poor people who have not jewelry, diamonds, and silver, and a great deal of provision on hand that they can carry off.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Mrs. Swift, do our people generally employ these Chinese as domestic servants?—A. Among my acquaintances almost all have Chinese servants.

Q. Is your acquaintance pretty extensive?—A. I have a large circle of acquaintances, and I have had a pretty good opportunity to learn whether there were Chinese servants in the house. I have been for two years a solicitor for fire-insurance. I have gone to a great many private families, and almost always the answer to the bell was by a Chinese servant.

Q. Is that pretty general?—A. It is pretty general; oftener than you would meet white women.

Q. Are there not a considerable number of women out of employment now?—A. A very large number of women are out of employment.

Q. What branches of employment?—A. The common industries that have been set aside for women.

Q. What do you designate as the common industries?—A. The most natural industry, I claim, for woman, her natural sphere, is making home what it should be.

Q. House-servants?—A. I would not like to call them house-servants, for I do not consider that there is any more service in a woman working in a house than a man working in a store. If labor is service, then it comes under that name; but I would not like to give them the designation of servants.

Q. What is the price of wages here of a white domestic servant-girl?—A. I have never asked for a situation myself, but I have given from fifteen to twenty-five dollars.

Q. A good cook, how much?—A. They would range from $30 in a private family, to $40 where they have considerable work.

Q. What does the Chinaman work for as a domestic servant?—A. They work at from a dollar up to $50 and $60. In many families they are considered finer cooks.

Q. They are paid, then, in accordance with their capacity as servants?—A. They are considered, among some people, better cooks, because they attend to just one branch. The Chinese when they work, work at one industry. They are not like our working girls. If a Chinaman goes into a family to cook, he says, "Me do no chamber-work; me do cooking." If a woman goes into a house she has got to do sewing, all the housework, take care of the little girls and boys, and do the washing and ironing. Chinamen do one branch. They do the cleaning, or else they do the housework. I am speaking of families who keep more than one Chinaman in the house.

Q. They are used as servants from the cellar to the garret, as cooks and chambermaids and nurses?—A. I suppose they are.

Q. Do they not make pretty good house-servants?—A. They do not.

Q. Are they not faithful?—A. They are not.

Q. Do they retain their places long?—A. Not generally; some of them. Where they have, as I said before, plenty of chances to steal, and get high wages, and get the confidence of the people, they are like a great many other people, they want to keep their places.

Q. Have you employed Chinese?—A. I have.

Q. Do you speak from experience?—A. I speak from experience in my own house and in my neighbors' houses, and from the reports in the newspapers and my associations with business-men. I have been eight years a business-woman, and I have heard men whom I can believe tell their experience of Chinese servants, and of white women. From that I speak.

Q. Then you think it would be more proper for our population to employ white servants than Chinese?—A. I think it would be more proper for our population, when they have house-duties that women can fill, if she had a place to work without being called a servant, any more than the physician, the lawyer, the clergyman, or any other man who is under hire should be called a servant.

Q. That goes beyond this investigation?—A. I am speaking of servants. You asked me the question as to servants.

Q. You state that the price of making underwear in early days was from $1.50 to $2.50?—A. I would like to say a word in answer to the last question in regard to Chinese labor. Do not understand me that I believe there is employment here for women; but when a woman is classed as a servant, and the Chinese are classed as servants, and she is put in the same catalogue, to eat in the same kitchen, at the same table, and sleep in the same cellar or in the same garret, that is why women will not go to work in these private families. I have had a great deal of experience with those girls, and have often heard them express themselves directly on that question.

Q. What can you buy a nice white shirt for now at the stores?—A. It would depend upon what a person might term a nice shirt; whether it was embroidered or plain.

Q. I mean a plain shirt, such as I or any of these gentlemen wear?—

A. The material has much to do with it, but the usual price for shirts is about $24 a dozen. It ranges from $24 to $40.

Q. Do the Chinese wear these fine white shirts to any extent? Do they ever patronize these houses and buy them for their own use?—A. I never saw a Chinaman with one on to my knowledge.

Q. Then the white population have the benefit of getting shirts now which cost less than it used to cost to make them?—A. I could not say that. They are starving their own poor and sending them into asylums. I should consider it was injurious to the interests of the State.

Q. To get them cheap?—(A pause.)

By Mr. KING:

Q. As a matter of fact are their shirts cheap?—A. Not a bit cheaper; it only makes the rich richer, and the poor poorer.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Then the profit lies with the manufacturer?—A. Those are facts. I cannot go into the question to say who it rests with, but it is a matter of making money regardless of the humanitarian rights of our people.

Q. This subject has been quite a hobby of yours?—A. My particular hobby has been to make a living for my children, and I have found it up-hill work to do it, when labor is not respected, only this class of labor. It is not a particular hobby. I have been very kind to the Chinamen. I treat them very well, but I would not want any of their small-pox, nor any of their diseased people, nor any of their women among us at all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is your religious belief, as you referred to this subject?—A. I do not know that I am prepared to give my religious belief.

Q. To what denomination do you belong?—A. I am a Presbyterian. I believe a great deal more in giving bread and butter enough to keep us from starving. I was raised in Cayuga County, New York, and was christened when a child in the Baptist Church. I was raised by the strictest parents. I never abuse any religion, Catholic or Protestant.

Q. In the former part of your testimony you spoke of the Protestant religion, and then the question put with that led me to desire to know your religious belief.—A. I will say this much for the Catholic denomination of San Francisco. They do respect our working women, and they afford them facilities by which their labor shall be respected as much as is in their power. I say this, although I am not a Catholic at all. I have a great deal more belief in giving our people something to do to make their hearts happy and their bodies warm and well fed, before we expect them to be good, either little girls or little boys. It is not a very good little boy who goes along the street and sees a man carrying home a basket of fruit, and it goes to a rich man, and he has none because his father and mother cannot give it to him. It is a lack of equality. We have the brightest and best boys and girls here I have ever seen.

Q. You want to give them a chance?—A. I want to give them a chance. A lady came to me and said, "I am so disappointed about that little boy picking hops; I do not know what to do." She said "My boy has nothing to do; he has been arrested, and I am afraid I cannot do anything for him." I told her "I am well acquainted with Judge Lauderback, and he would do anything in kindness for me;" but she said, "He has got to go to the industrial school."

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do I understand you to say that these Sunday-schools are damaging to the Chinese?—A. I should not think that they were damaging to the Chinese at all.

Q. They are damaging to the Americans?—A. They are damaging to the general industries of the United States. It is not California particularly that Chinese labor is injuring. The masses of your people are starving from the results of the large amount of manufacturing that was carried on in the time of war. They worked in those industries then, but those doors are closed. You have a large population East, out of employment. Our valleys and our fields are ready to be occupied by them, but Chinese labor keeps them from coming. It is the same to New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, right through the whole of the States, as it is to us, because they cannot send their surplus here, and our climate is particularly adapted to the filthy, degraded habits of the Chinese. They can live in a basement set up this way, (illustrating,) and do not have hot things to eat. They can pack in there and sleep. You put them in the climate of New York, or the cold winter of Massachusetts, and they could not subsist there. We have got to have them, if anybody is to have them, for here they can live.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have we a large class of poor people here; suffering people? You mentioned people suffering for food.—A. We have a great many people on vision. We have a great many people with visionary ideas with regard to their getting rich in an hour. We have another class of sickly people who come from the East, and from Europe. They come here hoping to recover their health and they break down. They are on our hands poor. People who grow up here are not usually poor. The immigration was not the healthiest in early days—we are only twenty-five years old—nor was it the best. Our young men raised here you find nearly all prosperous young men, that I am acquainted with, a larger class of them than those who are born elsewhere and come here. I speak of those who have matured to manhood. We have now a large surplus of boys out of employment, but I think there is a great deal more said about our hoodlums than what is necessary. I think we have much better boys than we think we have.

Q. These valleys are open to the immigration of the East. How do the Chinese prevent the farmer from coming from Michigan and other States and occupying our valleys? What figure do the Chinese cut? They are not farmers?—A. I will give you one idea and you force me to say it, which I shall say. An idea has been prevalent in eastern cities of the corruption of California women. If there are any of those eastern gentlemen here they will assert the fact that the idea has been generally carried that our California women are fast-going; that they were not like the old wives of the East. What is the reason? Their labor has never been used. They have never been compelled, as eastern women, to work, nor expected to work. While men hear those reports they do not want to come into our valleys and occupy them. They have got to buy a small amount of land. They do not come here to buy, because if they have five hundred dollars in greenbacks it is true that would buy them a few acres of land, and with a large family they can not buy that here, and why? Because the sons and daughters cannot do anything. The surplus of cooly-labor prevents our beautiful valley from being occupied with the best of our American people. That is my

opinion. I have looked upon it, I have read, I have received letters from every part of the Union, almost, in regard to immigration to this State.

Q. Then a farmer coming here from Michigan with stalwart sons and daughters could not work a farm on account of cooly labor?—A. When rich they do not want to come into a new country and go on a farm; they want to go into the city. We want to reach the middle classes.

Q. I am speaking of the poorer classes?—A. The poorer classes cannot come here and buy a thousand acres of land, for our land is more valuable than it is in many parts of the East.

Q. What made it so?—A. I suppose it was God. I do not think it was man.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. If I understand you, the great obstacle in the way of labor to the laboring class here is the antagonism to labor with this inferior race?—A. That has much to do with it, particularly with my own sex.

Q. They do not like to labor with an inferior race?—A. They do not.

Q. They look upon it as degrading?—A. They look upon it as degrading. Where there is a second girl wanted, say as a dining-room girl, or a chamber girl, where a family keeps two or three, they keep a coachman, and a cook, and a girl for the dining-room and chamber-work. If they have a Chinaman in the kitchen the girl will not go, and *vice versa* if they have a Chinaman in the garden and an errand-boy, the best woman cook will not go, because she will not mix with them.

Q. It is antagonism to the inferior race?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They might get employment if they would work with this inferior race?—A. O, yes; there is plenty of employment. It is very hard to get a good house-woman at the present time.

ALEXANDER BADLAM sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are the assessor of the city of San Francisco?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. A long resident of the town?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you prepared any statistics in reference to this Chinese question?—A. I was requested some days ago to make out, as near as I could, a schedule of the Chinamen in town and the business they were engaged in. I set a number of deputies to work at it, and they have devoted several days, probably four or five days, to getting the best information they could. They found it difficult to get it exactly, but they have it approximated.

Q. Will you be kind enough to state to the commission the result of your inquiries through your department?—A. Chinamen engaged in the manufacture of cigars, about 2,800; cigar-boxes, about 350; in clothing, including overalls, shirts, &c., about 3,250; vegetable peddlers and gardeners, about 2,500—it may reach a little over that; in laundries, about 1,200; merchants, about 1,000, engaged in various occupations. Those who engage almost exclusively in gambling amount to between 1,500 and 2,000. They are marked down as professional gamblers. The laboring men among the merchants, porters, &c., amount to 650. In the match-factories, engaged in making matches, about 100 or 150; in boots and shoes, from 1,500 to 2,000—a little nearer 2,000; in woolen-mills, from 500 to 700. There was a much larger number than this in the woolen-mills, but their places have been filled by white labor, and they are being filled now. They are changing them. Engaged in

making white shirts there are only a little over a hundred. There were several hundred in that business, but they are changing to white labor, believing it to be more advantageous. In tanneries, about 400; engaged exclusively in making slippers, a little over 1,000; restaurant-keepers and those engaged in Chinese restaurants, from 700 to 800; in and about joss-houses, attendants, &c., very nearly 100; fishermen, from 1,100 to 1,200. House-servants we have estimated by taking five or six blocks in a locality, and we estimate the number at from 5,000 to 6,000 as house-servants, cooks, &c. We have taken different wards and gone around a block, taking perhaps twenty blocks in the city as an average, and then taken the number of houses and residences. Dealers in old junk and chiffoniers, or rag-pickers, from 500 to 600. That would include a class of persons who get around in the morning and take plank from sidewalks and appropriate whatever they can pick up during the time that the police are off duty, about six o'clock in the morning. From half past five to six o'clock in the morning the police are called in to answer roll-call, and this class of persons improve that opportunity to get around and take up lumber and scantling, and everything they can carry and take away. Engaged in canning fruits, pickles, &c., 2,200; Chinese brokers, a little over 100. There are several other smaller establishments that they did not consider worth taking.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the aggregate of all those occupations?—A. We estimate about 30,000.

Q. Have you counted to 30,000?—A. I have not added them up, but the deputy said they added them up, and estimated among others small saloons, &c. There are something like 100 engaged in driving express wagons, singular as it may seem, where they have their own wagons.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. It adds up 30,150.—A. There are probably two or three hundred loafers who do not do anything. The men were very careful. They went through Chinatown, and talked with a great many leading Chinamen there, from whom they could get very little information. The Chinamen were loath to impart information, from the fact that they believed it would be used for this purpose.

Q. How many women are there in this town?—A. I did not have that estimated.

Q. State, if you please, in what part of the city they mostly reside, or in what part of the city is the Chinese quarter, and describe it, with reference to our municipal and business centers.—A. It is between Kearny and Stockton, Pacific, and half-way between California and Sacramento streets. They take one-half of the block on the Sacramento street side. The California street side has no Chinamen at all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How many blocks is that?—A. That would be nine blocks, in round figures.

Q. Do you mean by a block, the four sides, a solid block?—A. Yes, sir. On the California street side of the block, between Kearny and Stockton, there is only one-half of the block occupied by Chinamen. The other side is all occupied by white people, commencing from Stockton street and running to Kearny. There are no Chinamen on that side at all, but on the Sacramento side they are all Chinamen. There are a few white prostitutes near Stockton street, but otherwise they are almost all Chinamen.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the assessed and assessable worth of San Francisco, real estate and personal? Give each in round numbers—the millions—A. It is between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000.

Q. What proportion is real estate?—A. That is $190,000,000 in round figures.

Q. How many millions of personal?—A. Say seventy-one millions, but increasing all the time.

Q. What proportion of real estate is owned in fee by Chinese?—A. It is very difficult to answer that question, because there is property that is owned by Chinese in town, some few pieces, and they leave the assessment in the names of white persons.

Q. It is not changed on the assessment-roll?—A. They do not change it, and they pay their taxes in some one else's name; but the real estate assessed to Chinamen does not, really, amount to anything. Perhaps $100,000 will cover it.

Q. How is it about their personal property?—A. Their personal property was assessed this year in round figures at $500,000, a little more than that.

Q. What is the population of San Francisco in round numbers?—A. About 270,000.

Q. What do you state in your judgment to be the Chinese population?—A. A little over 30,000; taking in the women, would make it probably 32,000.

Q. What are our laws in reference to poll-tax?—A. They refer to all classes.

Q. I mean to say how much poll-tax do we collect? What is the per-capita tax?—A. It is $2 until July, and $3 after July until January.

Q. Two dollars up to the period of payment, and then $3?—A. Yes, sir; and after January, $4.

Q. How are the Chinese as to their personal property and their per-capita tax? Are they willing tax-payers?—A. In the assessment of Chinaman we have a great deal of difficulty. The deputies who take that district report that they cannot believe any of them; they never make anything at all like a correct statement of their property, and it is only through a great deal of adroitness on the part of our men and information that they gain from Chinamen who post them of where their property is. When we find it, wherever we can find it, we always assess them in the same proportion of value as white people. As tax-payers, of course, I cannot state, because I am not a tax-collector; that is an entirely different department; but I think it is managed almost entirely through the specials who attend on the beats. I know that the specials who have the beats in Chinatown come down and get the tax-bills and then go and get the money in a great many instances. How far they are delinquent, it is, of course, impossible for me to tell.

Q. Do the Chinese willingly, or otherwise, pay their *per capita* tax, what we know as poll-tax?—A. We have more difficulty with them than with any other class, because they trade receipts with each other, and we are compelled to put a distinctive mark. We change the mark every year, describing the Chinaman in almost every particular, his height, his age, his appearance, whether he has pock-marks, and other scars on the head, face, ears, and nose. Almost all of them are cut in some way. We have numbers describing those distinctive marks, and when the collector collects of Ah Sin they put 44. He knows nothing about that number when he hands that to another Chinaman. As soon as he goes to China he will send it back to his friends, and they would use it over

indefinitely if we did not catch them on the number. When Ah Sin presents that tax-bill through another Chinaman, we find that he is a little short fellow without any scars. We tell him that is not his name, and it is impossible for him to hide his guilt. Our men are thorough psychologists. They in a moment know he is guilty. His face shows it. We take his receipt from him and make him pay, which he does very willingly; he sees he has to do it. It is a regular business, and they have to understand Chinamen as a hostler would understand his horse, and they adopt all sorts of strategies that way. They go up the country and get receipts, and the interior assessors are very glad to issue receipts almost blank. In a gang of forty-five when one Chinaman uses it he will hand it to another, but after they pass through our deputies the moment a deputy sees the receipt he places a distinctive number on it, and then if that receipt ever turns up again from another Chinaman who differs in description, we will take it from him and tell him it does not belong to him at all.

Q. What, in your opinion, is the effect of Chinese here upon the value of real estate property?—A. I think it is a great blight upon any community.

Q. How do you reason?—A. The general aversion to living in a neighborhood that is infested with Chinamen. I do not know any other word to use but to say infested with Chinamen. If not dirty, their habits and smell are entirely repugnant and disagreeable to us. I know, from my own experience, that real estate in the vicinity of Chinatown is very much depreciated. That immediately in Chinatown pays the best interest of any property in town on the investment.

Q. Why does it?—A. Because they pile in and get so many more people in, and pay such frightful rent. They will take a building which would not rent for more than one or two hundred dollars a month to white people, and those Chinamen will lease it for a term of years for $400 or $500 a month—the same property. In examining that last year and this year I was compelled all through the Chinese district to increase the assessment on that class of property, which brought forth some two, three, or four hundred applications for reductions of assessments, because they were unaccustomed to having a high rate placed on that property. I placed it because it paid much larger interest.

Q. You regarded the income and return as evidence of the value of the property?—A. I looked at it that way. You cannot buy property like that in Chinatown, because it brings such frightful rents. They take an ordinary story of 12 feet and make three separate stories of it, and fill them as closely as they will pack with Chinamen. My poll-tax collectors, in going through Chinatown, go into every hole and corner. The stories they tell me are perfectly wonderful of how the Chinamen pile in, they find them so thick.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Who owns that property in Chinatown generally? Have you any list of the owners?—A. That is a matter of record in the office. The houses are owned by every one. All classes of citizens own them.

Q. Have you a copy of the list?—A. I have not a copy with me. I can make one if it is the desire that I should do it.

Q. I think I should like to have a list of persons who own real estate in Chinatown.—A. I can send you a list, or bring it if you desire it; but it is owned by every class of citizens. Persons who desire large interest on their money will buy there as quick as they will on Montgomery street, particularly if it pays better interest on the investment.

Q. Do you remember generally, can you name some of the owners of the property there?—A. I could name probably nearly every owner in Chinatown, but I would much rather give you an official list of the owners, because I would not like to pick out and designate any particular persons in my testimony as owners. I will send you or bring here a complete list of all those who rent to Chinamen. It goes into every class. There are estates that own property there, people who do not live in this country at all. There are women, there are the richest men in town, and there are our poorest men. Some men have got all they have in the world there, because it pays bigger interest. People seek property that pays the largest interest.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The French own there largely, do they not?—A. Yes, sir; the French own a good deal. Many of the names are not familiar to the ears of San Francisco people; they are strange names, while a great many of our best men in town own property there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Of what nationality?—A. Every nationality.

Q. Is there any prevailing nationality?—A. No, sir; it is about evenly divided.

Q. Evenly divided among the French, Germans, Americans, and Irish?—A. Yes, sir; Hebrews and all.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How much do you collect annually out of Chinese for poll-tax?—A. I never segregated the Chinese from the whites to see what the difference was.

Q. Could you do it readily?—A. It would take some time, probably a week, to go through the books. I should judge, in the rough, it would be more in proportion than the white people pay.

Q. How much more in proportion?—A. I do not know how much. I think we collect more from Chinamen, because we intercept them as they leave the city, and we do not intercept white people. I will state the reason for doing that. Almost all Chinamen look alike, and these Chinamen who are traveling have no habitation or place where we can find them, and we are compelled, in order to get a tax out of them at all, to intercept them as they go away. We do not do that to white people, because they have a home and habitation, and we know where to find them at their house. Any man who can be found in the city, of any color or race, is called upon for his poll-tax. It is demanded. That is all the law contemplates. We demand it and get it if we possibly can. We collect from all alike.

Q. Notwithstanding that, there is a larger proportion paid by the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you collect of the Chinese passengers who leave for Hong-Kong in steamships as they are going away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you ever collect from white passengers under such circumstances?—A. No, sir; because they are mostly non-residents, and never have lived here, but the Chinamen have lived here and accumulated money out of California, and we look at it as but just that they should pay taxation. In the case of most of these laborers, about the only thing they contribute to support the government is this little poll-tax, and we make a particular point of making the Chinamen pay whenever we can without being oppressive. I never allow that on any class, but I make it a particular point to enforce the Chinese poll-tax.

Q. Your statement here figures up about 29,000 who are actually engaged in industries.—A. Those are estimates. It cannot be exact, because it is impossible to make it so.

Q. You do not put in this list transient laborers who come here for a job until they can go out of the city?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not know that many of these occupations which you have named here as being filled by Chinese labor are being filled by white labor?—A. I mentioned in the testimony those my attention was called to.

Q. Do you think there are more white operatives to-day engaged in these different manufactories than there would have been if we had not started them with Chinese cheap labor? Do you think they would have been started at all?—A. If you ask me what I think, I think our country would have been much better off if we never had had any Chinamen here at all.

Q. That is not the question at all. There are various opinions about that.—A. I think they are a scourge in any country.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You mix with all classes of the community, I suppose, as assessor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know the general opinion of the people of this city as to the desirableness of a large Chinese immigration here?—A. I think the people at large are entirely adverse, and very properly, to the influx of the Chinamen here.

Q. Is that confined to low and vicious and idle classes, or is it the opinion of all classes—merchants, artisans, lawyers—busy men?—A. I think it would include almost ninety-nine one-hundredths of the people of the community. There are very few who think the Chinamen a benefit to the country, and they are certainly men who have become rich out of their labor. The wealth in that particular has been unevenly distributed. Had the Chinamen not come to California at all, that money which these Chinamen have carried to China would have been distributed among the poorer people, and they would have got more of it, and those who have become wealthy out of it would not have had so much.

Q. The attention of the committee has been drawn, on the other side of this question, to a particular class of men who have large ranches, gather great wheat-crops, &c. Is there any particular reason moving on their minds why they should entertain opinions adverse to those of a large part of the community?—A. I am well acquainted in Napa and Sonoma Counties, but only those two agricultural counties; and I have found that there are very few people there who like the Chinese labor after having tried it. They prefer the other, even at a little larger rate. They pay Chinamen somewhere about a dollar a day, and they board themselves.

Q. Is there any reason why a man, having a very large ranch, gathering very great wheat-crops, &c., would be in favor of Chinese labor?—A. No, sir. For the wheat-crop Chinamen are not of any use, and very little use throughout the State. There are only some little industries that they are skilled in. The Chinese command more attention or they are more in demand in little things, like woolen mills, factories, where particular skill on some branch is concerned; cigar-making, in which the white men can scarcely compete with them, because they are very skilled, and learn very easily in making and handling cigars, canning fruits, and such things as that; but take the farming interests and

the fruit-picking, there are more white people engaged than there are Chinamen, and the Chinese labor is not desirable.

Q. Has public opinion had any influence in the employment of Chinese during the last few months to exclude them in San Francisco?—A. I do not know whether it is public opinion or not, but about the time of the public demonstration against the Chinese many of the factories commenced to try the other labor.

Q. I see there are signs up about the town that certain manufacturers, certain merchants, do not employ Chinese in the production of their goods. Have you observed such signs?—A. I have seen a great many of them in shoe-stores and other places.

Q. Is that one of the evidences that public opinion is against the employment of Chinese?—A. That is one evidence, but I think these signs do not amount to much. When a man is in business he will generally buy his goods where he can buy the cheapest and on the best terms, and if the Chinamen will sell them a little cheaper than some one else, they are very likely, as business men, to buy of them, if their goods are just as good.

Q. You only think it is an evidence of public opinion by showing that the pretense that they do not employ Chinese is popular?—A. Yes, sir; if they would put out a sign, "These shoes were made by Chinese!" they would not sell many of them.

Q. Would not these gentlemen so enthusiastic about the Chinese buy them?—A. I do not think they would. I think they would go around where they would be suited best.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you think we would have had these industries so successfully carried on now by Chinese labor if we had not had the Chinese labor?—A. I think we would have been on a better basis.

Q. Do you think we would have had these manufactories?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there any other branches of manufacturing in which we do not do anything?—A. There are some things in which California cannot compete with the East. If there is anything in the world that a Chinaman can get hold of and make money, he will establish a factory, or there will be one established here, because there is plenty of capital seeking investment, but the successful part I cannot tell you.

Q. What percentage does capital require here in its investment as an income per month?—A. One per cent. per month.

Q. Do you know any manufactory that would pay that percentage carried on by white labor?—A. I know a great many that pay a great deal more than that.

Q. Here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Carried on by white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Founderies?—A. Founderies and machinery.

Q. The Chinese do not embark in them?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How is it about wooden-ware, brooms, and that kind of labor?—A. The Chinamen do a great deal of wooden-work, and brooms and brushes.

Q. Could not that be successfully carried on without Chinese labor?—A. I believe so.

Q. Would not the cost of transportation on such bulky articles make a tariff in favor of this State?—A. They could be carried on here with young men, in my opinion. I believe that our population is large enough

here, and our idle population is made idle through cheap labor, if you please, which means Chinese labor. I believe that we would have less of the hoodlum element, as it is called, and it would be better for the prosperity of the State and city if we had no Chinamen at all and never had had any.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you believe we have a surplus of labor here now?—A. I know we have. There are thousands of men out of employment. I can hire any number of men here for almost any pursuit. The intelligence-offices are run over with people. Of course, there are a great many men who would not stay long in a place and who are not good hands; but we have plenty of people here. Our boys ought to take the place of every Chinaman engaged in factories and manufactures in this city. We have plenty, I think, if they were only utilized and the Chinaman, as I was going to say, driven out; but I suppose that would be impossible.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If they were not here?—A. If they were not here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The commission, in the interrogatories which they propounded, ask as to the number who have been converted to the Christian religion. In that respect, what is your opinion about the number of heathen souls that have been snatched from the chances of perdition through the ministry of our clergy?—A. I give it up. I am not a gospel sharp. Brother Gibson will enlighten you upon that, because he has it all at his finger's end. I do not know anything about the Christianizing of the heathen. I never did believe in it much.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is there much heathenizing of Christians, of the young, by this class? Is there much corruption of morals?—A. I cannot speak of my personal knowledge.

Q. You do not observe a deterioration of morals?—A. I certainly do; but I have no personal knowledge.

Q. Are the boundaries of Chinatown extending?—A. Very little. People who hold property outside hold it very firmly. I notice California street particularly. Only a few years ago a Chinaman endeavored to purchase the property on California and Dupont and running up California street, and they offered through their agent double what the property was worth and paying interest for, and the parties would not sell to them.

Q. Because they did not want them to get on the street?—A. Because they did not want them to get on the street. I know that Mr. Newhall has been offered a fabulous price for the old Congregational church, and has almost given it to the Academy of Sciences, you might say rent free, when he could have got a large sum, probably up in the hundreds, by renting the buildings to the Chinese or selling to them.

Q. Is this a continual pressure by the Chinese to extend, offering twice the value of property, &c.?—A. They have in many instances, to my knowledge, offered a great deal; every piece of property comes under my eye in my official position, and I know that they are desirous of extending. I know that they have on Stockton street, between Washington and Jackson, got one or two houses in there.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In what direction are they extending?—A. In no way particularly; within the past year they are crawling down Clay street.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have they got this side of Kearny street?—A. No, sir.

Mr. PIPER. Quite a number are on this side of Kearny street.

Senator SARGENT. On the bay side of Kearny?

The WITNESS. I had not noticed it; only hiring a store, you could not call moving Chinatown any more than you could the establishing a new wash-house. I think their business is confined above Kearny street

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How near are the Chinamen to Portsmouth square, in front of the city-hall?—A. They face it on the south side.

Q. That is the only considerable public park in the city, is it not, the one on the outskirts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is the central park of the city?—A. Yes, sir; I think that in a very few years they will take the whole of that frontage, on the south side of Clay street, by the way they are coming down now; they have a joss-house about the middle of the block in Dupont street, and they are occupying houses above and below it; they have just built a new block of brick buildings in there.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do I understand you to say that the cheap wages for which they labor is detrimental to the labor interests of the State?—A. That is my opinion.

Q. Based upon the cheapness of the wages?—A. Yes, sir; their modes of living are so different from ours that, to use a vulgarism, they can live on the smell of a greasy rag, and can afford to work for almost nothing.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Explain how they live and what the substance of their food is?—A. It is rice and fish; the lower classes live almost exclusively on rice and fish and rot-oil.

Q. Mixed up of a sort of olla podrida?—A. I do not know how they mix it up. I keep as far from them as possible.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You own real estate, do you not, in that immediate vicinity?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do they increase their area? Do they take possession forcibly of people's property, or is it the greed of the Anglo-Saxon race to make money, and they rent and sell to them?—A. I have not heard of any Chinamen or white people taking charge of other people's property without due process of law.

Q. How do they extend their limits without any force? This testimony of yours is going to a people who are perfectly ignorant of this subject, and your testimony, when taken down, goes to show that this spread is forced. Do the property-owners lease their property to them or sell it to them, if they want it to extend the area?—A. I cannot imagine how they could get possession of it, unless they do it in a peaceable way. I have not heard of any force being used by Chinamen or white people.

Q. They lease the property the same as other parties do?—A. Yes, sir; by giving higher rent and converting it into their dens. You spoke about my owning property in the Chinese district. I own property on California street, and Chinamen are directly in the rear of us, and I have a very good way of observing their habits; the rear of their houses is directly in our rear, and I am almost among them, a little nearer than I desire to be

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 26, 1876.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: Something has been said about the character of the persons forming the anti-Chinese organizations, and as certain names have been read here and statements made that they were armed, intending to mob the Chinese, I wish to introduce the constitution, not in its entirety, but one section of the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union. I read article three, section two, subdivisions four and five:

4th. That only lawful means shall be used in the suppression of Chinese immigration, and the expulsion of the Chinese from the United States. The club shall not arm its members, nor organize itself into a military company.

5th. That the club, and each member thereof, will refrain from molesting, abusing, or maltreating Chinamen, and discourage and prevent, as far as possible, all unprovoked assaults upon Chinese residents.

Senator SARGENT. I suggest that Mr. King be sworn in order to identify this document.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

CAMERON H. KING sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. Is this constitution which you hold in your hands, from which you have read an extract, the constitution of the anti-Chinese societies?—Answer. This is the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union, composed of all the different clubs of the State. All are entitled to representation in that. It provides for the formation of clubs, and no club can become a member of the organization without adopting a constitution which embodies the articles which I have just now read to protect Chinese.

Q. How numerous is the membership of these clubs in this State?—A. That it would be impossible for me to state. They are represented in the Union on a basis of the numerical strength of the clubs. Each club is entitled to its officers and five delegates, I believe; some such number as that.

Q. Can you approximate somewhere near the number of citizens of this State who belong to these societies?—A. In the interior I cannot tell.

Q. In this city, then?—A. In this city I should think there are certainly three or four thousand active members.

Q. What class of persons form the membership?—A. All classes.

Q. You mean by all classes, artisans and merchants?—A. Precisely; artisans, merchants, business men of all kinds.

Q. Lawyers?—A. Lawyers and other professional men.

Q. Are they respectable people, as a rule?—A. As a rule; and in fact they are altogether so. I think there are very few of any other class. Of the lowest classes there are hardly any—none that I know of. They are mostly workingmen, of course.

Q. Aside from the written constitution which you have presented to us, what has been the influence of these clubs so far as preserving or breaking the peace is concerned? How have they thrown their influence in the case of any apparant danger or disturbance of the public peace?—A. In preserving the peace and in protecting the Chinese residents, I think they have had a very beneficial effect. They have suppressed disturbances that might have arisen among the very lowest classes, who knowing that they could receive no assistance from the anti-Chinese clubs have been compelled to desist.

Q. Are these organizations political in any sense?—A. Not at all. They are composed of all political parties.

Q. Is there any attempt by the officers of clubs or influential members to divert them to the support of one or the other political party?—A. No, sir; that has been vetoed throughout in every instance I have heard of. I wish also to call attention to the list of vice-presidents of the Anti-Chinese Union. Among the number will be found Senator Sargent, Senator Booth, Mr. Piper, in fact all our representatives in Congress, and the lawyers, W. H. L. Barnes, M. M. Estee, James Glynn, O. H. Lagrange, Governor Irwin, Secretary of State Beck, Comptroller Brown, and many others.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Are they members of these clubs?—A. They are members of the clubs; that is, they are honorary members, and they are supposed to be contributing members to a certain extent. They pay a certain initiation fee, or they are supposed to do so. I do not know whether it has been demanded of them or not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. This organization represents the union of the different societies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A sort of grand lodge, compared to Odd-Fellows or Masons?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What article was it that you desired to have put into the record?—A. It was simply the two subdivisions of article 3, section 2, which I read. Section 2 provides that—

Each anti-Chinese club in this State desiring representation in this association here after shall adopt a constitution which shall, among other things, contain the following provisions:

* * * * * * *

4th. That only lawful means shall be used in the suppression of Chinese immigration, and the expulsion of the Chinese from the United States. The club shall not arm its members, nor organize itself into a military company.

5th. That the club, and each member thereof, will refrain from molesting, abusing, or maltreating Chinamen, and discourage and prevent, as far as possible, all unprovoked assaults upon Chinese residents.

I offer these paragraphs simply for the purpose of showing that they are peaceable organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish also to have put into the record the second article of the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union, which states the object of the society, and sets forth its purpose.

Senator COOPER. If there is no objection, let it all go in.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would cumber up the record.

Senator SARGENT. It might go in the appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

(See Appendix F.)

The WITNESS. So far as their secret working is concerned, I am not a member of any of these secret organizations which might be in their character political in any event.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Several of the names you have read there, my own among others, are honorary members, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But not members contributing to the club?—A. They do not contribute money to the club. In some instances they have been called upon for an initiation fee. I think it is $5; that is all they pay. All the prominent citizens of the State are in the list.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I suppose they are elected generally without their knowledge?—A. They are elected generally without their knowledge, and informed of their election afterward.

Q. They choose gentlemen supposed to be in sympathy with it?—A. Precisely. Senator Sargent, I believe, was informed of his election, and all the other gentlemen on this list.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. It was asserted here by Mr. Brooks that these anti-cooly clubs are composed of a certain nationality and a certain religion. Is that true?—A. No, sir; it is decidedly not true; they are composed, of course, of the working-classes, the active members, in fact, being almost entirely workingmen, but they represent all nationalities. It may be that the Irish element predominates, because the Irish laboring element predominate in the city; but there are Germans, Americans, and all nationalities, and the membership is confined to no religion. There are, certainly, to my knowledge, Orangemen and Catholics in the same lodges working together.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Are the clubs secret in their work?—A. No, sir; open, except when in executive session. The clubs addressed a letter to the chief of police at the very time that there was something said about a disturbance, assuring the chief of police of their support, and that they were ready to be called upon to assist in maintaining order at any time. That letter is of record.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. There are different leagues. You have read from the constitution and by-laws of the Anti-Chinese Union?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I read from article 3, section 5:

Measures will be taken by the club to ascertain and publish the names of those persons in this city who employ Chinese.

A. That is the constitution of the Anti-Cooly Club of the eleventh ward, which was not offered in evidence.

Q. You don't offer it in evidence?—A. I did not offer it, but I am willing that it shall go in, now that you refer to it.

Mr. BEE. I offer the 4th section of article 3 of the constitution of the Anti-Cooly Club of the eleventh ward:

Each member of the club shall pledge himself not to employ Chinese labor; not to purchase any goods, wares, or merchandise from any person who employs Chinese, and not in any manner to sustain, foster, or encourage either the Chinese themselves or those who employ them.

Also article 7, section 1:

There shall be a committee of investigation, consisting of such members as the club deem proper. It shall be the duty of this committee, and each member thereof, to inquire as to what persons employ Chinese or purchase from Chinese any articles manufactured or produced in this State. The committee shall report the names of all persons employing Chinese to the club. The names so reported shall be recorded in alphabetical order by the corresponding secretary, and shall be read once, at least, in each month before the club. After any person has been so announced by the club as employing Chinese or purchasing articles manufactured or produced by the Chinese in this State, no member of the club shall thereafter patronage or purchase from such person, and he shall use all lawful means to discourage others from so doing.

Q. (By Mr. BEE.) Do the vice-presidents generally respond to your notice that they accept the position of vice-president?—A. That I cannot say. The secretary would know that. I suppose they would be informed, and those who did not respond of course would be left off the

list; although this list, I think, embraces all who were elected at the first meeting. Some may not have assented to it.

Q. Some have assented, that you recollect distinctly?—A. Yes; some have assented to it, I know; many.

Q. How many members are there of the leagues of which you are an active member?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. How many leagues are there in the county of San Francisco?—A. There are over twenty.

Q. Do they average a membership of one hundred each? They are entered upon a roll, I suppose.—A. O, yes; I think they average over that, considerably.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Has Chinese immigration among us had a tendency to degrade the dignity of labor or not?—A. I certainly think it has a tendency to degrade it. I think the laboring man dislikes to work beside a Chinaman, and that he feels that the Chinaman is not his social equal. He feels that he is degrading himself in associating with that class of people.

Q. Has it or has it not about the same tendency in relation to labor here that slavery had in the South formerly as to the respectability and dignity of labor?—A. I think it has, to a certain extent. So far as slave-labor made labor dishonorable in the South, just so far cooly-labor makes labor dishonorable in this State.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How does it have that effect? Slave-labor made labor dishonorable because it was not free; it was forced labor. Is not Chinese labor free labor?—A. I think not. It is certainly a very ignorant kind of labor. They are an ignorant people. So far as I have observed, although my opportunities have not been so great as many I shall put on the stand, they do not make their own contracts, but some head, some overseer, contracts for their labor, and they are sent here and there through the State, told to do this and that, driven as the slave-driver drives his slaves.

Q. Do you mean that they are coerced by the whip; that they are driven by force?—A. They are not coerced by the whip; that is, not in all cases; but certainly they are coerced by a fear of their own people; a fear of the consequences that might ensue if they did not obey.

Q. Do you count the labor of ignorant men slave-labor?—A. No, sir. I say that the Chinese belong to the most ignorant classes; that there is no labor among our whites that is as degraded as Chinese labor; and that the estimation in which it is generally held by the people of course has its effect upon white labor.

Q. Do you find white men here who will not work along with Chinese on a public work, a building, or anything of that sort? Are there white men here who will refuse to work alongside of the Chinaman because of his race?—A. Plenty of them.

Q. Are these generally ignorant people, or are they well-informed people?—A. They are of the average intelligence of our white working-classes.

Q. Is that prejudice because Chinese labor is not free, or is it because of their race, their color?—A. I think it is because, in the opinion of the white working-classes, the Chinese labor is not free. They do not regard it as free labor. It is not generally regarded as free labor on this coast.

Q. Let me call your attention to the fifth section, article 3, of the constitution of the Eleventh Ward Anti-Cooly Club:

Measures shall be taken by the club to ascertain and publish the names of those persons in this city who employ Chinese. When any person has been so announced by this club as a supporter of Chinese labor, no member shall thereafter purchase any article or commodities from such person, or bestow patronage upon such person in any form whatever.

I will ask you whether that part of this constitution is carried into execution?—A. I do not know to what extent it has been attempted, but it is carried into execution to some extent, at least.

Q. Does it extend to merchants, grocers, and to everybody else who employs Chinese?—A. To all, so far as they know it.

Q. What effect does that have upon the business of the city?—A. It has had the effect, in many cases, of inducing those who employed Chinese to discharge them. I have in my mind several cases where they discharged their Chinese, especially in the laundry business. There were many white owners of laundries who had been employing Chinese labor, but they discharged them because their business fell off so rapidly when these clubs were formed; and it must have been the result of that determination.

Q. Is that carried so far as to refuse to patronize hotels where Chinese are employed?—A. It is impossible, of course, to live up to the spirit and intent of that clause fully. They do it as far as possible, I think, a large number. The object was to discourage the employment of Chinese, in order that if the market could be flooded with Chinese labor, being a surplus, it would emigrate. That was the object they wished to attain.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The real object of the club, as I understand you, is to get rid of the Chinese legally, if that can be done?—A. Precisely.

Q. By any legal means?—A. By any legal means.

Q. They want to rid the country of the Chinese?—A. Precisely.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I see this article is confined to this city. "Measures shall be taken by the club to ascertain and publish the names of those persons *in this city* who employ Chinese." Do you understand that the clubs in other parts of the State have similar provisions in their constitutions, and endeavor to execute them?—A. Undoubtedly. For a while there was a paper published here containing a list of the names of those who employed Chinese. It was a small paper. I know I received many communications from the interior, from all parts of the State, some from San José, asking the names of those who employ Chinese here, so that they could stop trading with them from those sections, as, for instance, boot and shoe manufacturers. As they desired the list sent there, I know from that that they must have had the same provision in those places.

Q. How often is this list—I suppose you would call it the black-list—published?—A. Not now at all.

Q. How long has it been since there was a publication of that kind?—A. I do not recollect; some time ago; several months.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The article from which the chairman read is contained in the constitution of the eleventh ward club?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is any similar article contained in the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union?—A. Yes, sir; it requires every club to contain that provision, I believe.

Q. Something has been said about the competition of wages, cheap labor, &c.; is not the real question a competition in living, as between the white laborer and the Chinese?—A. I think so. I do not think that it is merely a question of cheap labor. Men do not complain simply of the cheapness of the labor, but it is the question of degrading the labor. Of course, the price of labor enters into it to some extent. If the Chinese are only paid a living price, they can live so cheaply that it would force white labor from our market entirely.

Q. This is the idea. A Chinaman can live, say, on ten cents a day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A white man who eats meat, and clothes and educates his children, and has children and a family, perhaps cannot live short of fifty cents a day for each member of his family. If only ten cents a day can be afforded for labor, then the competition comes between the means of the living of the white man and the Chinaman?—A. Precisely. The white man must starve if he cannot obtain more than ten cents a day.

Q. Can a white man live on the wages which the Chinaman will furnish labor for, as a rule?—A. Not as a rule, I think. I am not so well posted on those propositions as others; that is, I cannot speak of my own personal knowledge; I only speak from opinion.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you that one of the objections is the cheapness of this labor; that the Chinaman, on account of the cheapness of his living, and for other reasons, can work cheaper than the white man.—A. That is one of the objections, perhaps, among the laboring men.

Q. I understood that to be the substance of your remark a few moments ago, that they could live here for ten cents a day, and consequently work cheaply.—A. Yes, sir; that is one of the objections. Another thing, the cheapness of their labor does not, in the least, or has not so far, benefited the public at large, except the actual employer—the manufacturer; that is, the prices of the goods they have produced have not been reduced at all, correspondingly.

Q. If the employer can procure this cheap labor, is he not thereby enabled to sell his product cheaper, necessarily?—A. I should suppose that necessarily would follow, but it is not the fact.

Q. I would ask you, then, if competition would not bring the employer down to the lowest living price?—A. It might. Yes; it would eventually.

Q. And if he employed cheap labor, he could thereby sell his productions or his manufactured articles cheaper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you regard that argument as affecting the introduction of labor-saving machinery?—A. I would never put the question simply on the ground of Chinese cheap labor alone, but there is considerable difference in labor-saving machinery. Their very manufacture gives employment to men, and while it closes the avenue to one class of labor for the white man, yet still there are many others opened, and a labor-saving machine simply diverts the channel of labor. Not so with the Chinese. In fact they are a labor-saving machine to be applied to all purposes.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The sewing-machine is a labor-saving machine?—A. Precisely.

Q. Suppose the sewing-machine is run by Chinamen?—A. Then there are two labor-saving machines.

Q. It simply doubles the difficulty to the laborer?—A. Certainly.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Has not the sewing-machine greatly reduced the demand for fe-

male labor everywhere?—A. I should think that perhaps has been the result.

Q. One person with a sewing-machine would do the work of half a dozen?—A. Of a certain class, certainly; but yet the manufacturer of sewing-machines would require a great many hands. Of course a greater number might be forced into other employments. The sewing-machine only performs one class of labor. It does not clean the house, it does not work in the cotton manufactory, or do anything of that kind where Chinese can work.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The Chinese are engaged largely in the raising of the small market products of the country?—A. I think so.

Q. When the wife of a member of the anti-cooly league goes into the market, does she inquire of the vegetable-man who raises the vegetables that she is buying?—A. She will not buy of a Chinese peddler or any one whom she has good reason to suppose buys of Chinese.

Q. She buys vegetables necessarily?—A. Certainly.

Q. To a large extent?—A. Certainly.

Q. As the member of the anti-cooly league goes along the shopping streets of this city, and buys his boots and shoes and pants and shirts, does he catechise the dealer or the merchant as to who made them?—A. I do, always; and I presume a large number do. I would not on principle, certainly, buy a pair of boots which I supposed was made by a Chinaman.

Q. Would you prefer to pay two dollars and a half more for the boots?—A. I certainly would, and be more economical in other ways.

Q. Are the members of the anti-cooly leagues as able to do that as you are, as a general proposition?—A. I think so, fully. I think professional men are generally as little able as the working-classes.

Q. Then the members of the league are in pretty affluent circumstances?—A. Not at all.

Q. Then you did not understand my question. I asked you if the members of these anti-cooly leagues would do the same as yourself—pay the additional white-labor price in buying their articles rather than buy the same article made by Chinese at a cheaper rate?—A. I think they would.

Q. Do you think they do?—A. I think that a large number do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Would they not have a better ability to pay the higher price provided they had the work of making these things instead of being deprived of employment in their manufacture by the Chinese?—A. Certainly, their labor would be better paid; they would be earning more.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Suppose we did away to-day with all this Chinese cheap labor; that, on account of it, flour went $2 a barrel higher; that the white man got in proportion the same ratio of wages; that all labor was paid in the advanced rates, and that all he ate and consumed rose accordingly; would he be then benefited?—A. I do not think such would be the result. I think, so far as the agricultural products are concerned, the price is never regulated by the absolute cost of the production. It is regulated more by the supply and the demand. It might be different, of course, with manufacturers.

Q. If a farmer pays double the price to labor for harvesting, he sells his wheat at a higher price?—A. I think that that is good so far as grain crops, &c., are concerned.

Q. Take potatoes. We consume enormous quantities of potatoes.—A. I think even with potatoes it would depend on demand and supply almost altogether.

Q. Potatoes can be purchased in Sonoma County at $10 a ton. They are $2 a bushel in Boston. If it cost twenty-five cents to sack a sack of potatoes, and the man who raised them charged that additional price upon them, where would the benefits come in to the poor man by the white-labor part of it? He would pay the additional cost for his potatoes, would he not?—A. Those certainly who favor a protective tariff would answer you that it would benefit the white men, because it would give them employment.

Q. This thing, then, is rather protective?—A. No, sir; but there are many similarities, of course, between the free-trade question and the cheap-labor question.

By Mayor BRYANT:

Q. Does not the Liverpool market regulate the wheat market in this city?—A. Undoubtedly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Does not the supply and demand of the Liverpool market regulate it?—A. Precisely; but that is not influenced at all by the cost of our production. If it cost one farmer double the amount to raise a crop of potatoes that it cost another, it would not affect the price of the market at all; it would not affect the price at which he would hold his potatoes.

Q. Are we not, then, in a position to meet the demand of the Liverpool market by harvesting our crops cheaply?—A. I do not think the Chinese harvest to any great extent.

Q. By cheap labor of any kind would we not have the advantage over the Mediterranean or Liverpool market by harvesting our crops cheaper?—A. We would sell where we could to the best advantage, but of course our prices would be governed by the amount of grain in the market; by the supply and demand, not by the cost of production. It would be better for the individual, of course, if he could produce cheaply. He would make a greater profit.

Q. There are seasons here when wheat is very low?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is not a laborer better off with $3 a day, even if it costs proportionately to live, than with ten cents a day?—A. With that extreme I should say yes.

Q. Say $2.50 and twenty-five cents a day. In other words, is not a laborer more likely to live well and in respect of margin of wages who receives $2.50 than where he receives twenty-five cents?—A. All other things being equal, certainly.

Q. In other words, low labor is not a benefit to the laboring class, even if they get a low living? With low wages, how can a man ever hope to lay up something for the future? How can our poor men become at all rich or comfortable by means of labor?—A. I think if you take the wealth of the world and divide it among the population you will find that we all live from hand to mouth; that is, that we earn no more than our daily bread; and, of course, when you come to apply it to a class, you cannot say that any person can lay up. I think that Mr. Wells estimated the average earnings of the people of the United States, for instance, was $130 a year, barely sufficient to live upon, and that while some may accumulate much more than others, a few will be starving, and accumulate nothing.

Q. My question was simply whether, having started this labor problem, you think it is better or worse for the laborer to receive liberal wages, even if it costs proportionately to live, than to receive mean wages even if he can live on those mean wages? Which is better for the laborer? Is the American system of paying the laborer well the best?—A. The better labor is paid, the better for the laborer, undoubtedly.

Q. Even if it costs proportionately to live?—A. No, sir; I do not know that there is any difference in that case. If it cost proportionately to live, of course I do not know that there is any difference.

Q. You do not understand my question. I put the case of a man who receives, say, $3 a day for labor, as against a man who receives twenty-five cents a day for labor. Is there not a probability in the first case that there will be a proportional margin of profit between the cost of living and the amount he earns?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Then is not the American system of paying liberal wages to the laborer better than the Asiatic system of paying mean wages?—A. Of course.

Q. Even if it costs proportionately to live?—A. Proportionately, certainly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Senator Sargent's question is whether or not there is more dignity connected with a man who receives $3 a day for his labor than one who receives only $1.—A. I did not understand his question to be that. I do not think, of course, that there is any difference.

Q. What is the difference, if you can buy the same things for a dollar to support your family with in one case as you can purchase for $3 in the other case?—A. There is the mistake. That is where Senator Sargent looks at the question differently. It is not the money representative that is the value of labor; it is what it will buy. That is, of course, what I am speaking of in the value of labor. All that a day's labor is worth is just what it will bring. Of course the money is worth nothing; it is simply the representative of value.

Q. Chinamen live principally upon rice and fish?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What amount of rice will sustain a Chinaman for one day?—A. I do not know.

Q. Two pounds?—A. I have not examined the question at all, and dislike to guess.

Q. Two pounds of rice would be a very small ration for twenty-four hours?—A. It might be without anything else.

Q. With a little fish? What is the price of rice per pound?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you not know that it is eight, nine, and ten cents a pound?—A. I do not know the prices. You may state them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I see from the third article of your constitution that you propose to cut off Chinese immigration altogether:

To discourage and stop any further Chinese immigration, and to urge the withdrawal of the Chinese from the country, using only lawful means to attain these objects.

A. Yes, sir; that was the original intention. I think it not practical to carry it to that extreme.

Q. Is that a part of the constitution of all these clubs?—A. To the present moment certainly; but they would be quite willing to accept a modification.

Q. Have they ever made a modification or has one ever been proposed?—A. I do not know that anything has been proposed in the way of modifying the constitution, but discussions in the club lead me to believe that they would be satisfied with a limit to the immigration, a limit which would allow the departures to be far in excess of the arrivals, so that there would be a constant drain on the Chinese here.

Q. Which would result in the extermination of all of them.—A. That is what is meant by excluding the Chinese or compelling them to withdraw, to so limit the immigration that the emigration will exceed it. Of course that would be a drain upon the Chinese population, and in the end none or but few would remain, and those would be permanent.

Q. Would you regard it as desirable to have them all go away?—A. Certainly. I can see no evil effects to result from it, even if the labor market requires them at the present time; there is certainly a large surplus of labor in the eastern market and it would be attracted here if it will pay. Labor will go where it can be paid, and it would come here; like water it will seek its level all over, of course.

Q. What do you understand to be free labor? What constitutes free labor?—A. The right to follow whatever avocation one pleases under all the terms one pleases. That will cover it, perhaps.

Q. The right to follow any avocation he pleases, upon such terms as he pleases?—A. To be entirely a free agent.

Q. That is to say, to work for such wages as he considers acceptable?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you regard it that there are two parties to constitute free labor; that the employer must be free to employ upon such terms as he can?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Is it not a necessary element of free labor that the employer shall be free to employ upon such terms as he can?—A. Of course that must follow.

Q. And that without punishment?—A. And that without punishment.

Q. Then suppose that you place a pressure upon the employer by which you prohibit him from employing a certain class of labor under the pain of having his business cut off or destroyed, would you regard that as affecting the freedom of labor?—A. No, sir; I would simply say then that free labor combines to protect itself against slave labor. I presume that you allude to that clause of the constitution against patronizing those who employ Chinese.

Q. I am asking your view as to how that affects free labor itself?—A. In order that all the labor may be entirely free, those who compose the white working-classes say, "We will not trade with you, sir, unless you will trade with us; because if you do not employ us we must leave here; we may as well stop now; we may as well prepare to emigrate now; we will not trade with you or trade with any one who employs Chinese; we may as well prepare to leave the country as to continue until after a while when we will be obliged to accept the same terms and labor under the same conditions as the task-masters of the Chinese impose upon them."

Q. Let me understand the operation of this rule to another State; for instance, to another race. Suppose in one of the Southern States they should form clubs to pledge themselves not to employ colored men, negroes. Would you regard that as affecting the rights of a class and as affecting the freedom of labor?—A. It is on the same basis, of course, as trades' unions, and whether they are right or wrong I am not pre-

pared now to say; but it might be denominated here a war measure. It was absolutely necessary for the white men to take that step.

Q. Suppose that you should regard a certain kind of political opinions as prejudicial to your interest, and a club should be formed in which the members would pledge themselves not to employ or patronize men of particular political opinions, do you think that would be in consonance with our institutions?—A. No, sir; I think it would be wrong. It is only in cases of urgent necessity that I think these things should be tolerated even.

Q. Suppose a club should be formed in which the members would pledge themselves not to patronize any one who would use a labor-saving machine to do that which could be done by manual labor, do you think that would be proper?—A. It certainly would not be proper, in my opinion.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I want to set your leagues right upon one subject. Do you authorize in your leagues the sending of threatening letters to people who employ Chinese?—A. I know of no threatening letters having been sent; that is, what I would call threatening letters. I heard, although I did not see the letter, that the Mission woolen-mills were informed, or requested rather, to discharge their Chinese. I do not know how strong the letter was; but I think no threats were made.

Q. Is it not a fact that white labor is gradually crowding out the Chinese in all the manufactories going on of which such complaint has been made, and has this not been going on for fifteen years, they gradually substituting white labor, as far as possible; and do you not, as a representative of the laboring-men, know that this thing will regulate itself in time?—A. No, sir; I do not know that. If I supposed that the labor was entirely free it might regulate itself; but when it is slave or compulsory labor, contracted for as we have heard described in the testimony here, I do not think that left to itself it would regulate itself.

Q. I admit that myself; but I deny that it has been proved here that we are working under any such system.—A. That is a question of fact.

Q. Is it not a fact that white operatives are being taken in rapidly in the different manufactories here in place of Chinese?—A. I think so. I understand so.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The Chinese civilization and our own are very different?—A. Of course theirs is different.

Q. Is there, in your opinion, any possibility of their amalgamating with our civilization; taking up with it?—A. They are, of course, a very undesirable class of citizens or residents.

Q. Can they assimilate?—A. I do not think they can assimilate.

Q. What is your opinion as to the ability of an American citizen to live like a Chinaman and be received into the society of American people?—A. It would be impossible for an American.

Q. A similar mode of living would exclude him from American society?—A. Yes, sir; and not only that, but the population would become diseased, sickly, and incapable of even carrying on their labor, if they would live as Chinese do, under ground and crowded as they are; that is, any white people that we have among us.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You say that there are about three thousand members of these anti-cooly leagues?—A. Yes, sir; I think there are three thousand. That is a rough estimate. I cannot tell the exact number.

Q. Do you think that all the prudent, considerate men who would not commonly do a foolish act do not belong to these anti-cooly leagues?—A. No, sir; certainly not. You can stand on the street and observe those who pass, and the members of the club will average in sentiments or feelings with any other class.

Q. Do you think these three thousand anti cooly people are just about as prudent and considerate as any other body of men?—A. Undoubtedly so.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the condition of our laboring class of men, our respectable artisans and laborers, our mechanics?—A. I think their condition is better in this city than any other city in the Union, probably.

Q. They do not live in tenement-houses?—A. No, sir.

Q. They generally own their own premises?—A. Certainly.

Mr. PIXLEY. And they are saved from utter destitution by our climate.

MAURICE C. BLAKE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are a long resident of our city?—Answer. Yes, sir; I came here in 1853.

Q. And your position is what?—A. Judge of the municipal criminal court.

Q. For how many years have you performed judicial duties in connection with criminal matters?—A. Nearly eleven years.

Q. During that time have you had a large opportunity to observe the Chinese with reference to their respect for and observation of our oaths in giving testimony in your courts?—A. I have had a pretty good opportunity to observe them.

Q. State, if you please, what is the result of your observation of that particular.—A. I think the Chinese witnesses, as I have seen them, pay less attention to the oath than white witnesses. The Chinese who appear as witnesses in the criminal courts are generally persons who are connected by friendship or some other tie with the criminals, and they are not of the better class of Chinamen; but I think they pay less attention to the oath, probably, than white people do who are similarly connected with white men who are criminals.

Q. What is your opinion as a citizen regarding the desirableness of limiting Chinese immigration, regarding it in all its aspects, its effect upon society, morals, the industries, the citizenship, and the future of our State? Is it desirable that it should be limited or that it should be extended?—A. I think Chinese immigration ought to be discouraged. That is my judgment about it, though I have paid very little attention to the economical questions connected with the Chinese, and would not consider myself as well able to speak advisedly as most other persons.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you been upon the bench?—A. I was presiding judge of the court of sessions for nearly six years. That was a criminal court. I was at that time county judge. After that I was probate judge for four years, and then I was out four years. Since that time I have been about five years judge of the municipal criminal court, which is a court that has a sort of intermediate jurisdiction; that is, it would not try the highest grade of offenses, nor the lowest; it tries indictments for felonies except those that are capital.

Q. What is your observation in regard to the Chinese in the settle-

ment of their difficulties relating to business among themselves? Do they go into the courts, or are their difficulties adjusted among themselves chiefly?—A. As far as any observation of mine is concerned, I have understood that they settle a great many of those things among themselves; but I speak only by hearsay. I have lived a good deal by myself here, and know very little about these men exept what I see in court. I have never had a case of that kind to come under my own observation.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. I understood you to express an opinion that it would be better to stop Chinese immigration. Will you be kind enough to give the reason on which you base that opinion?—A. I think we should discourage it, not stop it.

Will you give us the reasons for that opinion?—A. I have no reason satisfactory to myself, except that I have thought if it were discouraged white labor would gradually take its place, and it would be better for the community to have white labor to do the work than this other labor. I do not believe myself that any very radical, sweeping change would be desirable. I have always had an idea that if the immigration could be discouraged, and white labor could take the place of Chinese labor gradually, it would be an improvement. I think it is certainly better for us if we can have a white man do the work than to have a Chinaman do it.

Q. Why is that; because of difference of race?—A. Yes, sir; because a white man will probably make a citizen, and be good for something besides labor, and Chinamen, I do not suppose, ever will. I do not think it is desirable that they should, and I do not suppose that they ever will, become citizens; but, as I have said, about those questions that are economical in their nature, I have very little confidence in my own judgment.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there a choice among the white race? Do you regard some as being preferable to others, some classes of white labor, some races?—Do you think there are some races of white men who make better laborers than other races?—A. I presume so. I do not mean to say that I do not think, as far as mere labor is concerned, that the Chinese are not good laborers. My impression is that they are very good, as far as mere work is concerned. I think they are very industrious.

Q. You refer to it as a question of public economy?—A. That is what I refer to.

Q. Affecting the general welfare, taking a series of years?—A. Yes, sir. As far as I have observed, I do not know of any people who are more industrious than the Chinese, and who will in the long run accomplish more; but, as I have said, I have not had very much experience among them; I only give my impression in regard to them.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The same reasons would apply to any race of inferior civilization?—A. Yes, sir; in respect to the oath that is administered, I think there is a very large part of the people who come to my court, and who are friends of the criminals, who pay very little attention to it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How is it in point of the difficulty of conviction of the Chinese? Is it more difficult to get at the real bottom facts of the case where all the witnesses are Chinese?—A. Where all the witnesses are Chinese, I

suppose it is; but my experience is that it is a very easy thing to convict a Chinaman as I see them in court. It is very likely that the police have a good deal of difficulty about hunting up testimony and getting the cases ready, but I think Chinamen are very easily convicted.

By the CHAIRMAN;

Q. Why is that?—A. I cannot tell exactly why it is. One reason is that when a Chinaman comes in he seems to be entirely helpless; he has no friends, and the policeman has perhaps seen him under some circumstances which show that he has committed a burglary. He does not know what to do with himself when he comes into court. The testimony for the prosecution is heard. If the Chinaman goes on to tell his own story, perhaps it is owing to the fact that he has not understood all the testimony against him; but he has not, as a white man would have, any idea of telling a reasonable story in his own excuse. He will deny everything, usually, and tell a story that will convict him, if he is put on the stand, and his lawyer is very apt to put him on the stand.

Q. Will your juries convict a Chinaman upon less evidence than a white man, as a general thing?—A. I think they are a trifle swifter; but occasionally, I think, a man is acquitted because he is a Chinaman. I think once in a while you get a jury, and they see a man has not much show, and they acquit him, when they would convict a white man perhaps. It depends a good deal upon the temper of the jury. To speak plainly, I think that this sentiment that divides the community to some extent influences jurors; but, as I have said, sometimes it happens that men who are pretty strongly anti-cooly, that class of men, will acquit a Chinaman because they see that he has not much of a show—that he is helpless; but, as a rule, the result of my experience is that a Chinaman does not stand quite as good a chance as a white man before a jury. I remember not long ago we had a case. There were several Irishmen on the jury, and they are supposed to be as unfriendly to Chinamen as anybody, and I was glad to see that they agreed to let him go, I think influenced by the idea that the fellow was helpless, and that if he had had any capacity for taking care of himself he might have got off. But then it is true that, as a rule, when a Chinaman's case goes to a jury, there is no help about it; the jury must convict him. The testimony on the part of the people shows that he is guilty, and he does not say anything that will help himself. They are the poorest witnesses for themselves that ever I have seen. Put on a white man, and he understands that if he is going to lie he has got to make it consistent.

Q. Under your law does the defendant testify?—A. He can testify. He cannot be called on by the people, but he can testify for himself if he chooses.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you noticed in your court where Chinamen were brought on either side of the issue that they seemed to testify exactly the same thing; Chinaman after Chinaman coming in and telling the same story without that variety of incident which would be observed by different American witnesses?—A. It is so sometimes, certainly. I have seen cases that depended on Chinese witnesses, where the testimony seemed to be very fair, I thought; but I have noticed cases, and a good many, perhaps, where the witnesses seemed to have had a story that must have been the result of conference among themselves.

Q. That was my experience formerly with them. I did not know whether it kept up or not.—A. I think there is no doubt about that.

Q. I did not know but that possibly it might be that the interpreter

would tell the same story over and over again.—A. The interpreter undoubtedly gets into a formal way of interpreting that makes it seem a little more the same story than it would otherwise. I have noticed that if a question is asked as to the character of a witness, the answer is almost always that he is a good person. I have supposed that hardly the same form of expression was used by the witnesses invariably, but that it was the interpreter who had got into the habit of translating certain words which had the same meaning in the same form.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have you any interpreters that you suppose can give the nicest shades of meaning and distinction in the Chinese language, so as to bring the witness out as you would an American witness?—A. The interpreters themselves say it is often very difficult to do this. I think in some classes of the Chinese the interpreters can give a pretty correct translation of what they say, but I know it often happens that the interpreter will say this man speaks a particular dialect and it is very difficult for him to understand it, and probably he does not catch his meaning with much exactness or with any very nice precision.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In speaking of the Chinese criminal coming into court with his friends, do you not find that the same state of affairs exists with white criminals? In other words, is not perjury committed in your court daily by whites?—A. Undoubtedly. I think I said that where a man who is really a criminal comes into court and has friends, they are not at all scrupulous about saying anything that will get him off.

Q. White or black?—A. Any class of witnesses. White witnesses will do that to almost any extent.

Q. Did you ever hear of a Chinaman being pardoned out of the State's prison?—A. Yes; I have heard of one case.

Q. An isolated instance, or several?—A. I only recollect one case at this minute. Very likely there have been more. I recollect the case of this Chinaman because, on some urgent representations, I signed the petition to have him pardoned, and very soon afterward I sent him over again.

HENRY GEORGE sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. Are you acquainted with the effect of Chinese employment on white labor on this coast?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. State what in your opinion the effect is.—A. I will state generally, in the first place, that my observation leads me to a totally different conclusion from that stated by Colonel Bee, that the employment of Chinese is decreasing. On the contrary I have observed for some years past, and I think it very evident, that besides increasing in numbers the increase has been highly marked in the classes of occupation. Year by year they are getting into new trades. For instance, in mining, they are now going into deep mining. In the last two or three years they have been going into agriculture very extensively, besides the various trades, one after another, which they have gone into. They seem capable of doing almost anything that a white man can do in the way of labor. There is a Chinaman now running a printing-press in this city and running it very well. Up about Marysville they are digging. I have seen them working at iron-work as machinists.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Founderymen?—A. Yes, sir, isolated cases; but I mean to say they can do all those things.

Q. Are they blacksmiths?—A. I have never seen a blacksmith among them. No doubt they can be taught anything. There is a Chinese coppersmith right down on the next street.

By Mr. KING:

Q. In your opinion do they prevent the immigration of white labor to this coast?—A. Undoubtedly they do that by lowering the rate of wages. I think one way in which you can see how they prevent white immigration is, that if you go all through this country, wherever you go you will eat food cooked by Chinese, you will be waited on by Chinamen. One of the most striking differences between the East and the West to a Californian who has lived here a long while is in going East; after getting on the Union Pacific and traveling a little while he finds the Chinamen succeeded by white girls. In all these places were it not for the Chinamen we would have white girls as they have in the East, and they would in due course become married and make a permanent population.

Q. You say if you go East, after awhile you fail to find the Chinese domestic, and meet the white girl?—A. Certainly.

Q. Do you think there is any difference between the wages of those two where they join in the Territories?—A. I do not know. The essential thing about Chinese laborers is that they are cheap laborers; that they work for a little less than the whites. Of course the employment of Chinese must be more profitable to the employer than that of whites, or they would not be employed.

Q. Is that class of cheap labor a benefit?—A. Undoubtedly it is an injury.

Q. In what respect?—A. By reducing the rate of wages.

Q. Does it not lower the price of the articles which they are engaged in producing?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Explain that, Mr. George.—A. The rate of wages is not, I think, an element in the cost of production. The difference between labor-saving machinery and cheap labor is this: the effect of labor-saving machinery is primarily upon production; the effect of a reduction or increase in the rate of wages is primarily upon distribution. If a capitalist can get a labor-saving machine that will add to the efficiency of labor, there is so much more produced; there is a larger fund to be divided; but if you merely effect a reduction in the rate of wages, the production remains the same; you get more for your share, but we all get less. I do not think, as far as the production of a country is concerned, that the rates of wages have anything to do with it. The capital and labor of a country will always be invested and directed toward those pursuits that furnish it the largest remuneration; and the question of wages is merely a question of the distribution of the product between the parties engaged in the production.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You think that the rate of wages does not enter into the cost of production?—A. No, sir; not into the real cost; not into the cost as between nations.

Q. Suppose there are two shoe establishments in this city, one employing Chinese labor, 25 per cent. cheaper than the other, which employs white labor. The shoes of the one establishment in that case

would cost them, so far as labor was concerned, 25 per cent. less?—A. Their shoes would not be 25 per cent. cheaper. Their labor would be 25 per cent. cheaper.

Q. But so far as labor enters into the cost of manufacture, it would be 25 per cent. less?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, could they not sell at a lower rate and make the same profit if the other establishment was employing white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then that establishment could undersell the white establishment?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And still make the same profit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In that case, would not the cost of the labor enter into the cost of the manufactured article produced?—A. Certainly; but the aggregate production of the country would be no greater, and in the long run I think the cost of making shoes would be increased, for it is a noticeable fact—noticed by every one who has investigated the subject—that the higher priced labor is, the greater is its efficiency. You go from here to Calcutta. You want to get a little piece of wood put in the deck, and they will bring ten mechanics to put it in. They get only a few cents apiece; but it is cheaper to pay an American mechanic five dollars to do the work.

Q. He would do the same work in less time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That would not be the cheaper labor in that case?—A. Not in the long run.

Q. If Chinamen would do twice the work, you could afford to pay double the price, and it would not be cheap labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore the establishment employing Chinese could not undersell the other?—A. No, sir.

Q. Suppose that a Chinaman will perform the same amount of labor 25 per cent. less than the white man, does not that enter into the cost of production and affect the price of the article in the market?—A. It would affect the cost of production as between the producers; it would enable the man who employed the Chinese to undersell the man who did not employ the Chinese; but it would not decrease the cost of production so far as the whole State was concerned—that is to say, with the same number of men working, the State of California would not have more to sell.

Q. That may be—that is another point of view; but let me take a single article. Suppose that to manufacture a pair of boots with white labor will cost a dollar and with Chinese labor it will cost half a dollar. There may not be that difference; but I am supposing there is that difference. The man who uses Chinese labor could sell his boots for half a dollar less than the other man and realize the same profit?—A. Yes; if you put those figures.

Q. Suppose it costs a dollar to make a pair of boots with manual labor in the old way, and you can make the same boots with machine-labor for half a dollar; the man who employed the labor-saving machine could sell his boots half a dollar cheaper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore the effect of a labor-saving machine and of cheap manual-labor would be the same on the cost of production?—A. No, sir. The effect would be the same as far as the employer was concerned. In the case of the labor-saving machine you would get more production for the same amount of labor; you would increase the efficiency of labor. In the case of the reduction of wages you would not increase the efficiency of labor; you would merely decrease the share in the product which the laborer got.

Q. To come directly to the point, if the same amount of labor can be

done half a dollar cheaper, either by a machine or by employing a Chinaman, I will ask you if that does not enable the employer to sell his work half a dollar cheaper and make the same profit? What is the difference in the principle of the thing?—A. I have been trying to explain the difference. It might be the same so far as the employer was concerned, but it is a very different thing to the community at large. For instance, if the product were a hundred thousand dollars, and a labor-saving machine increased that amount 25 per cent., you would have a product of $125,000 to be divided among all parties concerned; but if you merely reduce the rate of wages, you would simply have your product of $100,000, the only difference being that the employer would get more and the employés less in the $100,000.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The price would be regulated by the supply and demand, instead of the product? Is that your idea?—A. I do not understand the distinction you make.

Q. The product of the person producing the $125,000 would depend upon the demand in the sale instead of upon the cost of production?—A. They are all elements. Of course it would depend upon the price he could get for it as well as the cost of production. In other words, labor-saving machinery makes the whole community richer; it enables us to produce more with the same amount of labor. Reduction of wages does no such thing. One hundred men working for a dollar a day cannot produce any more than one hundred men working for three dollars a day, and in the long run we know that they will produce less.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The employer may make the same profit or he may make more?—A. But the community at large will be poorer.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do you not think that the price of all products, manufacturing and agricultural, is regulated by abundance or scarcity?—A. The ultimate thing, of course, is the cost of production. Of course there may be a difference any time in demand and in supply.

Q. For instance, labor-saving machines would have the effect to reduce the price of a commodity and make it more abundant?—A. Yes; to make it more abundant.

Q. But cheap labor would not have the effect of making the commodity more abundant?—A. No.

Q. That would not have the same effect?—A. No.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand this gentleman's idea is, that with the labor-saving machine, the men whose labor would be saved in that particular department would be employed in some other, so that the aggregate amount of labor by the machine and men together would be increased; but I am taking the case of a particular employment, a particular manufacture. I will ask my friend what is the reason that an English yard of cloth can be manufactured and brought to this country and sold cheaper than a yard of cloth manufactured in New England?—A. One reason is our high tariff. We could make cloth a good deal cheaper were it not for the tariff. Another reason is that we can do something better than making cloth.

Q. Why is it necessary to have a tariff to protect American labor against European labor?—A. It is not necessary. It is the greatest

absurdity in which any nation ever indulged. It was exploded a hundred years ago by Adam Smith.

Q. You think, then, that we could compete successfully with European manufacturers where they pay only one-fourth of the price for labor that we pay?—A. We do not want to compete with them. If they can make anything cheaper than we can, let them make it. If they give it to us for nothing, we will all be so much richer, and we will not have to do any work.

Q. That may be your idea in regard to the value of a tariff. I am asking you about a fact. I ask you if they cannot manufacture goods in the old country, where they have cheaper labor than we have, at less price, and bring them here and undersell us?—A. I think not on account of their cheap labor. I think they never have done that thing. For instance, take the building of ships, I think Adam Smith and Stuart Mill certainly indorsed the belief that, so far as the building of ships is concerned, American labor, although higher paid, is really cheaper, efficiency considered, than English labor. Mr. Brassey, who has worked men in almost all countries of the world, states as the result of his observation that the highest paid labor is always the cheapest, efficiency considered. I do not think it would make any difference in regard to the export trade, the interchange of the productions of various nations, what rates of wages are paid. For instance, in a natural condition of things, we will here in this country do that thing which we can do most profitably owing to our climate and soil, the amount of capital we have, &c. The people of China will do that which they can do the most profitably, and so will the people of England. We will continue to do that. No matter how you change the rate of wages, those profitable things will still be the profitable things, the other conditions existing.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do you know, as a matter of fact, whether or not labor is actually cheaper in England than it is here?—A. No; I think at the present day labor is better paid in England than here.

Q. Do you recollect that a short time ago five or six hundred workingmen returned there, finding employment at better wages in England than in this country?—A. I remember that one hundred and fifty stonemasons went from New York to Greenock, Scotland.

Q. What has been your trade?—A. I am a printer by trade.

Q. Do you know of any individual cases where Chinese have been learning that trade, the setting of type?—A. No. I know they are employed in all the English offices in the East as compositors, and they make excellent compositors.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean by the East?—A. I mean China and the countries coming generally under the designation of the East.

Q. Do you not think it would be an excellent thing to have Chinamen set all the type in the newspaper offices of San Francisco?—A. No, sir. If you did that, I do not know who you would get to read the papers by and by.

Q. And write all the editorials, for instance?—A. I think they could write about as good editorials as some I occasionally see.

Q. I believe you are an editor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why not have them set all the type and write all the editorials, as well as make all the cigars and boots and shoes? If they are a benefit to the community, why not let them be a benefit to the printers

themselves?—A. I do not think any man says they are a benefit to the community.

Q. I understand that the theory is advanced by those who are in favor of Chinese immigration that they are a great benefit to the State, and that our industries are carried on by them?—A. That theory will not hold water a minute, and I do not think it is entertained by anybody who ever thought upon the subject.

Q. Explain that theory?—A. I understand the theory is that if you get type set so much less a thousand you produce a cheaper newspaper; if you get boots made at so much less, you produce cheaper boots; and if you raise and harvest wheat so much cheaper, you produce cheaper flour; so that Chinese labor is really a benefit to all classes in giving cheaper commodities.

Q. That is the argument?—A. That is the theory.

Q. What is your response to that argument?—A. I do not think that will hold water a minute. It seems to me, in the first place, that when we speak of the wages of labor, we generally mean the wages of manual labor. There are other things that enter into the cost of production. There is the wages of the superintendent, and rent, which is a most important element.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you think that the theory of protection which you spoke about a few minutes ago is an exploded theory?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think that there ought to be free trade?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. That people should be allowed to buy where they can the cheapest?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And employ where they can the cheapest?—A. No, sir; I did not say that.

Q. You do not carry your free-trade doctrine so far?—A. No, sir; unless you give men what I call absolute free trade, and then I will. I indicated what I thought of the distinction a little while ago. Between a Chinaman working here cheaply and a Chinaman working cheaply in China, there is a very great difference. He can work as cheaply as he pleases in China, and, in my opinion, only benefit us if we exchange freely with him. Here he only injures us. If their race there works cheaply and exchanges with us, it really adds to our production. Here he affects the distribution of the product between the various classes by reducing the share which the laborer gets and increasing the share of the capitalist.

Q. As this is a sort of political discussion, allow me to ask you if you do not get your theory mixed? Are you not now proposing to protect American labor by excluding Chinese cheap labor?—A. That certainly would be my proposition.

Q. If you propose to protect American labor by excluding cheap Chinese labor, what is the difference in theory between excluding a cheap product in China that comes in contact with our own products?—A. I was trying to explain that very point.

Q. That is the point I should like you to explain, because if you can do that you can answer a great problem which we have been discussing in this country for a great many years.—A. The Chinaman by laboring in China cheaply does not affect the rate of wages here, that is, he does not affect the distribution of our product, he simply affects the production. If we ship a cargo of flour to China and get back a cargo of tea, the more tea we can get for our flour the better we are off—the greater is the aggregate sum that we have to divide among all classes; but

when the Chinaman comes here and works for low wages the effect is to make a great many other men also work for low wages and to lessen the rate of wages that is given to the working classes.

Q. I should like to understand if I can, (perhaps it is my difficulty of understanding,) the difference in principle between excluding cheap labor from China, keeping it out of this country, and excluding an article from our market manufactured more cheaply in China than we can make it here?—A. The difference is this: Excluding the cheap labor would prevent the reduction of wages; excluding the cheap product has no effect on wages except to decrease them.

Q. If you admit the cheap product here do you not thereby cut off American labor?—A. Not at all.

Q. Because we could not manufacture the same article and come in competition with the cheap article from China?—A. We do not want to do that.

Q. Therefore we have to give up the manufacture of that article, and the men employed in that labor they have to go into some other, and the effect is just the same?—A. It is not the same. They go into something else because they can make more at it. For instance, we make boots and shoes; if we could get boots and shoes cheaper from China, it would simply be the same amount of boots and shoes as is made for ourselves.

Q. Then the labor employed in that field must go into some other field?—A. Certainly.

Q. Suppose in that other field the same competition comes in?—A. The same thing cannot come in forever.

Q. It might come in so many things that you would not have much room for your labor.—A. You would not get these cheap products, then.

Q. That is your question, not mine.—A. I say they would not give us these things for nothing, and we must have something to exchange for them. Therefore we must manufacture some things.

Q. But you must manufacture so cheaply that you can exchange and come in competition with other countries; and suppose labor is so high that you cannot do that. Are you not traveling in a circle entirely?—A. No, sir; I am not. We would manufacture the thing that we had peculiar advantages for manufacturing. For instance, we raise wheat better than China and better than England can, because we have plenty of cheap land. We can dig gold better than they can in England, because we have got the means. We can make maple-sugar because we have maple trees and they have them not in China.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You are acquainted with the working and mechanical population of San Francisco?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you well acquainted with it?—A. Yes, sir; pretty well.

Q. Is the working and mechanical portion of this community a respectable portion of it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is the large portion of the white population?—A. Yes, sir. As to the character of those who are opposed to Chinese immigration, instead of being confined to the idle and dissolute as was stated here, I do not know any man who really thinks for himself who does not take that view. I think it is the thinking portion of the community who are opposed to Chinese immigration.

Q. How do the mechanical and laboring portion of our community live? Have they, generally, families?—A. To a very great extent.

Q. Have they not families to a greater extent than any other classes

of our community? Is there not a greater percentage of the laboring and mechanical citizens of San Francisco, who have families, than the so-called upper class?—A. I am not competent to answer the question. I think the proportion is quite as great among the laboring classes.

Q. How do our mechanics and laboring men, our operatives, live generally?—A. They do not live as well as they ought to live.

Q. Do not a great many of them live in their own houses?—A. A good many of them do. The number who do of course in proportion is gradually becoming less and less.

Q. They send their children to school, I presume?—A. O, yes; they all send their children to school.

Q. Has this influx of Chinese tended to degrade the dignity of labor?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Has it had a tendency to bring white labor into the same repute that slavery did in the Southern States?—A. I think its ultimate effects are precisely the same upon the white race as slavery.

Q. You think there is no doubt of that?—A. None whatever.

Q. Is there not a general distrust and perturbation among the mechanical portion of this community in relation to Chinese labor? Is it not held *in terrorem* over them by their employers that if they do not submit to their exactions as to price of labor, they will employ Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is a fact?—A. Yes, sir; I think that is one reason why some of the employers really favor Chinese immigration; it gives them a rod.

Q. So that they may subjugate the American or white laborers to their prices and demands?—A. Yes, sir; the effect is to break the power of trades unions and workingmen's combinations.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I want to ask you a question which was asked the previous witness. I wish you to explain, if you have an idea upon the matter, what the difference to the laborer is between receiving generous wages and poor wages, even if he can live proportionally on each?—A. Do you mean that the wages will buy the same?

Q. Suppose that the wages will buy the same amount, what is the difference between giving labor three dollars a day and ten cents a day? I do not mean to say that he can buy the same amount with ten cents a day that he can with three dollars, but proportionally the same. The American system of labor is to pay pretty generously. That has been the idea from all time. Circumstances perhaps have modified it somewhat. The Asiatic system is to pay extremely low wages. The cooly in China can live on from twenty to twenty-five cents a day and buy all he needs and wants. Query, whether it is better that the American laborer should live on fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five cents a day, if he can do so, or that he should receive three dollars a day even if it costs much more to buy food, clothing, &c.?—A. If he receives high wages, of course it is better for him, if the cost of living is the same—if the purchasing power is the same. There is no difference whatever between ten cents a day and three dollars a day if ten cents will buy as much as three dollars. If three dollars buys more, higher wages are, therefore, better.

Q. As it is always supposed that in wages there is some surplus saved to the laborer, is not the proportion likely to be greater where the laborer receives three dollars a day than where he receives twenty-five cents a day?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. And therefore he has a greater profit to lay up for sickness, &c.?—

A. There is more disposition to do so. The Irish in their own country were described some years ago, in the last generation at least, as idle, worthless, and improvident. When they come to this country, we find them saving and frugal, especially in this city. I do not think any class has got possession of more wealth with less opportunities than the Irish of this city. You find it the same way in regard to the Italians. The character we long had of the Italians was the same that we had of the Irish in their own country. They come to this country and get a chance to lay by a little, and it makes them prosperous.

Q. Because they get higher wages?—A. Certainly.

Q. Which encourages provident habits?—A. Certainly, and discourages dissipation.

Q. To your mind, that is an argument against cheap labor?—A. Undoubtedly. Cheap labor means the degradation of the working classes. It means their reduction ultimately to the same standard as the Chinese. The reason why the Chinese are in this condition is because they have been forced to work for low wages from immemorial time.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I want to ask a question about printers. I believe you stated that you are a printer?—A. I am a printer.

Q. Do the printers here have a union?—A. They used to have a union; I do not know that they have one now.

Q. Do they not have one now?—A. It is not as compact and strong as it was. They have a sort of an association, but I do not think that it is as strong as the old union.

Q. The printers have a union in this and every other city?—A. I am not certain whether they call it a union or not. The printers' union was broken up here some years ago.

Q. What was the primary object of the union?—A. The primary object, of course, was to keep up wages, bury the dead, help the sick, and bring the members together.

Q. Do they have certain regulations in regard to the number of apprentices that may be taken?—A. I cannot speak of it as it exists at this time. I think not now; formerly they had such regulations.

Q. Have other trades-unions provisions of that kind, limitations upon the number of operatives that may be taken?—A. I think in this city none that are really effective. I do not know of any trade that has really a strong trades-union, such as the printers' union used to be, or as the hatters' union was. Wherever there is a strong trades-union they generally adopt some such rule as that.

Q. In limiting the number of printers, that is done with a view of keeping down the number of operatives?—A. Not so much that as to prevent employers from taking in a lot of boys, learning them but a portion of the trade, enough to make them useful for the time, and keeping them doing that kind of work.

Q. It is done to prevent too great competition in the labor?—A. That is one of the reasons.

Q. And thus keep up the price of it?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. It was stated here by the other side that the general opinion of our intelligent people favor the immigration of Chinese. What is your opinion in reference to that as to the intelligent and conservative and wealthy classes? Do those who are not interested in making money out of Chinese labor favor or disfavor the continued immigration in large numbers of Chinese?—A. They are generally opposed to it; that is,

those who, as you say, are not interested, directly or indirectly, in Chinese labor.

Q. You speak of the intelligent thinking classes now of all grades of society?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the better disinterested popular opinion of this city and community is opposed to Chinese immigration?—A. Yes, sir. I think the wealth, though, is generally in favor of it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How many Chinese have we in this city?—A. Your previous witnesses are probably better informed than I am upon that point.

Q. About how many?—A. I have no means of knowing except from such statements as you have received here, which I presume are correct; 30,000, or something like that number.

Q. How many of them are laborers, mechanics, artisans, and so on, and how many of them are idle, in your opinion?—A. The majority of them are at work, of course.

Q. They are industrious people generally?—A. They are industrious people generally. They have their idle classes.

Q. You are not sticking type at present?—A. No, sir; I have not stuck any type for ten years.

Q. Do you publish any paper?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is your paper?—A. The Evening Post.

Q. You speak of the Irish, German, or Italian who comes to this country and sees, under our ways of doing things, a chance to better his condition, and while he has been indolent at home, he becomes a worker here. Do you mean this State, this coast, or the United States?—A. I mean the United States generally, or any other new country. You will find the same state of things in Canada or in Australia.

Q. Would you abrogate all our treaty relations now between China and the United States to cure this difficulty?—A. I would take out the clause which permitted the immigration of Chinese to this country.

Q. That is the fifth clause?—A. Yes, sir; I do not think there would be any objection on the part of the Chinese government to that.

Q. Do you think there would be any objection on their part to abrogating the whole treaty?—A. I do not think it is necessary to abrogate the whole of it.

Q. Do you think they would have any objection?—A. The Chinese? No.

Q. Did we not force that treaty upon them, section after section?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You occupy an official position here, I understand?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it State or municipal?—A. State.

Q. What is that position?—A. Inspector of gas-meters.

Q. I understood you to say that the Chinese are industrious?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is their character as laborers? Are they skillful laborers?—A. Yes, sir; I think they are very skillful laborers.

Q. Do they learn trades readily?—A. I think so.

Q. Do they make good mechanics?—A. I think they would. We had no opportunity of seeing them as mechanics. As operatives I guess they make the best in the world; that is, as factory operatives, tending machinery, any manual labor requiring skill.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Pixley's statement the first day of our session?—A. No, sir; I did not.

Q. Do you subscribe to the opinion that their excellence as laborers and their intelligence is one of the chief objections to their admission to this country?—A. My chief objection is that their standard of comfort is lower than that of our people.

Q. They consume less?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you regard their excellence as laborers, and their skill and the facility with which they take up new employments, as an objection?—A. In that connection, yes. It enables them to go one after another into all the trades and occupations, and reduce wages in each, and ultimately the effect will be to drive out our laboring white population entirely.

By Mr. KING:

Q. You say that in your opinion the Chinese government would not object to the abrogation of that clause of the treaty which allows immigration here?—A. That is my opinion.

Q. If that clause should be abrogated, do you think they would insist on the abrogation of the entire treaty?—A. Not at all.

Q. Do you not think that if they found this a profitable market for their products they would wish to continue the treaty so far as it related to commerce?—A. I do not think the Chinese government has any relations with the outside world, of its own wish. We forced the opening of the ports, and we forced the extension of the treaty upon them.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You think that was a mistaken policy on our part?—A. Not at all The more trade we have with China the better for us. I think the only mistake is in opening the doors to the Chinese population.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Were there any more Chinese who came here in the year 1852, the year before the treaty, than any year since, as shown by the statistics?—A. I cannot say, but I think it is very probable; for in the early opening of the gold-fields there was a grand rush to California.

Q. There were over 20,000 in that year, and the largest number since has been 19,000, as shown by the statistics. Did the immigration not continue along from 20,000 to 7,000, 8,000, and 9,000 down to the formation of the treaty, as shown by the statistics?—A. I cannot remember the statistics just now.

Q. Do you not know that is about the fact of the case?—A. I presume so.

Q. For several years after the treaty, was there any particular influx of Chinamen until the Pacific Railroad builders imported large numbers of them under labor-contracts?—A. My opinion of the treaty is, that it amounts to nothing at all except as an excuse to tie our hands and prevent us from keeping out these Chinamen.

Q. You do not think they come on account of the treaty?—A. O, no.

Q. But that it may be a restriction to legislative action?—A. That is all.

Q. Suppose it is the fact that a law of Congress, passed subsequently to a treaty, is superior to a treaty and can repeal it, how are our hands fettered? Suppose that the Supreme Court of the United States, in a leading decision, has decided that a law of Congress, inconsistent with a treaty, repeals the treaty *pro tanto;* that the treaty does not stand in the way of the power of Congress to pass any law that it sees fit?—A. Then the treaty would have no effect.

Q. Has there been that decision in the case of differential duties on hemp from Russia, secured by treaty?—A. It is self-evident that if the treaty accomplishes nothing, it accomplishes nothing.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. From Genoa, in Italy, there comes a large class of fishermen to this coast?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The Chinese compete in the fisheries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What effect, then, would this information from their countrymen here have upon Italian immigration?—A. Very great; if this industry is affected by Chinese, of course it would tend to reduce it.

Q. From Lombardy, in Northern Italy, comes a large amount of Italian gardeners. The Chinese compete in that industry. What is the effect, then, upon the people of Lombardy touching immigration?—A. Of course the effect is to reduce the temptation for them to come to this country.

Q. The Germans formerly manufactured all our domestic cigars. When I say all, I mean they had that trade.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The Chinese have obtained that trade. What is the effect, then, upon the cigar-maker of Germany? Would he be as liable to come to this country as though the Germans had the trade here?—A. I think not.

Q. Is it not the same in reference to washing? The women formerly did the washing of our coast. That is now done by the Chinese. Then what effect does that have on the laboring families of the East who might desire to make their homes here?—A. It gives less opportunity for young women to get employment.

Q. It takes from them that inducement to come here?—A. Of course.

Q. And so on in regard to various trades as to the effect upon foreign immigration and eastern immigration?—A. Certainly.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Why is the Italian immigration preferable to the Chinese?—A. They are of a different race. The Italians are of the same stock that we are, and have come to their present pitch by a slow course of development for thousands of years.

Q. They are a higher civilization?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Do you think the same objection would apply to any lower civilization as to the Chinese?—A. Undoubtedly.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Following out that line of interrogatory, do the Italians assimilate with us and become a part and portion of our body-politic?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Do they become citizens and take upon themselves the duties of citizens?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. And so of the Irish, the Germans, and all others of the European family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In time do they so assimilate with us that they are American?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We are all of that stock, are we not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you think there is a difference in that respect between Chinese immigrants and that race or family of which we can make citizens?—A. Of course.

Q. Your attention has been called mainly to the money-making feature of immigration. I will ask you if, in your opinion, there are not loftier and larger considerations in comparison with which the opportunity of money-making, or the increase of the wealth of the country, is not higher? In other words, is it everything for a State simply to make money?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Explain that.—A. Sir William Jones explains it better than anybody else in that little note of his, "What constitutes a state?" A state is not cities, nor money, nor rich plantations; the state is the people. The ultimate effect of an immigration such as the Chinese would be to have a community composed of but the very rich and the very poor. It would be a condition of society such as exists to-day in British India, where the few white men who are there ride in palanquins, and are waited on by dozens of servants, while all the work is performed by an inferior class. It would be the same state of things that existed in the Southern States prior to the war.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. I will ask you if that would not be destructive to our whole political system?—A. Undoubtedly; utterly destructive.

Q. Then this immigration brings with it elements of destruction to our political and social fabric, in your opinion?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. And to the extent Chinese immigration is encouraged, to that extent the difficulty is increased?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And to the extent that it is discouraged, to that extent our own family is encouraged and protected?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say it is a fact that a class of citizens are here from Italy as fishermen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they not an industrious, thriving class of citizens generally?—A. I think so.

Q. And in many instances property-owners, having nice homes?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you find them members of anti-cooly leagues generally?—A. I do not know about that. I know there is a very strong anti-Chinese feeling among them.

Q. It is not organized?—A. That I do not know.

Q. Do you not know that the Italian fisherman and the Chinese fisherman do not come in contact with each other? Is not the Italian the deep-sea fisherman outside?—A. No, sir; the Italians fish the bay all over.

Q. Generally, do not their boats go outside?—A. Some may go outside, but I think they are inside also.

Q. There is no suffering among them by this competition that you know of?—A. I think not.

Q. They are a well-to-do class?—A. Yes, sir; but this competition has not yet produced its final result.

Q. It has been going on twenty years?—A. No; not as it is going on now. Twenty years ago we had the richest country the world ever saw.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Suppose the laws permitted the Chinese to become citizens, do you think that would make any difference?—A. I think if they could make anything by it they would become citizens. I think, for instance, men like our railroad magnates, who have more or less interest in politics and have Chinese in their employ, would be very anxious to have them become citizens.

Q. Do you think, as a race, they would make fit citizens?—A. O, no; I have not the slightest comprehension that they would; it is totally foreign to their ideas.

Q. You do not think they could be made such?—A. O, no.

Q. You think it would be an injury to our civilization to incorporate them with us?—A. It would be utterly destructive.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. For what reason do you think our railroad magnates would like to have them become citizens and voters?—A. Simply because, in the first place, it would give them the direct control of a large number of votes, and in the next place its general effect would be to increase the power of money in politics.

Q. You think they would have them vote their way?—A. Certainly.

Q. They would not have many of them vote for me, would they?—A. I do not think you would get many votes from them.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do many of these Chinese attempt to become citizens?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was there not great alarm in this community at the commencement of the present Congress because the Chinese were applying to be naturalized?—A. No, sir; I think there never was any alarm of that in this community.

Q. What was the reason of the application to Congress at the last session to change the law?—A. To prevent future danger.

Q. Were there any lithographs here representing Chinese occupying the position of judges, mandarins, &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were there any editorials in our papers calling attention to the danger of being governed by Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Because they were all getting naturalized?—A. No, sir; those dangers are looked on as in the future. I have not heard anybody say that there is any danger of the Chinese rushing now down to the courts and becoming naturalized.

Q. No, because the door was shut; but how was it at the commencement of the last session of Congress?—A. I think there was no fear that there would be many Chinese voting at the presidential election this year.

Q. I am not talking about that; they would have to declare their intentions for a year beforehand; but were they not declaring their intentions to become citizens?—A. I think to some extent they were declaring their intention.

Q. Was it not done to a great extent—enough to produce considerable alarm among those who were opposed to it?—A. If so, I did not hear of it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you regard the Chinese as deficient in intellect as compared with the white race?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. You think they have not got the capacity to become voters?—A. No, sir; and I think the fact that they have been stationary for so many thousands of years is pretty good proof of that. What the race itself is capable of is one of the most interesting problems of the future, to my mind. There is an awakening going on in Japan now fraught with interest, but the Chinese seem to be, though of the same general stock, quite a different people.

Q. Do you think the Chinese incapable of learning our language?—A. No.

Q. Do you think them incapable of understanding our institutions?—A. Yes, sir; I think them deficient in all those qualities that have given us our institutions—regard for personal liberty, dislike of arbitrary power, regard for law, and personal independence.

Q. I will ask you if there are not some of the white races in Europe subject to the same objection, who adhere to despotism as faithfully as the Chinese?—A. No, I think not; I think there are among the white races in Europe classes who favor despotism for its own sake, or rather for the sake of what they believe to be a strong government.

Q. What is your understanding in regard to Chinese students in our colleges? Do they not acquire the sciences with equal facility with white boys?—A. I think not; I think they are like the negroes, as I have been told; that is, up to a certain point they learn very fast, but beyond that point it is very difficult for them to go.

Q. Do you think the negro also deficient in natural intelligence?—A. So I have been told by those who have had experience in teaching them.

Q. You think that, like the negro, the Chinese are incapable of attaining a high state of civilization?—A. They are incapable of attaining the state of civilization the Caucasian is capable of.

Q. You would make the same objection to the introduction of the negro to civilization as to the introduction of the Chinese on that ground?—A. I would have the same objection to the introduction of the negro as to the importation of the Chinese.

Q. How about those who are here?—A. The difference between the negro and the Chinaman is that the number of negroes in the country is fixed, while the number of Chinese may be increased indefinitely.

Q. Is not the condition of the Chinese the result of their institutions, in great part, as the condition of many of the white races in Europe is the result of their institutions?—A. Of course; but it is not the result of their institutions for the last twenty years or for the last hundred years. It is the result of their institutions for thousands of years.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are not their institutions the growth of their own people?—A. To a certain extent. Is it not Montesquieu who says that in the beginning of empires man makes institutions and afterward institutions make the man? There is an action and reaction.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know anything in regard to the character of Chinese learning?—A. Generally.

Q. What is regarded as learning among the Chinese?—A. A knowledge of the books of Confucius and some of their other philosophers.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Mencius?—A. Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are they not mathematicians?—A. I think not. I think in all the progressive sciences they are deficient. Chinese learning merely consists in knowing by rote a lot of moral and political maxims, and the man who knows the most of these is the best-educated man.

Q. Do you understand that the Chinese who come here, the common Chinese, are, to some extent, acquainted with mathematics?—A. If you mean by mathematics the ability to count up to a certain point, and to perform the simple rules of arithmetic—addition, division, and subtraction—I think they are.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. And silence?—A. Yes; and silence.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you ever see one who could not read and write?—A. I think they can all read and write.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you noticed the table of illiteracy at the State's prison?—A. No, sir. I think if the Chinese continue to come here very long, there will be a good many of our people who cannot read and write.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you not know that a large number of Chinese students have graduated in our eastern colleges?—A. I know there have been some Chinese graduates there.

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. I want to ask you about the naturalization law. Are you not aware of the fact that before the Revised Statutes were published, the naturalization law excluded Mongolians; that there was an error in the revision of the statutes by which that clause was left out, which was supplied at the last Congress by putting it back when the error was discovered?—A. I am not very well informed about that. I have never examined it carefully, and all I know about it is general—not enough to make my testimony of any value.

Q. Do you know of any representations sent to Congress by anybody, that the error occurred, and the necessity to fix it, or was it the movement of Senators and members there, who made the correction, they observing it?—A. I am not well enough informed about that matter to make my testimony of any value.

HENRY H. HAIGHT sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of this State?—Answer. I am.

Q. You have been governor of the State for four years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your judgment is it desirable or otherwise to limit by proper legislation the immigration of Chinese to this coast?—A. I think it is desirable to check it.

Q. Will you state the general reasons that lead you to this conclusion?—A. The reasons that operate most strongly upon my mind are those of a political and moral character. When I use the word "political," I do not use it, of course, in a partisan sense. I do not think it is desirable to have any considerable class of people in the country who cannot be intrusted with the ballot. The Chinese, as we all understand here, (and on that subject I think there is no difference of opinion whatever,) are unfit to exercise the elective franchise.

Q. And why unfit?—A. They have no conception whatever of the responsibilities attending the exercise of that duty under a republican government, and their votes would be controlled by the use of money, and in small amounts probably; that is, the amount *per capita* that it would require to throw the vote one way or the other would be small. In other words, their votes would be bought and paid for beyond all question. There can certainly be no doubt whatever on that subject if they were allowed to vote. You might, therefore, just as well vote so many quadrupeds exactly as to permit the Chinese to vote. I think it is a very great misfortune—I suppose we all agree on that subject—to this country that the negroes were originally imported into the Southern States. We suffered from that cause until it finally culminated in a war. There was the same class of reasons then urged in favor of the importation of the

African. There was a material gain to the country undoubtedly for a period of years by the use of that labor in the South, but it would have been very much better for us to have been without that labor than to have experienced the evils that resulted from it afterward. However that may be, without digressing in matters perhaps somewhat foreign, it seems to me there can be no difference of opinion among intelligent men that it is undesirable to have any class of people in the country, under institutions like ours, who cannot be trusted with the ballot; in other words, who cannot participate in the government of the country. That is the first reason which operates upon my mind. Then, again, the vices of paganism which the Chinese have are very difficult to be managed satisfactorily under our institutions. We have not any strong central authority. Our police is necessarily defective, owing to the manner in which it is created, perhaps, to some extent, and then to the small amount of power which it is allowed to exercise under our government. Therefore, it is difficult to get at these vices that infect the Chinese quarter in the way of correction. When I was in office, according to my recollection, the percentage of Chinese criminals in the State's prison was larger than the percentage of any other class; but that was simply a question of percentage. It was slightly larger in proportion to the population than the number of white convicts, but that, of course, has no very great weight, because, as Judge Blake has stated here, it might arise from incidental circumstances possibly.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you remember the table of illiteracy of prisoners published annually, showing how many could read and write, and how many Chinamen there were who could not read and write?—A. I do not recollect that. When I was in office we established a school in the prison for the first time, and some of the Chinese, and white convicts also, resorted to it for instruction in reading and writing. I suppose they are still taught in the prison.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You stated that there were two motives, political and moral. You have stated pretty fully your views upon the political question. Now, how as to the moral results upon our civilization?—A. There is a vicious element here which comes from Hong-Kong. I believe nearly the whole of our Chinese immigration is from the port of Hong-Kong, a British port, as I understand it. There is a vicious element that comes over from that port, and they have certain vices which it is much more difficult to prevent and punish than among the whites. They have been engaged systematically in the importation of prostitutes to my personal knowledge. I have been applied to by the Chinese who have been engaged in that business to assist them professionally by applying for writs of *habeas corpus* to get hold of women, which of course I declined to do. I see, from things that come under my notice professionally, that it is a regular business. There are some eight or ten who are engaged in it who waited upon me at one time and requested me to help them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Governor, suppose our laws prohibited immigrants from Europe becoming citizens of our country, but allowed them to come just as it allows Chinese, what effect would that have probably upon the character of the immigration from Europe?—A. It would be somewhat difficult, perhaps, to say, because the great mass of those that come from

Europe come to better their pecuniary condition undoubtedly. It might perhaps keep away a percentage of immigrants, though I do not know that it would be so.

Q. As you are being asked for your opinions, I will ask you if the prospect of becoming citizens of our country and having civil and political rights here does not encourage a better class of immigrants from Europe than we would otherwise get?—A. I think it is very likely that it does. The prospect of becoming citizens, and of having a voice in the Government, and of enjoying liberty in that way is an attraction undoubtedly.

Q. Suppose we allowed Chinese to become citizens, would that have the effect to encourage a better class of Chinese immigration? Would it encourage men to come with their families, as Europeans do?—A. Not at all. They have no conception of that thing. They do not understand it. The only idea, as far as my observation goes, that they could have in that connection would be a possible source of pecuniary profit. If the Chinese could be naturalized and allowed to vote, and if they ascertained that they could make something out of it, two dollars and a half, for instance, for voting at an election, they would become naturalized in groups, and avail themselves of the privilege in that way, without knowing anything about what they were voting for.

Q. Do you suppose that the Chinese are ignorant of the character of our free institutions altogether?—A. I think they are. That is the result of my observation. They seem to be incapable of forming any opinion of constitutional liberty; that is to say, liberty under a republican government. I do not think they have any idea of our institutions or any intelligent notion of them.

Q. They have no inducement now to study them? They have no prospect of ever participating in them?—A. The impression on my mind is that they would not address themselves to the investigation of our institutions.

Q. Suppose they had the prospect of becoming citizens and of enjoying equal political rights, do you suppose them to be mentally incapable of understanding that privilege and appreciating it?—A. They are morally and intellectually incapable, I think. When you speak of mentally incapable, there might be some question. They have some mental capacity; they are quick in some things; but it seems to me that ingrained into the race for generations are certain qualities of mind which incapacitate the present generation from ever acquiring that sort of knowledge which it is necessary to have for any useful exercise of the elective franchise.

Q. Has not the same state of things prevailed in Japan until recently?—A. I suppose it has. The Japanese are learning. Our information, of course, of what is going on in Japan is more or less superficial. We are not acquainted with the actual facts. I doubt whether the present generation of Japanese could qualify themselves for voting intelligently; that is, the mass of them. Of course there are exceptions among them. There are exceptions among the Chinese; but they are exceptions. I speak of the mass. When I was in office I recommended the admission of the Chinese to the right to testify; that is, I recommended, regardless of the legislation of Congress in that direction, that they be allowed to testify by State legislation in the courts the same as white people; because it has always seemed to me that every human being should have the right to tell his story in a court of justice; and as far as credibility of statement is concerned, it should be left to the jury to arrive at the facts with all the light they could get. I do not think it proper

to close the mouth of any man in a court of justice. At the same time I was perfectly aware, by experience, that it was difficult to arrive at the truth from Chinese witnesses.

Q. The change was made in the law according to your recommendation, was it not?—A. The change has taken place in this State. I do not think the legislature acted upon my recommendation; I think the change has resulted rather from the action of Congress.

Q. It has come about gradually?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has it operated badly or well?—A. I am decidedly in favor of the change myself. In other words, it was repulsive always to my ideas of justice and right to close the mouth of any man in a court of justice. I always thought that if he had suffered wrong he ought to be allowed to tell his story.

Q. There has been the same difficulty in regard to the admission of negro testimony. It has been gradually brought about in all the States?—A. Yes, sir; but from childhood I was accustomed to see negroes testify. It always seemed to me to be very absurd to deny to negroes the right to testify in a court of justice.

Q. I will ask your opinion, not expressing one myself, if in some part this prejudice against the Chinese is not the general prejudice against color, which we have had in this country for many years?—A. There is no question whatever but that there is some prejudice, and some blind prejudice, on that subject in this community. There is no doubt about that; but at the same time the intelligent, thinking, reflecting portion of the community, entirely apart from any prejudice whatever, as I believe, is altogether adverse to the increase of this class, for the reasons I have stated. That is my understanding. It is not a party question here. It is very rarely that I meet any intelligent persons who think otherwise, although I know of some few gentlemen, for whom I have great respect, who are of the other way of thinking, but it seems to me that they allow the material considerations to outweigh other considerations that are of more importance, in my mind, than the rapid increase of the country in wealth.

Q. I am asking whether this opinion entertained in regard to the capacity of the Chinese to understand and appreciate our institutions and to qualify themselves for citizenship, is not a part of the same opinion the people have had in years past, generally, in regard to the colored population? Was not the same opinion entertained in regard to the negroes years ago, generally?—A. Quite generally; and it is a question now, upon which there is a great deal of difference of opinion, of course, as to the wisdom of clothing the negro so suddenly with the right of suffrage.

Q. I am not asking you about that, but I am asking you if the same opinion was not entertained, as a general thing, in regard to the negroes?—A. Take the negroes in California, for instance; they are a class of people who have lived under our institutions from childhood; they are familiar with the working of republican government, to some extent; they are a moral class of people, I think, reasonably so, as much so, perhaps, as white people.

Q. They make good citizens here?—A. They are very respectable, decent people; and there is no reason in the world why they should not vote. They do vote now, of course, and there is no particular reason why they should not vote; but the case with the negro is quite different. You cannot go to a negro and give him a dollar for his vote; that is to say, as a class. I speak of them as a class. In other words, they vote according to their convictions, and they are not to be bought and sold *en masse*.

Q. I will ask you if a few years ago the argument against negro suffrage was not as it is now against the Chinese: that they could be bought and sold; that they would be an ignorant mass to be wielded by those of superior intelligence and power?—A. The argument against negro suffrage of course was based upon their extreme ignorance, upon their incapacity to judge intelligently of what they ought to vote for.

Q. Was not that the argument a few years ago?—A. I think it was. I always thought myself that it would have been better for the country if the negroes had been left without the ballot for twenty or twenty-five years, until they had become a little better informed.

Q. That was a very common opinion. Still, I will ask you if the result of negro suffrage in the State of California has not to some extent disappointed the anticipations of the people?—A. So far as the State of California is concerned this question did not figure much. The colored population here is small, and I do not know that it was discussed very seriously. When you spoke I thought you had reference to the negroes of the Southern States, the negroes of the old slave States, where they are in large numbers and not as intelligent as they are here.

Q. It would more particularly apply to them; but the inquiry is whether that was not the argument against negro suffrage in all the Northern States only a short time ago?—A. I suppose it was, somewhat. There was more or less prejudice of course involved in those discussions.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not think the negro learns more readily the nature of our institutions than the Chinaman?—A. Of course.

Q. That the negro who has lived for many generations in this country has a greater adaptability to our institutions than the Chinaman?—A. Certainly.

Q. They start on no imperialistic ideas?—A. I think not. Then from childhood the negro has been in the habit of hearing these things discussed from time to time, and the ideas have become engrafted in his mind somewhat. I suppose that is so even in the old slave States.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is your opinion as to whether the Chinese who have come here have or have not added to the wealth of the State?—A. I think they have.

Q. Do you think the transcontinental railroad and the railroads in this State would have been built at the time they were built without them?—A. I do not think the transcontinental road would have been built so soon. They might possibly have secured a force of whites sufficient; but I doubt whether they would have done so.

Q. It was very difficult, indeed, to get capital to invest in the enterprise, was it not?—A. Certainly it was.

Q. Were not the capitalists of San Francisco solicited in vain to invest in that enterprise?—A. At the outset there was lack of confidence in its feasibility.

Q. But few would enter upon it at all?—A. Yes.

Q. You say that the education of these people unfits them to become citizens. Do you mean the influence of their institutions that surrounds them in their native country?—A. I mean their education and habits of mind; the qualities of the race that have become fixed for generations disqualifies the present generation, I think.

Q. Is there any greater difference between the constitution or the government of China and the Constitution of the United States than

there is between the Constitution of the United States and many of the governments of Europe?—A. I suppose that the government of Russia, perhaps, is as despotic, although they have introduced, I believe, the principle of local self-government in Russia of late years. Russia is the only country that I think of at this moment in Europe which has an autocratic government.

Q. Is there any such thing in China as an established order of nobility?—A. I do not know whether there is or not. I think not.

Q. Have they any caste there?—A. The word caste requires definition. That is the difficulty about a great many of these questions and replies, using words in different senses. There is to some extent what I suppose to be caste in China; but it would hardly be worth while for you to interrogate me in regard to the internal administration of China, because I have no special familiarity with it. You had Governor Low here, for instance, who was our minister to China.

Q. You can draw an inference?—A. I speak of the Chinese as they are here in California. Although I am the interrogated and you are the interrogator, allow me to return an inquiry. Do you think the Chinese in this State could be usefully invested with the elective franchise?

Q. I do not think that I am one of the investigated at present. If the committee should desire to put me upon the stand I may answer the question. You said their habits of education and life unfitted them. I was trying to get at whether you knew anything about constitutional government in China, except the office of emperor.—A. To illustrate their habits of thinking: for instance, I have had some Chinese clients; the Chinese laundrymen employed me here against the laundry ordinance, which was a very disgraceful piece of legislation, in my judgment, and they were in my office somewhat in that business. I found that one of the Chinamen, who had been charged with some fraud in the matter, was afraid, not that he would be sued, prosecuted, or held to any legal responsibility, but that they would kill him. That was his apprehension. There seems to be a practice among them of resorting to that method of settling a difficulty. This particular Chinaman was very much afraid his countrymen would kill him in the event of any remedy being sought. He was not afraid of legal remedies at all, but he was in great fear, evidently, of that result.

Q. Has there been any instance of that kind?—A. I cannot say that I have any personal cognizance of it. My impression is that there have been such instances.

Q. According to your reading, has there been as great a proportion of murders among the Chinese as among the white foreign element?—A. Such an acquaintance as I have had with the Chinese has led me to the conclusion that they are apt to resort to that remedy.

Q. I want to get at facts. Have the dead bodies been found?—A. I am not specially familiar with the number of homicides, for instance, among the Chinese. I have no knowledge on that subject really that I can recall.

Q. Have you not read of very numerous instances of Chinamen assassinated by white people?—A. It is very likely that I have. I have not charged my mind with those statistics at all.

Q. In early times were there not numerous instances of that kind in the interior?—A. I have been told that in the mines Chinamen were robbed and murdered sometimes for their money, their gold-dust.

Q. Was it not very common?—A. Such instances, I presume, occurred. I think so. I do not really know how common it was.

Q. Have you ever met with a Chinaman who could not write in his own language?—A. I have not tested their capacity in that respect. I have seen a good many Chinamen, but I have not had any occasion to ascertain whether they could write.

Q. You see them very frequently writing, do you not?—A. I can hardly say that. I have not been brought as much in contact, probably, with them as a great many others have been; but so far as that is concerned, my impression is, and this is a mere impression, that they can generally read in their own language.

Q. If you should see it stated in the State's prison report that they could not write their names, would you not be rather inclined to infer that that meant in the English language?—A. I should infer so.

Q. You would hardly think it meant that they could not write in their own language?—A. I should infer that it had reference to the English language.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose a Russian were incarcerated, would you draw an inference that he could not read and write in English?—A. I would not be so likely to draw such an inference with reference to the European as I would against the Chinese.

Senator SARGENT. I do not know what the fact is. I merely saw the illiteracy of the prisoners reported. I do not know what it meant.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are they not generally good mathematicians?—A. I do not know whether they are. You might as well to ask me whether the Portuguese are not generally good mathematicians. I do not know.

Q. In comparing the proportion of Chinese in the State's prison with the proportion of whites, do you think it would be a fair comparison to compare the Chinese with the whole white population of the State?—A. It did not occur to me that there was anything particularly unfair in that.

Q. Would you think it fair to take, for instance, the foreign element, composed mainly of men, and compare the proportion of crime in that element with the entire remaining white population, including the women and children and the ministers of the gospel?—A. I think it is doubtful.

Q. Would it not be fair to take the same classes?—A. Perhaps it would not be fair to compare them with the whole population, as you have stated it.

Q. Did you ever undertake to compare the proportion of the Chinese criminals with the proportion of the same class of white people?—A. No. This comparison to which you refer was a casual glance at the prison statistics, without entering into any investigation of it.

Q. The result of the comparison was that the percentage of the entire population bore not an extraordinary disproportion to the percentage of the entire white population?—A. It was somewhat larger, but I could not tell you now how much.

Q. Not a great disproportion?—A. Perhaps not great. There was considerable disproportion.

Q. Is it not a fact that the proportion of Chinese criminals number not much less than the proportion of foreign-born criminals to the foreign population?—A. The only recollection I have about it is that there was a larger percentage of Chinese criminals in proportion to the Chinese population than there was of white criminals, but the relative pro-

portion of Chinese to the different classes of European emigrants I have no recollection of whatever.

Q. You were never able to converse with them in their own language?—A. No; not in their own language.

Q. Would it be possible for you to ascertain the extent of the literary attainments and culture of any person without being able to converse with him in his own language?—A. Perhaps not the extent of his literary attainments and culture. That would depend upon how readily he could converse in English. If he could converse well in English, then, of course, we could ascertain about as well in English as in Chinese; but if you could not speak Chinese and he could not speak English you would not have much opportunity of ascertaining the extent of his knowledge of course.

Q. I suppose you and I can speak the Spanish so that we can carry on business in that language; but can you read Spanish poetry to understand it, to get its beauty?—A. There is some truth in what you say. Take a Chinaman, for instance, who speaks the English language very imperfectly, you would not be able to ascertain, as you say, the extent of his literary attainments or his culture. If he could speak English tolerably well you could learn, probably, what his ideas were in reference to republican government, for instance, and things of that sort. In other words, excluding persons who are operated upon to a large extent by prejudice, the concurrent testimony of the thinking portion of this community, who have had good opportunities of observation, (of course some more than others,) as to the extreme folly of clothing the Chinese with the elective franchise is certainly reliable, it seems to me.

Q. That is hardly the point. I am speaking of their intellectual culture; whether it is possible for a foreigner not speaking their language to judge of their intellectual culture.—A. That is a matter of opinion. These gentlemen are just as competent to form an opinion as I am. You are putting a hypothetical case.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I do not understand Governor Haight to say that he is an expert or knows the extent of the culture of the Chinese.—A. Not at all.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. I understand that you are not familiar with Chinese literature.—A. I am not familiar with Chinese literature.

Q. And that you are not familiar with the constitution of the Chinese government.—A. Not particularly so. Governor Low and myself are very friendly, and I have talked with him about matters in the interior of China.

Q. Have you examined the Chinese code of laws?—A. Not critically. I do not know that I have at all, for that matter.

Q. You know that there is an established code, a printed code, in China?—A. I am unfamiliar with the system in China.

Q. Do you know that that code has been translated into English, and is in our own libraries here?—A. I am not aware of that fact.

Q. What do you mean by a despotic government? Do you consider a government despotic that has an established code of laws, for which every citizen is responsible?—A. If those laws could be changed at any time arbitrarily, by the will of one man, it would be a despotic government.

Q. Is that the case in China? Do not all the laws there receive the sanction of a body similar to the Congress of the United States, except

that they are not elected?—A. My impression of the condition of things politically in China is that it is arbitrary control at the head of the government and abject obedience on the part of the people.

Q. If the facts were the other way, would it make any difference, in your opinion, in regard to the admissibility of Chinese to suffrage?—A. I do not know that it would. The opinion I have formed in reference to the admission of Chinese to the right of suffrage is the result of observation which I have had here in California mainly, and that opinion could not be changed.

Q. What has your observation here led you to in respect to their industrious habits?—A. With the exception of this vicious class here in San Francisco, they are industrious.

Q. Throughout the State they are generally industrious?—A. Generally industrious.

Q. Are they not generally law-abiding?—A. I think they are.

Q. Do they not obey and reverence their parents?—A. There is a good deal of that quality in the Chinese character, as I understand it.

Q. Are they not religious? That is, do they not attend to the duties of their own religion faithfully?—A. I have always supposed that the religious element was somewhat wanting in the Chinese character.

Q. Do they not continually offer incense to the spirits of their ancestors and to their god?—A. There is a good deal of that kind of thing going on. They take out to the graves in the cemetery provisions for the spirits of their departed ancestors, I believe, once a year.

Q. Do they not continually use prayer?—A. I am not aware that they do. My impression of the Chinese character is, as I have already expressed it, that the religious element is somewhat wanting in them.

Q. Do they not recognize a higher power, to whom they are responsible, to punish vice and reward virtue?—A. I have always supposed that the Chinese had no intelligent conception of the Supreme Being, as we express it.

Q. Do they not believe in the immortality of the soul?—A. I think they do.

Q. Are they not patriotic?—A. I cannot speak of that.

Q. Do they love their country?—A. They are very much attached to China. That I should call, perhaps, a superstition rather than a feeling of patriotism.

Q. If they were judging us they might judge us in the same way, might they not?—A. Possibly.

Q. They call us barbarians?—A. Yes, sir; because our ideas of virtue and vice do not agree with theirs.

Q. What particular virtue is it they lack that we possess?—A. In the first place, you want my impressions only, of course.

Q. We are in search of truth here. We want facts, governor?—A. My impression of the Chinese is that they lack the quality of truth as a people; that they have very little conception of the difference between truth and falsehood; that a Chinaman, when it is to his interest, would as lief state a thing one way as the other exactly. That is the conclusion I have drawn from observation here in California. I may be doing them injustice. When I recommended the admitting of them to testify, I had the same impression on this subject; that their statements were not reliable at all.

Q. What is your impression in regard to the truthfulness of a native Californian?—A. Of course there are some defects in the character of a native Californian, undoubtedly.

Q. Is there not the same defect?—A. There is a good deal of lack

of truthfulness among native Californians doubtless, but I think not to the same extent.

Q. Is there not a great lack of truthfulness generally in the testimony that we have to deal with in courts?—A. There is, of course, a great deal of perjury and of falsehood.

Q. All the time?—A. Yes.

Q. We have to contend with that continually, do we not?—A. Yes. I will tell you what first created this impression on my mind with reference to the Chinese, if you wish. I had a little suit as early as 1851, in which I had some Chinese witnesses. They swore to one state of facts in the lower court, and they discovered by the time the case got into the upper court that it was to be tried *de novo*, and that that was not the statement which it was desirable for them to make, and they all reversed their testimony without the slightest regard to what they testified to in the lower court, and swore directly the reverse in the upper court. That was the first thing that created an impression in my mind, and that impression has been corroborated by every thing that I have seen since that time.

Q. I suppose you have met with similar instances in white testimony?—A. We all know that; of course lawyers know it.

Q. Is there not a great difficulty in getting out the witness through an interpreter?—A. Of course, I suppose there are embarrassments of that kind.

Q. A greater difficulty with a Chinese witness than any other?—A. Yes.

Q. When we are examining in any other language we can all of us follow the interpreter a little, can we not; and if we do, we have to check him both as to question and answer?—A. That is very often the case.

Q. Do not the Chinese occupy themselves in labor which is not generally occupied by any other class?—A. I think so; to a considerable extent.

Q. Is the reclamation of tulee-land labor which white men affect?—A. No.

Q. Is it not a very great advantage to the State to reclaim those lands?—A. It is, undoubtedly.

Q. Does not the building of railways down the San Joaquin and Salinas Valleys open up a vast tract of country to the settlement of white families?—A. I presume so, of course.

Q. Will not land reached by a railroad be cultivated profitably for wheat and sustain a great many more families than when used as pasture-land?—A. Of course an agricultural country will support a denser population than a pastoral country.

Q. Immediately after the completion of the San Joaquin, and those railroads, did not a large influx of whites follow?—A. We have had a larger immigration into the State since the completion of those railways. There was a good deal of immigration, however, into that country before that time.

Q. And considerable ever since the railways were completed?—A. Yes.

Q. You say that our information regarding Japan is superficial. Is it not better than our information concerning China?—A. Yes; we have had more information concerning Japan than we have concerning China.

Q. Do you think that if such treatment which we have extended to the Chinese were extended to any European immigrants, it would induce them to bring their families here and become permanent settlers?—A. I do not believe that the treatment of the Chinese has determined the question of bringing their families here particularly. In other words, I doubt whether it has had that effect.

Q. I ask you if such a course of treatment toward any European immigrants would induce them to bring their families here and become permanent citizens?—A. I rather think not.

Q. Would it create any attachment to our institutions or a desire to study them and become citizens?—A. You assume such a course of treatment. What particularly is it that you refer to?

Q. I will ask you about the treatment that has been extended to the Chinese. In our early history were they not taxed $50 a head upon their arrival here?—A. I had forgotten that. If you say it is so, there is no doubt, of course, about the fact.

Q. You have practiced law in this State?—A. Yes. There was a foreign miners' license tax of a considerable amount which was levied quite extensively through the mines.

Q. Varying from $20 a month at first, and afterwards $4, $3, and $6?—A. Yes.

Q. Was not a large portion of the revenue of the State derived at one time from that source?—A. A considerable part of it.

Q. Was that tax collected from anybody but the Chinese?—A. I have understood not to any extent; but I have never been in the mining districts.

Q. Were they not until very lately excluded from testifying in courts?—A. They were.

Q. Did not that subject them to all sorts of injuries, robberies, assaults, and even murders?—A. I suppose it had the effect of increasing the number of offenses against Chinese and their property.

Q. There was no possibility of proving crimes committed upon Chinese where there were none but Chinese present?—A. It increased the difficulty of proving crime, as a matter of course.

Q. Was not that the usual state of circumstances in respect to crimes committed in Chinese camps by raids of white men?—A. My knowledge on these subjects is extremely limited. I have never resided in any of the mining counties, and I have been in them but little. There are a great many others who have resided in mining counties, who of course would be able to answer your questions better than myself.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Are not the Chinese boys here anxious to educate themselves?—A. My knowledge on that subject is very limited. So far as the Chinese boys are concerned I do not know that I have had occasion to notice.

Q. Do you think that they can be converted to Christianity under our teachers?—A. I would dislike to say that they could not. At the same time they are very unimpressible and very difficult to reach with Christian influences. I suppose a portion of them can be, perhaps.

Q. Do you know of any who have been converted to Christianity?—A. I think I do.

JOHN MELLON sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Farming is the last business I have been engaged in.

Q. How long have you been engaged in farming?—A. Seven years.

Q. In this State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your experience as to the employment of Chinese in the occupation of farming? Tell the committee all that you know about that matter.—A. I prefer white labor in every case.

Q. Why do you prefer it?—A. We pay less to the Chinese, but I

think white labor is cheaper in the end. We get more work out of white men and can put more reliance in them. If you tell them to go to the field to do so and so, that is the last of it. They will go and do it.

Q. Do you think there would be any difficulty in procuring a sufficiency of white labor to harvest our crops and carry on the business of agriculture in this State?—A. I think not.

Q. You think there is plenty of white labor for that purpose?—A. The way that harvesting is done here now it does not require one-half the labor that it did in early days. The headers will come along, two in each header-wagon, the driver three, and the reaper-header. The grain is put into the header-wagon, hauled off to the thrashing-machine, and there are four men on each side attending to the feeding of the machine and the separator. On the coast where I live there is a little more labor attached to farming, for the reason that they cannot head there; they have get to cut it and then bind it.

Q. Do you know of any Chinese in our State farming on their own account? I do not mean vegetable-raising—gardening—but farming in the broad sense.—A. Three or four Chinese took a piece of land down there in partners with some Mexicans. The Mexicans furnished the land and the Chinese put in the potatoes, did all the labor, and got one-half of the crop.

Q. How many Chinese do you think there are engaged in farming on their own account in the State?—A. I am not versed in that.

Q. A very small number?—A. There are only those down there and another party up on the stage-road. They are no farmers.

Q. Do they seem to understand the occupation?—A. Not on any account.

Q. Can you trust them to manage a farm?—A. I cannot trust them to do anything except there is a white man right there with them. You do not know when they are telling the truth.

Q. In the way of picking fruit, berries, pease, &c., are they not better than white labor?—A. Our boys and girls are really as good as they are, if not better, for the reason that we can tell a boy to pick such and such qualities, and do so and so, and he will do it; but you go and tell the Chinamen, "John, you sabe him, you catch him this, you catch him that," but as quick as you leave him he is bound to do something wrong unless you have got a man right there with him to watch him.

Q. You think, then, our white boys and girls are more intelligent and their work is more useful in picking berries and fruits?—A. I do.

Q. Can you not obtain white boys and girls to pick berries and fruits here in this State sufficient to perform the labor required?—A. I think so, if the people are willing to try and get them, but I do not believe they try.

Q. Can you obtain them even at the same price?—A. Cheaper.

Q. You can obtain white boys and girls cheaper?—A. Yes, sir. I had a boy from the city here down on my place. He was about twelve or fourteen years old, somewhere along there. I paid that boy, I believe, twelve dollars a month during the summer, and I would not give that boy for any Chinaman I ever saw. I will tell you why. That boy could go into the stable, put the harness on my team, hitch them up to the wagon and take them to the field. I would send a man over and the boy would pitch up the grain to him. The boy would act as a man, he would drive the team home and he would get on the stack and the man would go with the load and pitch it off, as he was the strongest. The boy on the stack would pack away the grain equal to a man.

Q. In other words, the boy could do many things the Chinese could

not do, and you could utilize him in other things as well as picking berries and fruit?—A. I have not any berries and fruit, but I have seen any quantity of that work done. I am speaking of what has been done on my own place. The boy, of course, if I told him to go up on any part of my ranch and fix the fence, he would take his hatchet and nails and fix it; or if I would tell him to go and look after such and such stock, he would go and look after it.

Q. Could you do that with a Chinaman?—A. No, sir.

Q. Even if he understood you thoroughly?—A. You cannot make the Chinaman understand you thoroughly. If you send him to drive home some of the stock from the field, he would drive them all home and you could take out such as you wanted, but if you sent the boy, he would do just as you would tell him.

Q. I understand you, then, that in very much of that farming which consists of fruit-raising, picking fruits, picking berries, pease, beans, hops, &c., boys can be as profitably employed as Chinese?—A. I do not see why they cannot, and more so. In the first place I consider they are smarter, and they can do, as I said before, whatever you tell them; they understand you. What money they have stays right here with us. If it is a pair of boots they want it is bought here, or a coat, or a pair of pants, and whatever money they earn goes to the support of smaller brothers and sisters, and the support of their father and mother. That is why I think they should get the preference by a good deal.

Q. In harvesting our crops what is the proportion of white and Chinese labor employed?—A. Do you mean in price or quantity?

Q. The proportion in numbers. Are there more white men than Chinese employed?—A. There are more Chinese employed, I think, for the reason that white labor has been driven out of the country. I have known white men to come down there around our place. I would keep them over-night and give them their supper. The farmers in this country do not furnish beds to hands like in the Eastern States. I would give a man his supper and breakfast and he would sleep in the granary. I would give him a pair of blankets and fix him the best I could. If he wanted to stay around a day or two he could do so.

Q. You have employed both classes of labor, Chinese and white labor?—A. Yes, sir; all countries. I can take one white man and he will go into the field and bind more grain than any two Chinamen I have ever seen. I have had Chinamen binding, white men, Germans, English, Americans, and Irish. It is the same way with picking and digging potatoes.

Q. What is the price of Chinese labor, farm-hands?—A. The Chinaman understands very well. If they get you in a tight pinch they will squeeze very tight, and as soon as they find an opportunity to get out of the contract they will quit.

Q. What is the price in dollars and cents, as near as you can average, of Chinese labor?—A. For binding grain, sometimes one dollar and a quarter, one dollar and forty cents, and as high as a dollar and a half an acre for binding.

Q. How much do you pay white labor for that?—A. I pay white labor about the same.

Q. I understand you to think that white labor can do more work?—O, yes; a white man will go to work and, as I told you, binders—there are plenty of white men who are good men, but not good binders and not good hands in the harvest-field.

Q. If there were inducements for those who understand that business

in the East to come here they would find ready employment, would they?—A. Plenty of employment among the farmers, but of course, when the harvesting commences, and such like, they are obliged to hire somebody. In the plowing season they have got to get all the white men they can to do the plowing. A Chinaman is no man with a horse. There is not one out of a hundred Chinamen that you can teach to handle a team. I have had a great many of them off and on and never a good hand with horses yet.

Q. What is your experience as to the effect of Chinese immigration upon other immigration of the farming class to this country? Do they prevent that class of immigration here?—A. Certainly, they have driven them away, as I remarked before.

Q. Do you know of individual instances where they have driven them away?—A. I do.

Q. Where whole families were driven away?—A. I know a Portuguese—that is, what they call a Portuguese, from the western islands, who had to leave; and I have known Americans there to curse the country, poor fellows. I saw one man traveling clear from Leonard City and across the mountains by the spring road from the Sierra Morena. He never ate a mouthful from the time he left Leonard City until he came to my house, and he was then a mile or a mile and a half from Spanish Town carrying his blankets; and he is not the only one. I had nothing for him to do, but gave him something to eat, some bread and butter and cold meat. A man like that comes along occasionally. A farmer never turns him away from his door.

Q. If the Chinese who are now here were absent, would there be enough white labor, in your opinion, to conduct the business of farming as it is now conducted in this country?—A. I tell you what I do know, and what I would not be at all afraid to put up money on, that in six months I can get all the men that this State wants, in here, on a contract of $25 a month and board.

Q. Did you ever observe that white men dislike to work in the same fields with Chinese?—A. They do not like to work alongside of them, of course.

Q. They regard it as degrading their labor, do they?—A. They do. Of course, they do not think they are on an equal footing with the Chinese, and do not want to be classed with them, certainly not. Of course, we are obliged, sometimes, to employ Chinese, but we do not consider them any companions. When you have got a good white man, you can take him into your dining-room or kitchen, and sit down and talk to him. If you want to go off to the city, or on business, you can tell him so and so, to see that this and that is done, and he will attend to your business; but a Chinaman says, "I no sabe." If you have him hired by the week, by the time the week is up he wants money, and if he has a chance of getting more pay the following week, he will make some excuse, "Me welly (very) sick," and what can you do? You cannot make him work.

Q. You are acquainted with the market-values of farming and agricultural products, are you not?—A. Pretty much.

Q. Do think that cheap labor has any tendency to depreciate those values, and make our grain cost less, or potatoes cost less, &c.?—A. No, sir; not at all; it cannot do that. It is the quantity or the scarcity in the market that rules the prices. Any man of common judgment knows that. The difference may be between paying two bits a sack for digging potatoes, but if the market is glutted, they will sell for whatever they bring.

Q. Then I understand you that Chinese cheap labor does not benefit the consumer at all?—A. Not at all.

Q. It simply adds to the profits of the employer; but you do not think even that, I believe?—A. I do not. I will tell you what I do know. I never got a Chinaman to dig potatoes for less than nine cents a sack, and we pick them up and sack them ourselves, and the Chinaman picks small ones and sacks them. You can never trust a Chinaman to sack potatoes for the market.

Q. Why not?—A. You pay them by the sack. If they sack them they want eleven cents a sack. Then, if they are paid by the sack, they do not care, they shove in wormy potatoes and spoil the sack when it goes to market.

Q. They are dishonest to their employers?—A. That is what I tell you. When the potatoes come into the San Francisco market, a man comes along and wants to buy potatoes. He turns the sack on the side, and takes his knife and cuts it open on the side, and there is the sack open, and he sees exactly what is in it; and if they are wormy or rotten potatoes, or anything of that kind, of course the sale is spoiled.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Where are you farming?—A. Down at San Mateo.

Q. What is the extent of your farming?—A. One hundred and sixty-four acres.

Q. You have employed Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long did you employ them?—A. Off and on whenever I would want them. I generally keep one Chinaman steadily the year around.

Q. Do your neighbors employ them?—A. Those who cannot help themselves.

Q. Do you hire Mexicans?—A. Occasionally.

Q. What is the price of wages between the two?—A. We pay those a dollar a day and board.

Q. What do you pay the Chinamen?—A. In the harvest time we pay the Chinamen a dollar and a quarter sometimes, and sometimes he will cost you a dollar and a half. It depends on how he would catch you in a tight place.

Q. What could you hire a white man for?—A. Sometimes in harvest time you must expect in the busy time of harvest to pay more than any other time of the year.

Q. You pay a little more for harvesting than for haying?—A. We call that harvesting too, for when the hay is cut it has to be cured; if it lies so long in the sand you must get a rake and cock it up and cure it, so that if you pay a dollar extra you can get the hay cured in good time.

Q. Why do they not employ boys and girls to gather their crops, vegetables, and strawberries, if they can do it as readily and cheaply as Chinese?—A. They do not raise that fruit where I am farming, but from my experience with boys, I prefer a boy twelve to fourteen years of age to a Chinaman.

Q. Why do you and your neighbors not employ them, then?—A. Down there there are not enough married people.

Q. You cannot get the boys and girls down there?—A. Not down there.

Q. Could you not get them here?—A. Yes, certainly; but here is the idea, our farming is short. We are not picking berries. Where they are picking berries or pease, it last the whole summer. When our haying commences it is quick; it has got to be cured. Our grain is the same way.

Q. There is not white labor enough convenient to do that thing, and it is necessary to be done quickly?—A. Not all the time is there white labor enough.

Q. You have to get these Chinese to do it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say you pay $1.50 an acre to bind grain. Cannot white laborers make good wages at that rate?—A. O, yes.

Q. Why do you not hire them?—A. I will tell you; for instance, to-day you are raking and I am reaping. Barley wants to be bound as quick as ripe. If you can bind it right after the reaper, you save your grain.

Q. Then the necessities of this thing compel the people to hire Chinese in order to save the crop?—A. They are not compelled actually.

Q. You do it, however?—A. We do it for the convenience, for we can haul and stack our grain without being bound.

Q. Why do the Chinese drive away white labor?—A. So many of them come in to work when no work is to be done, and a Chinaman will work for a mere nothing.

Q. Does he bind grain for twenty-five cents an acre?—A. The time you get in a tight place he sticks it on. If there is no work to be done, he works cheap.

Q. There are not enough white men to prevent you from getting into a tight place?—A. There are plenty of white men, but at the time you want them you cannot get them. As I said before, Chinese labor drives them away, of course. As I have told you, I have had men come around and look for work, but at the time they came I did not want them. They would go to chopping wood, some of them, for saw-mills.

Q. Do you not think Chinese labor makes potatoes cheaper here?—A. If you will show me where Chinese labor will make potatoes cheap I will be satisfied, but I cannot see it.

Q. It is set up here that this Chinese labor is ruinous to us, and you seem to be an intelligent farmer?—A. Show me where it is that Chinese labor makes the potatoes cheaper. I want to see it, but I cannot.

Q. Will white men sack potatoes as cheaply as the Chinese?—A. I will tell you what I have had white men to do. I have paid white men a dollar a day for digging potatoes. I had two of them digging right straight along for, maybe, three weeks—somewhere thereabouts—and they have dug as high as thirteen and fourteen sacks a day and sacked them up. Count that up. The cheapest I have ever got a Chinaman was nine cents a sack, and I sacked them myself.

Q. One dollar and forty the white man earns; and how many did the Chinaman sack?—A. Nine cents was the lowest I ever got a Chinaman to dig for, and I sacked them myself.

Q. John made ninety cents?—A. And I had to sack them.

Q. That was under contract?—A. That was under contract; the only way a Chinaman will work for you.

Q. Do they not sack three-fourths of the potatoes raised on this coast?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Have you ever been in Sonoma County?—A. I was there at the time I was looking after a ranch. But no man will trust to a Chinaman to sack potatoes for market. If he does, his potatoes will be solely sacrificed.

Q. In your opinion, it is better to employ white men to sack them?—A. I do think so.

Q. All things being equal, as you state, why do you not employ white men?—A. We do whenever we can.

Q. When you cannot employ white men, what do you do?—A. When

we cannot employ them, we have got to do the next best thing, of course, and get the Mexicans.

Q. Or any other cheap labor?—A. I will tell you why. I would rather pay more to a white man, and I think there is no honest man but what will say that it is proper. Suppose that I pay a white man thirty dollars a month—I have one year paid forty dollars a month to a white man. I hired him here in San Francisco, on the 4th of July. I paid that man forty dollars a month, and had him two months to cut at the rate of about two acres of grain a day for me. That man was cheaper to me than four Chinamen.

Q. He cut it by hand?—A. He cut it with a cradle out at the side of hills. You cannot run the reaper every place; and then, of course, you have got to cradle it or mow it. Suppose that I pay a white man thirty dollars a month through the summer. That money he will spend in town. He will go down and buy his clothes. He eats his victuals with me. If my family or me wants to go to town, we can leave him at home to take care of the place. The Chinaman, whatever money you pay him, will go down and buy a bag of rice for 6½ to 7 cents a pound. Seven cents is the highest I ever paid for rice for them. That is all the money he will spend. He will buy a pair of coarse brogans or boots, and daylight never sees the balance of the money.

Q. Still he has given the employer the worth of the money, and he is entitled to it. He does not dissipate it?—A. I am not speaking from prejudice at all, I want you to understand.

Q. I see you are not prejudiced?—A. I am speaking for what I consider to be the benefit of the community at large. I do not care for my little time to live. I have quite enough to do as long as I live, if I take care of it, but I am looking to the rising generation. Now, I will give you a little instance. I have got six children, five girls and a boy. Last July a year I fell from my horse and had my hip put out of joint. Suppose I had not been fortunate enough in my young days to have something here to live on, what would become of me now? If one of those girls of mine to-morrow went out to look for a day's work in a factory or in making shirts, or at laundry, or dress-making, or millinery, they would be told, "I don't want you; I have got Chinamen," and I can prove that is the case. What would be the result? There are my five girls, three of them young ladies; what would they do? They would have to go as prostitutes on the street or steal. What would I do? I must go to the almshouse. Is not that so, gentlemen?

Q. Very correct. Are those instances rare here?—A. I can bring them every day.

Q. Just such instances where poverty has stricken a family?—A. Come up around with me, and I will show it to you. As I say, I have plenty for myself. I worked hard for it and took care of it. You have got enough. I suppose all these gentlemen have enough to do them, but we do not consider the poverty of the poor. Here is a tenant living in my house there now and he cannot get a day's work. He has been around every factory. He has got to pay rent, and he has got to buy fuel and live. What has that man to do? If he goes to a railroad depot, they have enough. If he goes to try to get work on a railroad, they have got enough Chinamen. I do not pretend to say that Mr. Stanford is a bad man by any means.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Is it not the case that where there are a few Chinamen to compete with a few white men in the way of farm-labor, where they come to you

and ask you to employ them, they will underbid the white labor until they obtain the employment, and after the white labor has been forced away, then will they not raise their price and force you to pay the same wages that you paid originally to the white people?—A. That is what I explained a bit ago. When a Chinaman gets you in a tight place, he will tell you, "Me welly sick; me lackee some money; welly sick." I tell him, "No, John; no work, no pay." "O, me welly sick, bossee; me welly sick." He pretends that he cannot work. You must have your grain cured, or whatever you are doing, and the consequence is you have got to hire somebody else, and the same Chinaman will bring you more Chinamen at a bigger price.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you ever hear of strikes of that kind with the white race?—A. Certainly, but here is the idea: if I pay a white man a dollar and a quarter or a dollar and a half a day and board, in harvest-time, as I said before I have paid that, I know that man is going to spend that money right there and I do not begrudge it to him. A Chinaman is serving me, and after he gets his money he does not care if everything I have is taken. If he saw the cows in the grain or in the potatoes, you tell him, "John, run quick, fy, fy;" but he will say, "Me no sabe."

By Mr. SARGENT:

Q. What you mean to say is, if you make a bargain with a white man for a month, as a rule he will stay until the month is up?—A. Yes.

Q. If with the Chinamen, if they have the advantage of you, they will not stay until the month is up?—A. If you get in a tight place they will tell you, "Me welly sick;" and you cannot force them to work. What will you do?

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do not white boys and girls consider it a degradation to sleep and eat in the same apartments with Chinamen?—A. I would not want a child of mine to sleep with them.

Q. Is it not the fact that they consider it a degradation to associate with them as in eating and sleeping in the same apartments?—A. Certainly they do.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is it not the same in regard to the colored people, the negroes?—A. I would prefer a colored man any time. I do not pretend to say that it is right for either Chinamen or a colored man to sleep in the same apartments with white men.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. When you hire European or American white boys and girls, do you object to their eating at your own family table?—A. Sometimes.

Q. If they are genteel, nice people?—A. If they are genteel it is all right, that is, if they are from this country, those eastern people. I have been out of the city so long—but I see this is Mr. Piper; you are an old Californian, and I have been here some time myself, though I was never acquainted with you. I have been out of the city some time and have lost the run of the old Californians, but these eastern gentlemen must remember there is somewhat different here from what it is in the East. A farm-hand will come along looking for a day's or a month's work; you do not know who he is, and you do not want to bring him into your family. You generally have beds up-stairs in the granary and they furnish their own blankets. We generally have mattresses for them, with straw, and let them furnish their own beds.

Q. Suppose you should hire some poor neighbor's sons and daughters, how would that be in regard to taking them into your family?—A. That is another thing.

Q. You do not consider them inferior to you?—A. Not at all; we do not consider any other white men inferior; but because we do not know them we treat them strange.

Q. Do these white laboring men consider the Chinese inferior to them?—A. Certainly they do.

Q. They consider it a degradation to be put upon an equality with them?—A. Certainly. I would like to state one thing, and I do not wish to detain you. This is my view about it: if Chinese immigration continues for twenty years as it has for the last two years, the Chinese will be telling us to get up and leave. That is my humble opinion. This is 1876, is it not? In 1976, if Chinese immigration continues, the Chinese will be celebrating the anniversary of their independence from the United States. Take my word for it, history will tell, if Chinese immigration continues as it has done.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you think they can root out the white race?—A. Twenty years from now there will not be a white man seen here if the Chinese continue at the rate they calculate to bring them, five to six thousand a month, and then where will we be?

WILLIAM VINTON sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. Where is your residence?—Answer. San José, Santa Clara County.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Tailor.

Q. Are you connected with any of these anti-Chinese organizations in San José?—A. I am.

Mr. KING. We have heretofore confined ourselves to the Chinese in San Francisco. You will please state their condition in San José, so far as you have observed, giving all the statistics you can.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Tell us where San José is.—A. San José is in Santa Clara County, State of California.

Q. How far from here?—A. I think about fifty-three miles.

Q. About how many inhabitants are there in the place?—A. I think about sixteen or seventeen thousand. I would state that I was sent here at the request of the Santa Clara association, with a statement giving some information on the points which it was supposed this commission would like to hear. [See Appendix G.]

Q. Is the statement made by yourself?—A. It is made by myself with the assistance of a committee.

Q. Do you know the facts to be true as related to us, and by whom?—A. The statistics were given to us by the Chinese missionary there.

Q. What is his name?—A. I do not know his Chinese name. I had no extensive acquaintance with him.

A. Go on with your statement.—A. You simply want the statistics.

Q. And any information you wish to give.—A. In the city of San José there are between thirteen and fourteen hundred resident Chinese; that is, there is about that number usually there. As to their morality the following items will show for themselves, and also from the police court record that I have here, the impossibility of conviction, &c.,

as the police court informs us. I here speak from the information of Judge May. The reason that this table shows so small a percentage of convictions is that it is impossible to convict upon evidence offered by officers. Hence it shows a small percentage as to what there should be with the amount of criminals they have, he says here, from the unreliability of evidence. Chinatown occupies about a block, giving a description of the place, almost in the center of the town of San José. Its average population is about one thousand. In that block there are twenty-eight places of prostitution. The number, as near as the information we could obtain from this missionary, is 143 prostitutes. The number has been considerably enlarged within the last few weeks. There are 38 gambling-dens, rooms in this said Chinatown, where they gamble. The number of opium-rooms we did not count, but there are many of them. There are also two lottery-drawings daily, one at 10.30 a. m., (I think I may be mistaken there; at 10 or 10.30,) and the other at 2 p. m. To be particular, it may be 10 o'clock and 2.30; I have forgotten exactly. I know about 2 o'clock in the afternoon I have been present watching the excitement, looking at their bulletins of drawings, about the same as congregate at the bulletins of stock-boards. At Chinatown, our informant states, there are 400 who never do a day's work.

Q. Your informant is a Chinese missionary?—A. Yes, sir; a Chinese missionary. With regard to the inhabitants of Chinatown, we judge from his Christian standing that he would be truthful, and that was the only reliable information we had. He says over four hundred never do a day's work; they live by trading, stealing, and gambling, the two latter avocations largely predominating. Every Saturday evening, until Sunday, as any resident of San José can testify, it is their harvest, as at that time a large number come in from the surrounding country to spend Sunday from Alviso. Alviso employs, according to the poll-lists, some two hundred and fifty to three hundred. It is very adjacent to San José, and they spend their time and money and Sunday in San José.

By Mr. KING:

Q. How far off is Alveso?—A. I think about four or five miles. They get cleaned out when they come to San José. We have also nearly forgotten to mention the existence of a secret order of thieves. An officer who was acquainted with Chinatown took me into their special joss-house. I stated that it was devoted specially to them. They certainly deserve credit for one thing: they have got the cleanest joss-house and the most elegantly ornamented of the like I ever saw. I suppose their business is most profitable, and they can better afford it. As to their habits of cleanliness, we utterly fail to describe it. It has to be seen to be understood. Another question asked by this commission is, Does their presence here prevent white immigration. We know most assuredly that it does. We know numbers of laboring men during the last year who have had to go back East for want of employment in consequence of their inability to compete with Mongolians, and thus the State has sustained a loss, not alone through them, but through their influence, when they return to their old homes, not yet cursed by the Chinese' presence. As to its effects on labor, we know that it degrades labor to a fearful extent, and closes up all the avenues to the employment of our boys and girls right at home, thus leaving our rising generation in a fearful condition; in fact, so fearful, that we shrink in horror as to what must be the final result unless we obtain some relief.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You have there the statistics of crime among the Chinese?—A. [Exhibiting.] Here I have the return of the police court for six months.

Q. Read it.

The witness read as follows:

Catalogue of cases in George May's court, from April 1, 1876, to October 10, 1876.

WHITE CASES.

53 cases of battery.
41 cases of disturbing the peace.
25 cases of petit larceny.
4 cases of grand larceny.
3 cases of assault.
4 cases of gambling.
4 cases of embezzlement.
33 cases of different crimes not mentioned in the foregoing.

167

CHINESE.

12 cases of petit larceny.
4 cases of battery.
2 cases of threats to commit murder.
1 case of assault to murder.
1 case of assault to commit housebreaking.
5 cases of gambling.
4 cases of destroying fish with explosive material.
1 case of selling lottery-tickets.

30

Yours, respectfully,

GEO. W. PARKER,
Clerk of Police Court.

About one-half of the crimes charged as whites were committed by Spaniards.

Q. (By Senator SARGENT.) What is the opinion of the community of San José, the respectable people there, generally, in regard to the desirableness of Chinese immigration in numbers?—A. I can speak of my own knowledge, from the fact that I have talked with them on this Chinese question and find that at least seven-eighths of the people are desirous for a change. They believe a change would be beneficial to general interests.

Q. Is that opinion confined to a particular party?—A. Not to any people generally.

Q. To what political party do you belong?—A. I am a republican.

Q. You find that republicans and democrats have the same opinion?—A. It makes no difference at all, republicans and democrats all think the same.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Are lotteries forbidden by your laws?—A. I should suppose they are from the fact of one prosecution for selling tickets that I know of.

Mr. KING. It is forbidden by State law and also by the State constitution.

Q. (By Senator COOPER.) You say they have lotteries daily?—A. There are two drawings daily.

Q. Are they open?—A. They are open to Chinamen. White men cannot get in. You no sooner attempt to approach than some one gives a signal and the door is closed.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Then they know it is against the law?—A. They understand it fully.

By Mr. KING:

Q. What, in your opinion, is the reason there have not been more convictions under that law?—A. First, from the unreliability of the evidence taken.

Q. The Chinese will not testify?—A. They will not testify. They will contradict themselves right along.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Would not the same evidence upon which you make that general statement of lotteries be sufficient to convict them?—A. With regard to this preacher?

Q. Yes; the same man who makes the statement could have them convicted?—A. I do not know whether that could be done, for a person would have to be an eye-witness of the transaction, as I understand it.

Q. Does he not give this information to you?—A. He knows by common report and mingling with his countrymen that these things exist.

Q. He has no personal knowledge of the fact, then?—A. I do not know how that may be.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How did you become possessed of the information that there are twenty-eight houses of prostitution in San José?—A. I stated it simply upon information, and I said so at the outset.

Q. Have you municipal laws at San José?—A. We have.

Q. Police?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A police court?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do the police have beats in this Chinese quarter or are they special?—A. There is a special officer, paid by the Chinese themselves.

Q. With the same power as a regular?—A. He is appointed by the sheriff, and receives his powers, as I understand, as a deputy sheriff.

Q. Has any effort been made to stop these twenty-eight houses of prostitution?—A. As I understand, one or two efforts have been made, but they have been unsuccessful every time to secure conviction.

Q. Upon what grounds?—A. I could not say, not being present at the trial of the cause.

Q. You know there are these houses of prostitution, as a citizen, yourself?—A. It is so understood.

Q. Would not your evidence be sufficient to convict?—A. I do not know that it would.

Q. How about the thirty-eight gambling-houses? You have laws there in reference to gambling?—A. Most assuredly.

Q. Why do you not suppress them in San José?—A. Simply because it is impossible to do it. I think partly by collusion with the officers.

Q. By collusion with white officers?—A. Yes, sir; I will state that it is an impression that we have; we have no evidence of that fact, but we have that impression.

Q. But you have evidence that there are 38 gambling-houses there?—A. We have evidence right here that there are that number.

Q. How many inhabitants has San José?—A. 16,000 or 17,000.

Q. Have you a pretty good class of people?—A. I think so.

Q. You have schools and colleges there?—A. As good as any in the State.

Q. It is one of the finest cities in the State?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you ever lecture your citizens upon these things?—A. No, sir.

Q. You say you have opium dens there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you any law against smoking opium down there?—A. I do not know how that is.

Q. Are the San José Chinamen generally a drunken, dissipated class of people?—A. I do not think they are, as far as drunkenness goes.

Q. Are you quite intimate with Chinese character?—A. I have observed them considerably.

Q. You have had some communication with them?—A. I have had business transactions with them.

Q. Have you ever seen one who could not read and write?—A. I cannot say how that is. I have seen but one who could read and write the English language.

Q. You speak of 250 Chinese employed in Alveso. What is the employment of them?—A. I stated that the poll-book showed some 250. The number, I presume, is much larger.

Q. That is the number of those who had paid their poll-tax?—A. Those who had paid their poll-tax; it showed that number. I suppose the total number, as near as can be ascertained, is in the vicinity of about 400; they are employed on the strawberry-farms there.

Q. Why do they not employ young girls and boys in San José on the strawberry-farms?—A. That is a question I could not answer, but I have often thought if I were again in the strawberry business I would not employ Chinamen. I have been in the strawberry business and did very well without Chinamen, in Illinois, and think I could do as well without them here.

Q. You say there were 167 cases of whites in the police court?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And thirty cases of Chinese?—A. Thirty.

Q. How many of those Chinese were convicted?—A. These were convictions I speak of.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know the old capital building of this State at San José?—A. I do not know it by that name.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know what the poll-list is of San José; how many names there are on the register?—A. No, sir; I do not know exactly.

FRANK MUTHER sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a cigar-maker by trade.

Q. How long have you been a cigar-maker?—A. About sixteen years.

Q. In what parts of the United States have you worked?—A. I have worked in about all parts; I think in about fifteen or eighteen different States.

Q. How long have you been a resident of this State?—A. Two years and a half.

Q. How many Chinese cigar-makers are there in this city?—A. Between 6,500 and 7,000.

Q. How do you estimate that number?—A. We estimate it in this way: The revenue report gives taxes paid on 9,300,000 cigars a month; they will not average, from the best authority, over about 100 a day. At that rate it would take 3,000 Chinamen at constant employment to make

these cigars, to roll them. It will then take over five hundred packers and strippers. There is a surplus of labor here; the Chinamen here complain that one-half are out of work; we put it down lower than that.

Q. Down to what?—A. To about 2,500 constantly out of employment.

Q. That makes over 6,000?—A. Yes; that makes over 6,000.

Q. How many white men are engaged in the business at the present time?—A. There are journeymen workmen, perhaps 150, in the city altogether. We have a society here that numbers pretty nearly a hundred.

Q. Have the Chinese any protective cigar-making union?—A. They have.

Q. At how much do they estimate their membership?—A. That is very hard to get at. I talked to one very reliable firm which puts it down at a membership of 9,000, and nobody is admitted unless he has worked one year at the trade. There are other reliable Chinamen who tell me that there are only between 5,000 and 6,000 in the union, and a great many do not belong to it. I asked them furthermore how many Chinese cigar-makers they believed to be on the coast. One of them put the number clear up to nearly 20,000, and another came down to between 12,000 and 13,000 who had actually learned the trade.

Q. There are about a hundred white cigar-makers?—A. About a hundred.

Q. How many are employed at the present time?—A. Between 50 and 60.

Q. How much are white men worth per week? What is their rate of wages?—A. They will average about $11.

Q. All by the piece-work?—A. All by the piece-work.

Q. The Chinese will average about how much a week?—A. About $6. That is because they work by the piece and are slower workmen.

Q. As to Eastern rates how does it compare with the Chinese?—A. The Eastern States ought to be visited for anybody to get an intelligent idea of the trade there. The manufacturing is controlled under a good deal worse system here than East. The system is because John is in it, and he will make anything to shove on the market. We are not prepared for the manufacture as they are in the East. They make far inferior preparation for the workmen here, and it gives the men no chance. If they would furnish the same accommodation here and not work the amount of men they do, it would be better. Where we consider in the East a shop fit for 20 men, they work 100 and 150 Chinamen in the shop here. Hence they have not the facility for drying the tobacco and preparing it. If they would introduce the same system here that they have in the East the white men would make almost double what the Chinamen get; that is, they have got the slave system here. They put in a room treble the amount of men that the room can hold in order to properly manufacture.

Q. Are cigars here bought by the public generally any cheaper than they are in the East?—A. As a general thing, they are dearer here—that is, fair goods.

Q. Then Chinese cheap labor does not benefit the consumer, so far as cigar-making is concerned?—A. Not in the least; but there is one class of goods that affects the retailer; that is this: very cheap, inferior goods—such tobacco as white men throw away; the Chinamen pick it up and work it up, and they put it in the market. Where it is considered in the East as lying loose, to be thrown away, the Chinamen here work it up.

Q. What class of goods?—A. Everything—if necessary, cigar-stumps—

anything containing tobacco, whether it is moldy, rotten, or anything else, that a white shop throws away, but the Chinamen take it up and manufacture it by apprentices.

Q. What are their habits as to cleanliness in manufacturing cigars?—A. Their habits are fair where white men control the Chinese. If you watch them closely you may bring them down to fair cleanliness, but where they work by themselves their habits are simply ridiculous.

Q. What do they do?—A. I have seen them with my own observation very often. One thing they practically do is to take a cigar in their mouth and put spit on it to get it smooth, and then they will take it in the hand and roll it, in order to get this shine on it, what is called a Chinese polish.

Q. How did the cigar-manufactories in this city start? Were they started by white or Chinese labor, originally?—A. In the first place, the cigars were principally brought from New York. Afterward manufacturers came here, and there were lots of little white shops, but no extensive factories, because the country did not call for it at that time.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. They were mostly Germans?—A. They were principally Germans; you might say nearly all Germans.

Q. Is that an employment in which boys, women, and girls can work to any extent?—A. I have worked in the Eastern States with ladies side by side with me, through Connecticut and Massachusetts; even through Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland, Mississippi, and all those States where there were women; I would sit beside young ladies there who would throw out eighteen or twenty dollars a week; that was in good times—right after the war, when everything was flourishing in the country; and where I would earn about a hundred dollars a month, they would earn about eighty.

Q. You consider yourself an experienced mechanic in the work?—A. I am a little faster than most of them. I consider myself an experienced mechanic. I would state that boys and girls can make cigars (for it is very easy work) just as well as the oldest man—in fact, much better. The prime of cigar-makers is between twenty and thirty, as it is all in activity; it is not laborious work. After thirty they get slow. I have seen boys of fifteen years of age, when I myself was in the city of Chicago, earn from $8 to $10 a week.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is this method of polishing cigars practiced in Cuba, or by white employés anywhere?—A. It is practiced by every Chinaman, if you give him a chance.

Q. Is the Havana cigar prepared in that way?—A. The imported cigars are principally made by Chinamen.

Q. Are they prepared in that way?—A. No; they object to it. The Cubans passed a law that the Chinaman had to cut off his queue and go in ordinary citizens' clothes. That is the reason we have got so many Chinese cigar-makers here. Chinese cigar-makers here have told me that they got disgusted in Cuba, for they made them wear regular citizens' costumes, and compelled them to cut off their queues. For that reason a great many of them came to California, as that was their nearest outlet.

Q. My question was, whether this method of using spittle on cigars is employed in ordinary cigar-making, or is it a peculiarity of the Chinese?—A. It is a peculiarity of the Chinese.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. And not permitted in well-regulated establishments?—A. No. Another thing they do commonly with the wrappings which I will state; of course there is a certain amount of wrappings. The Chinaman gets to sweating; and, I do not care how many sores he has on him—they are all, as you see, scarred. I have worked with them in shops in this city where the Chinamen were packed around me as thick as herring in a keg. Under such circumstances, where I was compelled, on account of poverty, going, until such time as I could see an outlet, they would get to sweating, and it was a common thing for them to take these cuttings and wipe their arms and their faces with them, and blow their noses into them. That is something very common among them. It may look rather bad, but it is a fact.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do the Chinese ever take any means to drive the white men out of the factories?—A. I will state what I know of their offering bribes; that is, one man, for instance, has a shop; he is working white men; they will go to the boss and offer him wages below what a Chinaman will work actually on in the long run. They will agree to work for a certain length of time. If necessary they will screw those wages down to almost nothing in order to obtain the shop. When they cannot prevail on the boss they will turn around and try to bribe the foreman. They have offered $10 for every Chinaman they will put on, or $10 for every thousand cigars manufactured, and where the foreman sometimes will have a chance to make money he will take on the Chinamen.

Q. Do you know any foremen of that kind?—A. I have met foremen who have told me that they were offered money. I asked them if they would come on this stand. They told me they were situated in business that they did not want to expose. I went to one particular one named Joe Betts. He told me he would swear that in the last few weeks he was offered money, one dollar for every thousand cigars manufactured in the shop by Chinamen, or ten dollars for every Chinaman he would put on. It is from this fact that they have hurt us so much. Even when we can hold the bosses they bribe the foremen, and of course it is hard to hold men under such a liberal offer. When they offer a man $80 and $100 a week for a year or so, it is hard to hold honest men under such inducements. Temptation is hard to resist when it becomes that liberal.

Q. Something has been said about trades-unions limiting the number of boys as apprentices. Is there any such rule in the cigar-makers' union here limiting the number of boys that they will take as apprentices?—A. I am vice-president of that organization, and can only state that we have no such laws. We have ladies working in the city in the trade who belong to the society, and we would accept a child of two years of age, provided he could keep shop and make cigars. We have no limit on anybody as far as they need work; but the fact is, our bosses will not learn them. You go to a boss and say, "Here is a good boy, I desire you to learn him the trade." The next thing, he will tell you, "I will not learn him the trade, because I believe in treating the boy right." "Why do you not learn him the trade?" He will say, "If I want to learn the boy the trade in all its branches and do it right it will take him three years." Most of us old cigar-makers learned in three years. He will say, "When the three years are up I can pay him but little wages." Then he has to go to another trade. I cannot say that he will get work after he learns the trade.

Q. On account of what?—A. On account of the Chinese who have got the trade. They have got us, so to say, conquered. A conscientious man will not take an apprentice in this town as a general rule.

Q. If the Chinese cigar-makers were excluded from this country entirely would there be plenty of white labor?—A. Not in the State now, because they have been driven away, but New York reports 3,000 cigar-makers walking the streets doing nothing. We had one hundred and sixteen societies in the United States two and a half years ago. When people understand that we have been incorporated, and they are itching for a change as times are hard, and they correspond with us, our general reply is, "Do not come."

Q. Have you had many such demands for employment here?—A. I dare say when I came out here myself I had as many as a hundred men writing to me here from the city of Chicago, where I was born, telling me if there was any show for a living to let them know, as they wanted to see California and come out here anyhow.

Q. Did many of those men have families?—A. I suppose a majority did not, but perhaps one-quarter did. But of course I had to reply that there was no show here. When I came here first I got a very good situation, but it has been dwindled down so now that I cannot make within eight dollars a week of what I did two years ago.

Q. Something has been said about this opposition to Chinese immigration being confined entirely to the Irish. What in the nativity of the cigar-makers generally of your union, those residing here now?—A. I know about all the cigar-makers here. Of course I never inquired into that fact, but, as far as I know, there are about one-half Americans.

Q. What is the other half?—A. The other half are principally Germans and Jews. I guess of the other half, one-half—that would make a quarter of the whole—are Jews, and the others are Germans principally. I do not know that we have any Irish. There is one boy here in the trade by the name of Kelly, but I think he was born in San José.

Q. Something has been said also about the endeavor of the Gilroy Company to obtain white labor, and after so endeavoring they were only able to procure two white bummers. How is that?—A. That is a lie, if I dare term it so, because when the Gilroy factory started they limited the room to twelve white tables. That is the foreman's own words. When the boys went there in a bunch to get labor, as they understood they wanted more work than the hands they had could give, the foreman then stated he was limited to twelve white tables, and they had over three hundred Chinamen in the shop. They claimed to work two thousand Chinamen in both shops, tobacco-houses, and all the way through. Shortly after that a friend of mine, by the name of Dave Atsell, went to the foreman, Mr. Wolfram, and asked him if he would not give him work for men if he would send them, and he made this reply, that he was confined to twelve tables, and would do the best he could, but did not give the assurance to send for them; and, finally, as lots of the boys were out of work, he went beyond the limit, and put up four extra tables and marked them white tables, tables intended for white men.

Q. Was there any difficulty in furnishing that company with all the white labor they required?—A. As I stated, the boys went to the foreman and made the proposition to send east for men, but he would not acknowledge that they would give them work; but the advertising dodge for white labor I do not dispute, because they always do that. They had twelve white tables. Afterward they overstepped the bounds and made it eighteen, because white men came down there dead broke,

and by lots of persuasion they agreed to work eighteen tables until these men would get a little money and leave the town. There were over one hundred and fifty white men at the time in the shop. Consequently these Chinese cigars were sold for white goods, and invariably the same thing is done here in this city.

Q. Do you know of any white cigar-makers and families that have been driven from this coast by Chinese labor?—A. I know of a great many who come here and go right back, because the field is better east than it is here, although many are out of work there. I think hardly a day passes but white men come into shops here from the East with all the discouraging letters that we send them and publish for them. I think a letter was published which I wrote myself to the societies east. All these items are generally, when put in our papers, copied there, because the eastern societies do that. We are not connected with them any more than in sympathy.

Q. Do you know whether there is a Chinese company here, Tak, Lang & Co., who have a shop for apprentices?—A. There is a shop here composed of four parties. One of the firm has gone back to China. He had a couple of wives there, and he said he was going to bring a few more along; that he could buy them there for sixty dollars and sell them here for five hundred dollars. Another partner I spoke to this week. He said he had a shop to work exclusively apprentices. I asked what it paid, &c. Of course he could not get at that exactly; nevertheless he told me that he gave them their board. What that may be I do not know.

Q. Do they sometimes employ Chinese, paying even higher wages than they can afford, and then by boarding these men make up the difference?—A. Chinamen, when pinched, will take contracts below the actual cost of the goods; that is, certain companies from these wholesale tobacco-houses. They do not run in that business with the consumer or with the retailer, but with these wholesale houses. The monopoly of this town is the wholesale houses. In the first place they take contracts. They furnish all the cigars this house can make. They contract to furnish all the cigars, such brands and such brands. They have to give good quality; everything that is not good they have the right to refuse. Then the contract absolutely will say that they have to purchase the tobacco of the wholesale house, and in this way the tobacco-houses make the monoply. They have got the Chinamen and they have got the public. They invariably beat the Chinamen on the tobacco and get the good goods, the goods they contract for, all into this ship; and all the poorer trash the little white shops have to work up. This Tak, Lang & Co. take a very cheap contract. They have four hundred boarders, besides apprentices, and this Chinaman told me that he can collect between four hundred and four hundred and eighty dollars a week from all these Chinese boarders. Then he does not care if he does not make anything on cigars. If he can get contracts, he will take them rather than to lose his boarders, because he works a sort of intelligence-office. He charges them so much for board, and then of course he will do anything to give them work. Invariably, though, whereever they take contracts, nobody ever pays any money to their men; they all pay to Tak, Lang & Co. Tak, Lang & Co. pay the Chinamen one price, and take the contract for what they can get.

Q. Is not one danger not only to your trade but to all the trades here that they are an organized force, organized in large bodies, and can be centered immediately upon any one trade under the direction of a

leader, and therefore oust white men from that trade?—A. I think they are organized, because the Chinamen that I have worked with all tell me the same story; that they are compelled to do as the six companies, or any company that they may live under, wants them to do; but when they do not come under that head, and do not obey the orders of the head of a company, they simply condemn them and consider them outcasts; and any Chinamen who will stone them, and kill them after that, will get credit from the six companies; and, if necessary, they will hire lawyers to defend them. That is the objection I have got to them.

Q. They will produce evidence to clear a Chinaman who kills one outside of the companies, an outlaw, as you term it?—A. They will produce evidence to clear him, of course. I talked to a Chinaman, one that I consider the most civilized in the city. He worked fourteen years in Cuba, and he left at the time this queue regulation was put in operation there. He did not propose to leave the country and go to China. We retired farther from the interior. He said when he got back there the company that he belonged to, which he said was not strong in that part, had been murdered by another company, and he said of course he knew very well as soon as they found out he was there belonging to the company, as all his relations were murdered, they would likely go for him. So he thought it was not safe quarters for him to inhale the air there, and he departed straight for New York, and from New York to San Francisco. He told me that he did not wish to wear a queue nor the costume of China. I asked him why. He said he did not like it; that if he could raise money he would go back to Spain, because he could cut his queue off there. I said, "Why do you not cut off your queue here?" He said, if I do they would stone me wherever I am seen, and I would be afraid of my life. Then I told him, "I will make a proposition to you; we will get up a row in the way of a joke, and I will cut off your queue and pretend to be mad." He said, "That would be all folly, for as soon as my hair is long enough to braid in another one I will have to have another, and they will bring me in any way."

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Who are they who manufacture cigars and put up a sign, "No Chinese labor employed here?"—A. They are Caucasians, quite naturally. You may ask me what they are, Americans or Germans, or white or black.

Q. What nationality are they?—A. A great many are Jews, a great many Americans, and a great many are Germans; but I think the Jews predominate in the matter.

Q. Is it the fact that in those establishments the cigars are not manufactured by Chinese labor?—A. Invariably so. I will state to you one incident. I was appointed once from our society to visit a house. It sent us a card to send them white labor. I went there to look after such a glimmering hope as that. The president of our organization appointed me to go with two more on a committee. It was to Alexander & Co., 222 Battery street. Said I, "We are appointed to wait on you." Said he, "Yes; I want to get rid of these coolies; I want nothing more to do with the pig-tails." I said, "I am glad to hear that; I like to hear one man talk out that way." Said he, "What I called you for is this: I want to know what terms I could make with you for white labor. I want the most skillful white labor or any other labor that can be got in the shape of cigar-makers. I propose to introduce something new in this country. I do not propose to introduce any *centering*." [Producing a cigar.] That

is the wrapping, this is the binding around here that holds the cigar in shape, and inside of that is the filling. He did not want to use this part, [exhibiting;] he wanted to use purely filling and wrapping. That is an awful advantage, to make a pretty cigar. That is what we use to get the shape by, what we call binding, and afterward polish it off. He told us if we could furnish him such reliable labor he would do it. I told him we could, but only the oldest mechanics could do this work. He said, "I am aware of that; a Chinaman cannot do it." The next thing he turned around and said, "What will your men charge me?" I said, "Our organization makes no charges; we hold no particular price." "Then," said he. "are you a married man?" I said, "Certainly, and so are all the oldest skillful cigar-makers." He said, "Then I cannot use you." Said I, "Why? It is hard you should shove out us Americans because we have families." Said he, "I will tell you why; the Chinaman is not married, and he can work very cheap; now, if you will introduce me to any unmarried men I will pay them enough to live comfortably, but I do not care to keep more than one comfortably." I said, "I think any man's hire is worth the support of his family and children." Said he, "I am not responsible for other men's children, and cannot support them; I did not have anything to do with their existence." I bade him a happy good-by and told him he was a fraud like all other advertisers for white labor. He then offered me wages at which I suppose a skillful mechanic could make $8 or $9 a week.

Q. This man is a white man?—A. A white man.

Q. Is it not a fact that where you see this advertisement, "No Chinese labor employed here," Chinese labor is employed?—A. I wish to state to you in the first place that we have a society here and the members of that society only work where there is white labor used. Wherever those men work they have a certain stamp that they put on their cigar as white labor. Of course, we have legitimately a right to stick out this brand, "No Chinese labor employed here." There is a white man appointed in the shop to keep a book of every cigar manufactured, and if you want these stamps you can get the amount you are entitled to and no more. These are copyrighted, and it is an incorporated society. We did that because so many men were swearing that they worked only white men when they used Chinese. The advertising dodge is to call for twenty white men. If the white men go to the shop they will put them on. They will then advertise all through the country that they have been working white men, and are deserving of preference in the trade; but as soon as they get this thing established, by the next Saturday, Chinamen are there. Our society in that way has spent enough to make cigar-makers rich by advertising.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You refer to a particular house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What house is that?—A. Denicke Brothers.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did they not make a great hurrah that they had discharged Chinese labor?—A. That is the house I am speaking of.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What becomes of the Chinese cigars that are made?—A. They are eventually consumed by human beings. They send a great many East.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is this stamp on the box?—A. It is on the box.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Whereabouts are these cigars made by Chinese consumed by human beings?—A. Principally, in America; a great many on this coast, and a great deal of the common trash I spoke about is sent East.

Q. A great portion of it is sold in these stores where they have a placard up that "no Chinese labor is employed here?"—A. There are two classes of those stores, one true and the other not. Where it is a true store he has bad goods if he has Chinese goods. We stamp the boxes, and if he has Chinese goods he cannot present them for white labor. If you want these Chinese goods they have a stamp that you can have, but they will not sell them for white labor if they have our stamp.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Can you describe this stamp? Is it a stamp on the box or is it a label?—A. It is a stamp similar to a revenue-stamp, only a little broader, and on the box it says, "The cigars contained in this box are made by white men." The label is issued by the Cigar-makers' Association of the Pacific Coast, adopted by law, incorporated at such a date.

By Mr. KING:

Q. It is a trade-mark filed in the office of the secretary of state?—A. It is copyrighted.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you sell that stamp?—A. Yes, under conditions.

Q. Under what conditions?—A. The conditions are that you must work white men, and we will sell you as many stamps as will correspond with the number of cigars made in your shop? We keep a book of every cigar made by white men.

Q. How can you tell what number of cigars white men make in a particular shop?—A. I will have to explain our society. I am pretty well posted in our constitution. We will suppose that one of these gentlemen keeps a cigar-shop; he has white labor to work. If he wants to obtain this stamp it is necessary for him to have one man belonging to the society in his shop; all the rest may be foreign to us; and then that man will put down every Saturday every cigar each man made, Muther, Harris, Connor, each man so many. This man is bound to report at our headquarters, 107 Geary street, every Saturday night, or between Saturday and Monday, and make regular papers. We have regular headquarters there, regular officers, a safe, and a regular book where everything is entered. If this man should call for stamps, the stamp committee opens the book to find out how many he is entitled to, for they know how many he has manufactured and they cannot fool us on the number of boxes. They cannot put a stamp for one hundred cigars on boxes of twenty-fives, as it reads plainly there are 100 cigars in this box, or 50 or 25 cigars in this box, as the case may be.

Q. You are speaking of the manufacture of cigars?—A. That is the way we control our labor.

Q. In the retail cigar-stores is there anything to prevent the filling of these same boxes with Chinese cigars?—A. We can only say this, that in the first place it is unlawful. Our internal-revenue laws do not permit it. In the second place, there is nothing made by it, because every retail-stand desires to sell a good article and they make their own retail-goods, and if they buy, they buy them all from one shop. They do not buy trash to retail, because they would only ruin their own trade.

Q. Do I understand you that cigars are made in Havana by Chinese?—A. A great many.

Q. What proportion of them?—A. I cannot say, but according to what I can get from men who have worked there for years, Chinamen who have come from there, about one-half. I do not know that there are so many made there now as formerly, since they passed this law about cutting off the queues.

Q. Have you known of any instance of a Chinaman being injured or interfered with by his countrymen because he did not obey the company to which he belonged?—A. Do you mean from my observation?

Q. Yes.—A. No; I have seen them fight, and one thing and another.

ALBERT M. WINN sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. General, how long have you resided in the State of California?—Answer. Nearly twenty-eight years, I guess it is. I came here in the early part of 1849.

Q. What relation do you occupy toward the laboring interest of the State? What official positions, if any, do you occupy in that direction?—A. I am president of the Mechanics' State Council. That applies particularly to this State.

Q. Are you acquainted with the labor question of the United States generally, and of this State?—A. I suppose I am pretty well acquainted with it; perhaps as well as any one person could be.

Q. The committee have proposed certain interrogatories here as to the character and effect of Chinese immigration to this State. Will you please state to the committee, as you like, your views upon the matter and the facts within your knowledge?—A. If the committee will allow me I should like to read a communication to them, which I prepared for the purpose of having it filed:

Chinese immigration and cheap labor presents to our consideration a complicated question of political economy. It has two sides, each possessing the elements of discussion for every class of people. Most of the rich want cheap labor to carry on their shops and farms to the best advantage for an increase of profits; the poor cannot afford to compete with labor so far below the American standard of industry. This creates a conflict of opinion between the rich and the poor.

The question is no longer treated from an individual standpoint; it is national in its character; the nation's Representatives have treated it in that way, and I have seen the necessity of furnishing the committee with all the information we can obtain. The question has been in a state of agitation for twenty-five years. Those who then discussed its merits are getting old, while a new generation has been born and grown to manhood. For the benefit of those who might come after us I have had bound in pamphlet-form some important papers issued during the last quarter of a century and given them to parties having the subject under consideration. I have one copy left, which I propose to deposit with your committee. It contains valuable information and arguments of able men.

The report of Hon. Philip A. Roach, in 1852, will be read with deep interest. The letter of Henry George will be found to embrace an exhaustive discussion of the question. It is decidedly one of the ablest papers ever written on that subject. There are three or four of my speeches in it also. The argument does not exhibit any great degree of wisdom, but serves to show the time and circumstances of the agitation in California.

Comparisons are often made as between the Chinese and other foreigners without taking into consideration that Chinese can never assimilate with our people, and will always be Chinamen; while from every other country the people delight in becoming American citizens, and their children are native Americans as much so as those who descend from the revolutionary fathers. The free schools form their mind, while our contact with them in everyday life establishes their republican principles.

China can send her millions of men to this country who may become a Trojan horse in time of war with any power opposed to a republican form of government. I do not believe in underrating the skill and power of an enemy. With a few brave, energetic white men they would be a formidable army, when their prejudices are ripened into revenge. The cornered coward often exhibits astonishing courage; and it might be so with them.

A government formed by and for the people is a failure unless it can arrange commerce so as to benefit its citizens and keep them employed. We are told that a high tariff is as much for the protection of the mechanic and farmer as for revenue; yet we bring the same

labor here to compete with those we claim to protect. Such inconsistency is too plain to need argument.

I see it stated that our mechanic associations prevent boys from learning trades. I cannot see exactly what figure this will cut in the Chinese investigation; but as the testimony has gone before the committee, I herewith present you the constitution and by-laws of the Mechanics' State Council, showing the trades that have sent delegates.

In the first-named pamphlet you will also find a subsequent list of twenty associations. Not one of them have ever had such a regulation known to me, and I have been the president of that body eight years out of nine.

I am told that the molders' union had some regulation as to the number of apprentices in proportion to the journeymen employed in a shop, which broke up the union some years ago. Since then I have only heard of such a regulation as stated by men who know nothing about it. The fact is, a master-workman cannot afford to teach apprentices while Chinamen can be had at prices less than the cost of feeding and clothing a boy.

It is my firm belief, from information and personal observation, that our boys are no worse than those of other cities; but they are made hoodlums for want of employment. They have no encouragement to be better. They grow to manhood hearing themselves called hoodlums, till at last they think they are past recovery.

By Mr. KING:

Q. What is the effect of Chinese labor upon our white working classes?—A. The effect is to throw the white working classes out of employment.

Q. Has it any social effect, looking at it from a social point of view?—A. I know little about the social effect of the Chinamen.

Q. Does it tend to degrade labor?—A. I suppose it does. It evidently has that effect. If a man is working alongside of one who is entirely beneath him, he certainly feels degraded in having to work with him.

Q. Is there a sufficiency of white labor in California to supply the demand?—A. I cannot answer that question fully, though I think we have plenty of labor here; at any rate, we could have it very soon.

Q. If the Chinese were not here would white labor flock to this coast in your opinion?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you know whether the presence of Chinese here prevents the immigration of the white laboring classes?—A. Yes, sir; it does.

Q. Do you know it from personal observation?—A. I know it from facts stated to me by men who are interested in the labor organizations in the Eastern States. When they write to me here to know what chance there is for employment, I write to them to stay away if they can get any employment; that the Chinese have filled all the places here that they would be likely to get; and then they answer that they will not come.

Q. Is that frequent?—A. That is very common. I state this to them all the time whenever I write. When a man of family comes here he can only get Chinese wages, and he cannot support his family. A Chinaman has no family to support, and the Chinese can live upon a very small amount per day. Therefore the white laboring men had better stay where they are.

Q. What is the difference between the price of Chinese labor on this coast and the price of white labor East?—A. I do not know that I am able to answer that question particularly. I do not recollect what the price is, although I have a list, and I could, by having time to inquire into it, ascertain that fact. But certainly Chinese labor here is not much more than half what the labor is there; that is, the same kind of labor. I refer to the wages of those Chinamen who come here green. Of course, those who have been here four or five years, and learned their trades like white men, demand the same price.

Q. There is no difference, then, in price, I understand you, between skilled Chinese labor and skilled labor in the East, or very little?—A. I do not know that that is the case, and I could not say.

Q. Do you consider that the Chinese are a benefit to the people in the way of building up manufacturing and other industries on this coast?—A. I do not believe that they are a benefit to the country at all.

Q. I mean even in that particular.—A. I do not think they are a benefit in any shape. I think they are injurious to the country. They benefit a few wealthy men—men of large farms and large factories—but they injure the poor man who must necessarily support the Government. That is my view of the matter.

Q. Do they tend, in your opinion, to benefit the consumer?—A. No, sir.

Q. They do not reduce the prices, then, you think, of the articles consumed; that is, grain cultivated by Chinese, and clothes made by Chinese cheap labor, are about as dear as those manufactured by white labor to the consumer, after passing through the middle hands?—A. I do not know about that. The grain, of course, that the Chinese raise, and the grain which is raised by the white men, must both sell for the same price. The market governs the price of grain and the market governs the price of vegetables. The Chinaman gets as much for his vegetables as the white man, and the Chinaman does the work, and the white man is out of employment and not able to buy the vegetables for want of money to do it with.

Q. What do you consider the condition of the working-classes of this coast, those who are employed generally?—A. I think their condition is as good as others in any place; that is, those who are employed.

Q. Take the Chinese who are employed; what is their condition here as compared to the white working-classes here or in other places?—A. I do not know that I exactly understand the question.

Q. How do they live; do they live like white men?—A. O, no; of course not. It is very plain, it has been stated over and over again, that they can live on ten cents a day. I have no doubt such is the case; and they do not want more than two feet by six to lay down in. A hundred of them will occupy the room of a family of five or six. There is no comparison as to the living of the Chinese and that of the white men. A white man could not possibly live as they do. That would be out of the question.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. We have statistics presented here which show that there are about 27,000 Chinese skilled artisans, which embrace domestic servants and all others employed in the city of San Francisco. If the Chinese had never come here, is it your opinion that that amount of labor would have been supplied from other and from what sources?—A. Certainly. Of course the same places they fill would have been filled by white boys and girls and men, because from all the Eastern States they think they could do so much better here, the climate is so much better.

Q. What, in your opinion, would have been the moral effect of having all our industries filled with white men, women, and children, as compared with the employment of adult Chinese; would it have been better for the State or worse for it?—A. The State is the people. It would have been a great deal better for the people, of course, if none of the Chinese had ever come here. Of that there is no question.

Q. You have admitted in your testimony that some wealthy people make money by using Chinese labor?—A. As a matter of course.

Q. It makes so many people poorer and some richer?—A. Of course. The man who has ten, fifteen, or twenty thousand dollars to put into a

manufacturing establishment, if he can get Chinamen at half price, of course makes a greater profit than if he employed white labor.

Q. And thus he absorbs the wealth that ought to be distributed to the laborers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What, in your judgment, is intelligent, popular opinion on this subject? I mean, what is the opinion of the disinterested, thoughtful people of the State upon the propriety of limiting Chinese immigration?—A. That just brings up the question that I intended to introduce here. I was a leading person in getting up the petition that was sent to Senator Sargent in Washington, and there were twenty six thousand signatures in the two books. I had them obtained and sent on there. When we started, the men had to get subscribers to that petition.

Q. What was the substance of the petition?—A. The substance was to request the abrogation of the treaty with China with a view to prevent the immigration of Chinese. Our object was to ascertain the opinion of the people who were supposed to be interested in Chinese immigration. We had always been charged with going around among the poorer classes, among the Irish, Germans, and laboring men, and getting their names for the purpose of swelling the number. Hence we took the precaution, knowing that it would be examined carefully in Washington, to direct the carriers of the petition to go to the leading men of the city. For instance, we sent one man the whole length of Kearny street, and we said to him, "When you come to a man and he refuses to sign, mark that one, and so go all the way through." We said to the man going in Montgomery street the same; and to the man going in Sansom street the same; and so with all the leading streets, with a view to ascertain the percentage of those who refused. The percentage was published at that time. In the examination we found that on Kearny street about 90 per cent. signed; 90 per cent. of those to whom the petition was presented. On Montgomery street it was about 93 or 94; 95 per cent., perhaps, I am not certain, but the paper shows just what it is. We had it published at the time. On Sansom street the percentage was not so great; about 80 per cent. On Davis street, I think it was about 80 or 85 per cent; I am not certain. But the percentage of those who signed was all above eighty, and the petition was signed by the leading principal business men of the city. It was not sent away up here in the southern part of the city where the laborers all congregate.

Q. State in this connection what relation these streets bear to San Francisco.—A. These are the business streets of the city.

Q. The commercial center?—A. The commercial center. Montgomery, California, Sansom, Battery, Front, and Davis are the commercial streets of the city.

Q. Financial and commercial?—A. Financial and commercial.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Streets with large wholesale and retail establishments?—A. With large wholesale and retail establishments, including the banks and insurance offices, and everything of that kind. The mercantile and commercial business generally of the city is done in those streets. Of course, there are a few streets south of here, Third, for instance, and Fourth, Second, and Fifth. Those streets we had taken down in that same way, and we found very few persons, not more than one perhaps out of every hundred, who refused to sign in that direction after we passed south of Market street. But our object was to get the expression of opinion from those in the commercial part of the city, the leading principal business part of the city, where the rich men live, and we obtained it in that way.

Any person who knows the people here will find by an examination of the petition that that is the case.

Q. It has been stated that the opposition to Chinese immigration is confined to the low and dissolute classes, principally Irish?—A. That is not so. I will state another fact in connection with this matter, that in the payment of the money for the printing done, and to send men around with the petitions, the money was nearly all paid by men of business. I think the laboring-men paid about $25 out of some $300. The whole of it nearly was paid by business-men, men living here in the commercial part of the city. Some paid $5, some as high as $10.

Q. How long ago was that?—A. It was the last Congress, 1874–'75.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Two years have elapsed since then. Has that popular, intelligent opinion increased or has it diminished?—A. It was said at that time the republicans were strongly in favor of the Chinese, but my experience since that time is that the republicans are generally opposed to the introduction of Chinese.

Q. What is your party relation?—A. I am a democrat.

By Mr. KING:

Q. This is not a party question on this coast?—A. Not at all; on the contrary, this opposition is so general among the partisans that you can scarcely tell the difference.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How does the religious element of the community, as a rule, regard Chinese immigration? Do they favor or disfavor it? I speak of the members of the Christian church.—A. I confess that I know very little about them. I do not attend church, and the result is that I know very little about them, but I believe that the ministers generally are in favor of bringing the Chinese here. That is my impression, so far as I can find out. I have heard one or two, perhaps three, of them say that when they came here it was God's providence in sending them here.

Q. What is your opinion as to the result of christianizing them? Have they succeeded in christianizing as many Chinese as the Chinese have succeeded in heathenizing the white population?—A. I do not know anything about it. I do not think there are any Chinese christianized at all. The information I get is that Chinese attend Sunday-schools, go to church, and learn the English language, and get the advantage of it in trade.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you mean that there is a general attendance of the Chinese on churches and Sunday-schools, or that only some go?—A. Some go; very few compared to the whole number visit churches and Sunday-schools. They have their own church, and they go there.

Q. Their own place of worship?—A. Their own place of worship, Joss house, or whatever you call it.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 27, 1876.

ERNEST C. STOCK sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am police-reporter for the Morning Call, and have been so for ten years.

Q. Do you also act as interpreter?—A. I am also interpreter for the courts.

Q. State what facts you know about the Chinese as to their treatment of the sick, and as to their cleanliness. Be as concise as possible.—A. In my capacity as reporter, cases of this character have often come under my observation. The first case I will cite is that of a Chinaman, or rather two Chinamen that my attention was called to some years ago, on the floor of the hospital on Broadway—a Chinese hospital. I went in there and found almost naked the bodies of two Chinamen, who probably died of consumption or some disease which showed a wasting away. They were lying on mats something like on this floor, and had no covering over them. At the head of the one was a little bowl of rice and a pot of tea. After the time of the death, the rats had eaten out their eyes, had eaten away the tips of their fingers and tips of their toes, and one of them had a circular piece eaten away on the chest, around the region of the heart, probably the size of a dollar, or larger. The coroner's attention was called to the fact, and the bodies were removed. Another case is one which I saw over the store of Tuck-Wo & Co., on the corner of Jackson street and Washington alley. On the roof of the building there had been erected a platform, and over that a number of small stringers, upon which the Chinese suspended sausages for the purpose of drying them in the sun. On one day in winter the roof leaked, and a man was sent on the roof to repair it. When they removed this platform, they discovered under there the decayed remains of a Chinese female that was wasted away to a skeleton, there being nothing left but a little mass of flesh around the pelvis-bone and some tresses of hair. On another occasion officers called my attention to a case in Cooper alley, what are known as the Chinese rag-pickers' quarters. We went to the establishment and found four or five men and one woman in the room eating supper. One of the officers told them to get up, and then he hauled up the flooring of the room, some four or five planks, and he got a shovel and dug up earth for two or three inches, and when he did so he found the decayed remains of a female who had been underground for two or three weeks, I should judge, from the advanced stage of decomposition.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long ago was that?—A. All this is within the last five years. I did not take the dates, because I was requested only last evening to come here, and I had not time to look over the files. I made mention of all these cases at the time. There is another instance, where a sick woman was found on the corner of Cooper alley and Jackson street. She had been turned out, and was left on the sidewalk. She was picked up lying on a piece of matting, and was carried into the house. When I saw her, she was covered with syphilitic sores, and so putrefied that every time she turned over from one side to the other the sores would drop off of her. Then there is another case, where a Chinaman had been brought down from some place up the country, having been injured. He had one of his thighs fractured just above the knee. He was taken to a hospital on Commercial street, and when I saw him his leg had become putrefied. The thigh-bone, from the line of the fracture, for a distance of four or five inches above it, was protruding. The gangrene had set in. White physicians were called up there to attend to him, but the Chinese refused to allow the white physicians to do anything with him, saying they did not believe in their treatment. He was lying on a mat on the floor with nothing at all beside him except a cup of tea. When I went in there, the first thing he asked for was a li le money. He gave me

to understand that he wanted something to eat. I gave him some. Then there are numerous instances I know of, where Chinese have been left outside of houses to die. In one instance, a woman was found and carried to the city prison, and within three or four minutes after she was received, she died. Several dead bodies have been found on the streets in that same way, having been placed there. Then there is another case where a woman had been shot through the head. This is a recent case. She was taken down to the city receiving-hospital, and received such medical treatment as our physicians considered just and proper for her. The Chinese refused to allow that treatment to go on, and took her away, and tore off the bandages which had been put on her head. They took her to her own house in one of the Chinese alleys, and plastered her up with some Chinese medicine.

Q. What became of her? Did she die?—A. I do not know whether she died or not. I do not recollect now. I would like to speak of the uncleanliness of the Chinese quarters. I have on several occasions taken parties around through Chinatown to show them the sights. On one occasion I took Mr. Hepworth Dixon, the lecturer and traveler. When we went around I showed him, as I thought, some of the filthiest places he had ever seen. He said he thought they were. Finally, I took him into Cooper alley. There I showed him a place, a second basement, a little room about eight feet square and about six feet high with two men sleeping in there. The gentleman went down ahead of me. He said, "Is it possible anybody lives here?" I told him, "Yes;" and I went in and pulled up the curtain in front of the bunk and showed him the two men asleep. When we placed our feet on the floor the boards sunk down and slime oozed up through the cracks. He remarked at the time that he had been in the Seven Dials of London, the slums of the eastern cities, the sink-holes of Calcutta, the Five Points of New York, and other places of that character, and in all his travels he had never seen anything so filthy as that place. There was an old Chinaman here, who was nicknamed Brandy. He was employed by the Chinese for the purpose of conveying the dead out of the houses to some place from which the undertakers could carry them away. On one occasion he had a Chinaman to carry away who had become so stiff, rigor mortis had set in to such degree, that he could not bend him in any way at all, and he could not get him out of the little room in which he was. The passages were so narrow and intricate that he could not carry him out, and the Chinaman said, "All right; me fix him." He took up a portion of the floor of the room in which he was and dropped the body to the next floor below. That is one of the ways in carrying out the dead. He was in the habit of taking them out and finding a proper place to lay them so that the undertaker could take the body away. A recent case occurred here during the fumigation of Chinatown in Bull Run alley. They have a place known as a Chinese hospital, a miserable, dirty little room about six by eight, and probably seven or eight feet high. At the time I went in there I found that there was in the room one bunk and two or three mats on the floor. In one corner of the room on one mat there was a Chinaman apparently very sick, and in the middle of the room was another one who had evidently fallen off his bunk. He was dead and almost stark naked, with nothing on but a little undershirt. Within a few feet of where his body lay was a Chinaman cooking his dinner and eating it. That is about all I know on that subject.

Q. How long have you lived in San Francisco?—A. Twenty-six years.

Q. You have been a reporter on the Call for ten years?—A. Yes, sir; going on eleven years.

Q. You speak of being an interpreter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you interpret the Chinese language?—A. No; I interpret French and German.

Q. Are there instances in this city, or have there been, where the bodies of white people have been found dead?—A. I have never known it to exist where it was under the supervision of anybody. I have known of cases where parties have died in their own room where the room was locked up.

Q. Are there instances where white people have been found dead in squalid or miserable apartments?—A. I have never known of but one, and I would be very likely to know, because all coroners' inquests come in my line.

Q. Have you read of white persons being found dead in the streets, or in obscure places about the city from time to time?—A. I have read of cases where people have been found dead on the street, and I know of cases where people have dropped dead of heart disease, or something of that kind.

Q. Where they have been found in a state of decay?—A. I have known of but one case.

Q. I will ask you if such things are not reported in the newspapers of all cities from time to time, so that it is nothing extraordinary?—A. I have known of but one instance where it happened under the supervision of anybody.

Q. Do you not read in the papers from time to time of the coroner being called upon to hold an inquest over bodies of persons found dead where the death was unexplained?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Is it not a common thing?—A. It is a common thing.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is this exposure of persons who have died and were put out by people much more common in Chinatown?—A. Yes, sir; parties are turned out to die in Chinatown. Such things as that I have never known white people to do. I have never known white people in this city to take one of their own kind and put him out on the sidewalk because he was dying.

Q. The cases you have referred to, which were reported in the papers as cases of death by diseases of the heart or accident, were cases where there was no heartlessness on the part of any body?—A. They were cases of that kind. The case I referred to, the case of squalidness, the man had been missed for twenty days. He was a man without friends, who kept to himself all the time—an old hermit. They burst open his door and found him lying on the floor of his room.

Q. Would those persons who burst open his door, if they had known his condition, have left him in that condition?—A. Certainly not. The moment they discovered his death the coroner was notified to take him away.

Q. The humanity that prompts the white race to look after persons that way, even if the destitution is concealed, is not, as I understand you, characteristic of the Chinese?—A. No, sir; my personal observation of the Chinese has been, if a man dies, he dies, and they do not care what becomes of him, unless it is some of the higher class of the Chinese, where he has lots of friends.

Q. Then these circumstances which you are relating are unlike those which occur among Americans, or any other class of foreigners?—A. They are very unlike.

Q. And your information does not justify you to say that they are

not different?—A. There is nothing like the heartlessness of this class of people.

Q. Have you given all the instances, or only specimens?—A. Only specimens. I could not begin to cite them all. These facts were reported by me to the Call at the time of their occurrence.

Q. With many others from time to time?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. KING:

Q. I do not know whether this is within your knowledge or not, but do you know that a law was passed by our legislature prohibiting the exposure of dead bodies, and that this was forced upon them by the action of the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; I would state here now one case which has just occurred to me, that, during the time Mr. W. D. Sawyer was police judge, two Chinamen were detected bringing a dying Chinese woman from a house in Chinatown, and they left her on the steps of the city-hall, on the Merchant-street entrance. The Chinamen were arrested for that, brought into court, and convicted of assault and battery, and each sent to the county jail for a period of seventy-five days.

Q. It was not a crime before to expose a dead body?—A. It was after that that this State law you speak of was passed.

Q. Do you also recollect an instance where the coroner was summoned to hold an inquest on the body of a Chinese woman and, on arriving there he found her still living, and they wanted him to kill her?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Relate that circumstance.—A. There was a case of that kind, where the coroner was invited to hold an inquest on the body of a Chinese woman. The coroner arrived there and found the woman still living. The coroner then started to go away, and the Chinaman said, as you said here, "Hold inquest now, she die quick." He wanted the coroner to hold the inquest right then and there. This calls to mind a case that occurred a few days ago in the office of Massey & Yung. A Chinaman came there one evening and asked for a coffin for his child. The man in charge of the institution took the coffin to the house, and found the child alive. He asked him why he wanted to send for a coffin to have the child coffined, and the Chinaman gave him to understand that he should put him in the coffin now, because he would die in a day or two, and might as well be in the coffin already when he died. The child did not die until about sixteen hours afterward.

There is another point that slipped my memory in regard to their uncleanliness. It is a practice among a certain class of Chinese every morning and evening to go into the court yard around their houses, or in the court yard adjoining their houses, and build a fire of paper in little tin boxes, say two or three inches square, and they take off their underclothes and turn them inside out, and then pass them over the flames for the purpose of killing the vermin.

Q. That might be considered cleanly?—A. It shows they are not simply cleanly; they burn them just as a housewife would singe a chicken.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you ever known that practice carried on by white people?—A. No, sir.

Q. You seem to have a particular scope in that way; your investigation is wholly addressed to the Chinese?—A. I only mention such facts as come under my observation.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about the Chinese being put out of the house to die when they were sick.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know that? Is that mere inference, or how do you know it?—A. It is not mere inference.

Q. Do you infer that simply because they are found on the street?—A. I cited this one case where the woman was at the point of death and she was seen carried out. The Chinamen carried her out, and laid her on the sidewalk on the south side of Washington street, near Dupont. They laid her there, and the officers found her and carried her into the city prison, and very soon she died. Other cases are found very similar in their character, and the natural inference is that they were carried out the same way.

Q. Is that within your knowledge?—A. This is within my knowledge.

Q. Are any other cases within your knowledge? Our object is to get at facts aside from prejudice.—A. I have no prejudice against them at all.

Q. Does the supposition that they are carried out to die by their friends arise, as a general thing, because they are found unattended?—A. Certainly.

Q. If you found white people on the streets dying, would you draw the same inference?—A. I have never known white people to be found under similar circumstances.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If you did, would you draw the inference the same way?—A. I might if I found so many cases; but there is one peculiarity about it from which the natural inference comes, that in almost every instance the Chinese found on the streets were found in exactly the same position; found in a sitting posture up against the side of a house. Of course we do not see all these things, but the inference to be drawn from all the facts, surroundings, and everything of that kind leaves no other conclusion but that.

Q. You mean to say that you do not see in every case the bringing out and putting of them up against the houses?—A. I do not see it.

Q. But you know of one instance in which it was done in that way?—A. I know of one instance, and another comes to my mind since my attention has been called to it, and in all cases the parties were found in the same position.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I will ask you if the Chinese quarter is not visited more and observed more than any other quarter of the city by white people?—A. By foreigners to the city, people coming here, yes, sir.

Q. Is there any curiosity that takes people there?—A. O, yes; almost every stranger who comes here wants to see it.

Q. And what is bad there is seen oftener than any other part of the city?—A. I do not know that; strangers are taken all around.

Q. Whatever is bad is more apt to be seen in Chinatown than any other part of the city?—A. It is.

Q. I will ask you whether the roughs of the city are in the habit of visiting Chinatown?—A. At times.

Q. Do they go there for the purpose of having sprees and scrapes?—A. O, sometimes hoodlums pass through Chinatown and abuse Chinese.

Q. Is it a common resort for hoodlums at night?—A. No; it is not a common resort in that sense. They do not go there nightly.

Q. I do not mean every night, but I speak of it as a frequent occurrence.—A. It is not very frequent.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Is it not very unfrequent that hoodlums resort to the Chinese quarters?—A. I should think it was. It is the exception rather than the rule.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The hoodlum element attacks the Chinese outside, generally?—A. Hoodlums would rather catch a Chinaman where he is all alone, and where there are no officers around.

Q. Do you not know, a few weeks ago, of a hotel-keeper in Jackson street putting a small-pox patient on the sidewalk, in a dying state from that disease? Do you not know it that you saw it in the papers, and it was reported to the health-officers?—A. I do not recollect any such case.

Q. Your attention has been more directed, then, to such cases in Chinatown?—A. Not particularly in Chinatown. I tell you that all cases coming under the coroner's jurisdiction come under my jurisdiction.

Q. Have you visited other portions of the city—the Barbary Coast, and Tar Flat—and looked into the squalor there?—A. I have visited the Barbary Coast, Tar Flat, Ragtown, Appletown, and all those places.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You relate a case about a Chinaman and his child, whom he wanted coffined; do you think they have any love for children?—A. I do not know much about their love for children.

Q. That would indicate a want of love for children?—A. I should think it would.

Q. Was it his own child?—A. It was; at least he claimed the paternity.

Q. And you think his desire to bury it arose from a dislike to the child?—A. More a desire to get rid of it, because the child was sick, I think.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You seem to be pretty familiar with this portion of the city. Do you know whether the authorities take any pains to instruct these people as to their duties in reference to their sick and otherwise? Do they take any pains to let them know what they ought to do, and what the city is under obligations to do?—A. They have been instructed as to sanitary measures.

Q. In what particular?—A. As, for instance, to report cases of small-pox, and to report cases to the coroner.

Q. Do you know whether they have been notified that it is a duty on the part of the authorities to take care of all these cases of paupers and sick people who are not taken care of by their friends?—A. It is generally understood among the Chinese that when there are any sick people the authorities will take care of them.

Q. How do they get that understanding—who imparts that knowledge to them?—A. They instruct themselves upon the laws.

Q. Then the authorities do not take much pains to go around, as you have, and ferret out these cases, and instruct these people what we, the superior race, would do for them?—A. I do not think the authorities go out of their way for that purpose. They publish the laws and let the people find out for themselves what they have got to do.

WILLIAM G. BUCHANAN sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Shoemaker.

Q. How long have you been engaged in shoemaking?—A. Twenty years.

Q. Where are you now at work?—A. I am working in this city, employed by Einstein Brothers.

Q. Has Mr. Einstein any Chinese in his employ at the present time?—A. He has none.

Q. How many Chinese shoemakers are there in this city?—A. Between 2,000 and 2,500, as near as I can tell.

Q. How many whites are there in the trade?—A. In the neighborhood of about 1,000.

Q. What proportion of those are women?—A. I should say they are about one-third women and boys.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. One-third of the thousand whites?—A. Yes, sir; one-third of them are women and boys.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Did these shoe-manufacturers start with Chinese or white labor?—A. They started originally in this city with white labor.

Q. What were the wages of a shoemaker five years ago; that is, how much could he earn by the week, working by the piece, on the average?—A. Five years ago they used to call the average wages about $4 a day.

Q. That would be $24 a week?—A. $24 a week.

Q. How much is it now?—A. It is now about $16.50 to $18. Eighteen dollars would be a high average to-day for shoemakers in this city per week.

Q. Is there any difficulty in procuring a sufficient number of white shoemakers for the purpose of the manufacturing trade?—A. I do not find any difficulty in getting all that I require.

Q. You have not turned away some and refused to give them work?—A. Every day.

Q. Do you have applications every day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the comparative prices of Chinese labor and white labor in the Eastern States?—A. The cost of making shoes, the labor part, with Chinese is near about the same here as it is in the Eastern States by whites.

Q. I understand you, then, that there is very little difference between the cost of making shoes by Chinese labor here and the cost of making them by white labor in the East?—A. Very little. If there is any difference, it is in favor of the whites at the East.

Q. Mr. Einstein at one time, I believe, employed Chinese, did he not?—A. They had at one time as high as 300 Chinese in their employ.

Q. Take the cost of making shoes at Einstein's by the Chinese, how does it compare with the cost of making shoes now with white labor?—A. The shoe, with white labor, is being made to-day near about the same as it was with Chinese formerly, in Einstein's shop.

Q. When goods were manufactured by Chinese labor in Einstein's, when all the trade was monopolized by Chinese labor, was the cost to the public of shoes any less than goods manufactured by white labor of the same quality?—A. The shoes manufactured by white laborers go

into the market at the same price as they did before when they were made by Chinese. It is the same priced shoe that goes into the market.

Q. Do you know whether or not there is a white man's co-operative shoemaker's establishment?—A. There is.

Q. Do you know what they receive on the investment that is paid; what the interest is?—A. It is paying a good deal more than banking rates.

Q. Do you know how much more? Do you know whether it paid for the last year 24 per cent.?—A. It has.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is the white co-operative shoe-factory?—A. Yes, sir; in this city.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do you know how this Chinese competition has affected immigration to this State among your tradespeople?—A. I should say it has kept back immigration considerably.

Q. Do you know of any instance where it has?—A. I certainly do, from letters I have every day from people in the East wanting to come here if I could offer them any inducements; but I cannot do it while Chinese are so much in the business as they are.

Q. Do you know of any cases where shoemakers have been obliged to leave here because they could not find employment, owing to the Chinese?—A. I know of any amount of cases where they had to leave the shops, and their places were filled with Chinamen.

Q. Do you know of any who left the State?—A. I could not track them up after they were lost to us and the Chinamen dropped into their places.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you a manufacturer? Do you carry on the business?—A. I am superintendent of a factory.

Q. What establishment are you in?—A. Einstein Brothers.

Q. Is that an extensive concern?—A. It is one of the largest in the city.

Q. What do they employ generally?—A. All white labor.

Q. Did they formerly employ Chinese labor?—A. They did.

Q. Is that the concern with which Mr. Altmayer was connected?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What led to the change from Chinese labor?—A. They thought that they could make shoes just about as cheap with whites as with Chinamen and thought they would try it. They started it gradually, and accordingly as it went along they found they were successful, and they got rid of them all.

Q. They can make shoes as cheaply with white labor as with Chinese?—A. They are making shoes as cheaply with white labor as they were making them with Chinese labor.

Q. And they have now adopted white labor entirely?—A. Entirely.

Q. Do you believe that what they do can be done by others just as well?—A. It can.

Q. That shoes can be made as cheaply here by white labor as by Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is that owing to—the fact that the whites do more labor in the same length of time, make more shoes?—A. They do more labor. Where a Chinaman would do say eighteen pair a day the white man will do sixty pair.

Q. It is the difference between eighteen and sixty pair?—A. Not quite so much as that; but that is the way the shoe comes to be done cheaper by white labor.

Q. Perhaps it is important to know about what is the average difference in the amount of labor performed?—A. There is the difference between eighteen and forty-eight.

Q. The white man will make forty-eight pair while the Chinaman makes eighteen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What does the Chinaman get for making eighteen pair?—A. About $1.00.

Q. What would the white man get for making the forty-eight pair?—About $2.88.

Q. Then the white labor would be the cheapest, taking pair by pair?—A. No, it is about the same.

Q. But when you consider the consumption of fuel and rent and all that the white labor in the cheapest, is it not?—A. No; I cannot say that it is any cheaper. It is just as near about the same as we could figure it.

Q. Are there other reasons why the white labor is preferable aside from the mere question of their work?—A. There is not much more reason, only they are nicer shopmates to have about the shop.

Q. You get along with them better?—A. Yes, much better; they are much cleaner around the place.

Q. Do you think in this point of view that white labor is able to take care of itself here?—A. I do not think that it is hardly.

Q. Is there any danger of its being crowded out under these circumstances?—A. It is being crowded out.

Q. Why should it be crowded out when the white labor is just as cheap and is otherwise preferable; how is it crowded out?—A. The Chinese go to work on their own hook; they start factories for themslves. They will sell with less profits; they will work longer hours and do more for themselves than they will for other manufacturers. Where one firm can compete with another that firm cannot compete against a Chinese firm.

Q. Then it is because the Chinaman will sell for smaller profits than the white man, and be more industrious, working more hours?—A. I suppose that is one of the principal causes.

Q. Do you regard that as a valid objection to the Chinese, or to any other kind of labor?—A. I should say it was an objection.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Does not their threatening to manufacture for themselves have the effect of forcing manufacturers to employ them to prevent their establishing competing institutions?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You say that the wages have been reduced in the last four years considerably?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the cause of that, the apparent cause?—A. There was a surplus of help, in the first place; that helped to bring it down somewhat.

Q. What kind of help?—A. Both white and Chinese.

Q. Do the employers hold a threat over their white laborers, that they will employ Chinese if they do not accept the prices that they see proper to give them?—A. No; I do not know that they hold a threat over them. If they cannot get their work done for a certain price by white men, of course they have got Chinamen to fall back upon. They

do not need to make a threat; the thing is plain and open to everybody.

Q. It has that tendency?—A. It certainly has a tendency to work that way.

Q. Do white men like to work in the same shop, at the same bench, with Chinamen?—A. At present they will do it. There was a time here when you could not get a white man to go in with a Chinaman.

Q. Do white laborers and mechanics deem it degrading to associate with Chinese?—A. I do not know as they do much in the shop; they certainly do not associate with them much outside the shop; but if compelled to work near them they will do it.

Q. It is a kind of compulsion?—A. It is compulsion to get one to work on the same floor with him.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long have you worked in the shoemaking business in this State?—A. Eleven years.

Q. How many white shoemakers were there here eleven years ago?—A. I suppose about fifty on factory work. I do not suppose there were any more at that time. Manufacturing was in its infancy then.

Q. You say that there are now 1,000?—A. Yes.

Q. Where did you get our boots and shoes eleven years ago?—A. From Massachusetts.

Q. We had to send the money there for them, did we not?—A. I suppose we could not get them otherwise.

Q. You say this was started with white labor at $4 a day; was that eleven years ago?—A. Eleven years ago they were getting fully more than $4 a day.

Q. Five years ago?—A. Yes.

Q. Could we supply ourselves with boots and shoes at the same price to-day, and pay the shoemakers $4 to make them? Would they not necessarily be higher in this State?—A. They would.

Q. Are you foreman in the co-operative shop, or in Mr. Einstein's?—A. In Mr. Einstein's.

Q. You say the Co-operative Shoemakers' Association here pays 24 per cent.?—A. Twenty-four per cent. on the capital invested; yes, sir.

Q. Is that competition? Do you look upon it that Chinese labor will bring you in competition with such an investment as that? Where does the competition come in on anything that pays 24 per cent.?—A. Chinese labor is not so much in boots as shoes. This co-operative labor is altogether on boots.

Q. What does Einstein make?—A. Boots and shoes.

Q. Do you know what his capital pays?—A. I do not know anything about it.

Q. How long has he had white men?—A. Exclusively white?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Since last Saturday. He started in last May to weed out the Chinamen, and we got them down to the fine end of nothing last Saturday.

Q. They are gradually working them out in Einstein's factory?—A. They have worked them out.

Q. And others are probably doing the same?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. You do not fear Chinese labor, then; when the facts are in your knowledge that it will pay 24 per cent. to establish boot manufactories here, you do not fear Chinese labor? Have you a family?—A. I have.

Q. What is your opinion?—A. I certainly fear them.

Q. In what manner?—A. I cannot see where we are going to have

employment for our boys and girls if we go to work and fill our factories with Chinamen. If everybody did it, we could have no place for our boys to work.

Q. Are there many shoemakers idle, East, at present?—A. I could not say. I have not been East for some time.

Q. By your knowledge from reading the papers, can you speak as to the general depression of business there?—A. Business, I suppose, is dull East. There are supposed to be a good many out of employment there.

Q. In all branches?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know whether that is caused by any system of labor in competition with them there?—A. I guess not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the difference in the quantity of labor performed in the same time as being about the difference between eighteen pair and forty-eight pair. I will ask you what that difference arises from; does it arise from want of physical strength or from want of skill on the part of the Chinese?—A. Want of skill and quick movement. They are naturally slow.

Q. I will ask you if that same difference in the quantity of work prevails in other trades, as you understand it; does it extend to other trades?—A. I could not say outside of our own business.

Q. Is there any reason why it should not extend to other trades?—A. I cannot say how it would operate in other trades.

Q. Would there be any reason for its operating differently in other trades?—A. I should think not.

Q. That proportion is nearly three to one, is it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You speak about the profits of this co-operative company being 24 per cent. on their capital; what do you understand about the general profits of the boot and shoe business in this city by white establishments; is it so great, or nearly so great, as that?—A. No; I do not think it is.

Q. Is it 15 per cent.?—A. No; it is not.

Q. Is it 10 per cent.?—A. I could not say. I am not acquainted with the profits of those stores.

Q. I am asking your opinion about the general profit yielded by shops of that kind in this city?—A. I do not count that manufacturing here is a very good paying investment for capitalists.

Q. But I am asking you your opinion as to the general profits of boot and shoe stores; whether it ranges from 10 to 12 or 15 per cent., along there. Have you any impression?—A. I have no impression at all.

Q. Is the profit of 24 per cent. made by this co-operative company a very large profit?—A. It is a large profit.

By Mr. KING:

Q. I understood you to say that you thought all manufacturers were making profits above banking rates?—A. No; I only spoke of the co-operative company.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do the Chinese, after learning to make shoes, set up as manufacturers on their own account and sell their own product?—A. They do.

Q. How does that affect the profit of the white employers and sellers; what tendency does that have?—A. If a Chinaman can sell shoes for a less profit, of course the white importer or dealer cannot. They both cannot sell the same shoes at the same price.

Q. Is the tendency of this Chinese competition against employers to reduce the profits of the manufacturers?—A. It has that tendency.

Q. Has that gone on to any considerable extent, Chinamen making shoes and selling them on their own account?—A. There are three-fourths, I suppose, of the Chinamen making shoes here in this city selling their own shoes.

Q. That supplies the market to a considerable extent and excludes so far the white employers?—A. It does.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is Mr. Einstein making many shoes?—A. He is making a few.

Q. Have you a protective union or association among shoemakers to protect yourselves as mechanics?—A. No, sir.

Q. Does not this Chinese labor prevent trades-unions from establishing prices and rates which the white boss must pay them? Does it not prevent them from accomplishing that which is done in the East throughout?—A. I do not know that it does.

Q. Then, if they did not come in competition in that way the shoemakers could get together to-day and make their terms?—A. They could make their prices, but they would have to be moderate, I suppose.

Q. Then you could not really as a shoemakers' trades-union establish a rate to manufacture boots and shoes, and carry it out here at much of an advance from the present rates? Would the bosses submit to it, or would they employ Chinese? That is the point.—A. I do not suppose they would submit very gracefully to an advance of wages.

Q. Does not much of this feeling arise from that very cause among the mechanics, that the Chinese stand in the way of the labor-union dictating to bosses?—A. I do not think it does. The feeling arises more from men being out of work and going around looking for it and not being able to get it.

Q. How does it occur that shoemakers are out of work when the business is paying from 10 to 24 per cent.?—A. If a man does not want to make any more shoes than he can sell, he is not going to make them for the sake of giving men work.

Q. Then the co-operative union conclude to just keep the market at about where it will pay 24 per cent.?—A. I do not think that they control the market.

Q. Suppose they get two hundred more shoemakers to work and reduce it to 20 per cent; would not that be a pretty good investment from your theory?—A. Yes, sir; if they could, I suppose that would be a good investment.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do the bosses determine upon the amount of work that shall be done, or the workmen?—A. What do you mean by the amount of work?

Q. Colonel Bee said to you that the co-operative union determined the amount of work that should be done. Is the co-operative union the workmen or the bosses?—A. They are both workmen and bosses.

Q. Could the bosses do any more work, if the workmen do want to work, than they can sell?—A. It is the sale that regulates the work; not the number of workmen.

Q. The amount of production is determined by the amount that the Chinese do as well as the amount the white manufacturers do?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And if the market is overstocked there must be less employment for the white workmen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They have no means of compelling greater production, and consequently securing greater employment?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Has the market been overstocked in your knowledge since you have been connected with the manufacturing of boots and shoes?—A. Yes; I rather think it has.

Q. What percentage did it pay then to the co-operative union?—A. This co-operative union is a house doing business on its own hook. It is a small item in the manufacturing of this city. It cannot be taken as a criterion.

Q. There are openings for other co-operative unions, are there not, on the same basis?—A. I suppose so.

Q. They could make a large percentage in the same way?—A. I suppose so, if they went into it. There have been different establishments started, but never any of them were successful except this one.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there a trades-union among the shoemakers of the city?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are the customers of this co-operative union where white labor only is employed persons who, as a rule, are hostile to the employment of Chinese, therefore giving them rather an exclusive market?—A. Rather so. We prefer dealing with them on account of being co-operative, and not employing Chinese.

Q. If men would prefer to buy only work produced by white men, then there would be opportunity for more co-operative unions?—A. There would be.

Q. How is it about customers from the interior districts who buy shoes? Do they go where they can buy them the cheapest?—A. Certainly.

Q. Whether made by Chinese or not, with some exceptions?—A. It makes very little difference to them where they are made as long as it is a shoe.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You state that white shoemakers can make shoes and boots at the same price the Chinese get and make money by it. That I understand by your statement here as to the difference in the amount of work they do. You say they could compete with eastern people, and the price is about the same they get East. You stated that, in comparison with Chinese labor, you thought Chinese labor, was paid here about the same price that they paid in the East for making shoes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the difference in the cost of living East and here to a laboring man, a mechanic? Is it in favor of California or the East? Is it cheaper there or cheaper here?—A. I should judge that it is cheaper there.

Miss MAGGIE HAYES sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Assistant foreman at Einstein's shoe-factory.

Q. How many young girls are there employed there?—A. There are 23 at present.

Q. In what branch of the business?—A. In the uppers of shoes.

Q. What is that called—the fitting department?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the same manufactory were Chinamen formerly employed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All this work, I understand, is done by piecework?—A. Yes, sir; the Chinamen are paid by the day; they get a dollar a day. The girls make from a dollar and a half to two dollars a day.

Q. Working by the piece?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the manufacturers heretofore have employed Chinamen by the day while they employed girls on piecework?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the comparative value of the Chinese and the white labor—that is, which works more rapidly?—A. The girls work a great deal faster than Chinamen.

Q. In what proportion?—A. The girls may do four and a half dozen a day while the Chinamen will only do four.

Q. Do you know how many girls there are employed in the city?—A. No, sir; I do not. There are a great many at shoe-fitting. I do not know how many there are.

Q. Do you think there are in the neighborhood of 250?—A. About that, I should think.

Q. Has it been difficult heretofore for girls to obtain employment in the factories?—A. Yes, sir; it has. A great many have come for work and been sent home again.

Q. Is there any difficulty in obtaining girls to work now in these factories? If you put an advertisement in a paper for a number of girls would you have a large number answer that advertisement? Have you seen any such instances as that?—A. O, yes; they have advertised and a great many have come there for work; and when they do not advertise girls are all the time looking for work but cannot get work, but have to go home and go somewhere else.

Q. Where Chinamen are employed, do girls object to working alongside of Chinamen?—A. If we do we cannot help it. We have to work anyhow. We have to work for a living, and so we might as well not say anything.

Q. Do you know of any girls that have been driven out of employment by Chinese?—A. Yes; we have in the shop a great many Chinese who have been working there; and there have not been half as many girls.

Q. There are no Chinese there now?—A. No; none now.

Q. You do not know how soon there may be Chinese there?—A. No; it is only since Saturday that there have not been any.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you been employed in that establishment?—A. Four years.

Q. What are your wages?—A. Twelve dollars a week.

Q. What wages do the men get who are employed there by the week?—A. I do not know as to the men; I am only where the girls are.

Q. Do the men work faster than the girls?—A. They work on different work. The men do not do the same kind of work that the girls do.

Q. But on the same kind of work the girls will beat the Chinese four and a half dozen to four?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think the difference between their work is greater in other branches than in yours?—A. I do not know. There are a great many at ours. I do not know as to the others.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Buchanan's statement, that the white men

would make forty-eight pairs of shoes while the Chinamen would make eighteen?—A. I did not hear it.

Q. What would you think of the correctness of that statement?—A. I do not really know about that.

Q. Mr. King was asking you about working in the same room with the Chinese. Do you find that they are rude in any way to the girls?—A. No; they never say anything to the girls. They work all the time, but they never say anything to the girls.

Q. Do they behave badly, or are they offensive in their manners?—A. No; they never talk all day long; they sit and work all day long, and when it is time to go home, they go home.

Q. Do they talk to each other much?—A. They talk to each other once in a while; they work very steadily.

Q. At what time do they begin their work?—A. They begin their work at seven and we begin at half past eight.

Q. How long do they work?—A. From seven till a quarter to six.

Q. How long do the girls work?—A. The girls work from half past seven to half past five.

Q. The Chinamen work a little longer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they work longer in other parts of the establishment as compared with the white men?—A. Those who work by the week all work from seven till a quarter to six, but those who work by the piece can go home any time they like.

Q. The Chinamen work longer in your room. What is the reason; to make up for want of speed?—A. No, sir; because they work by the week.

Q. You work by the piece?—A. I work by the week. Those who work by the week all have to work from seven till a quarter to six.

Q. How do their wages compare; do the Chinamen get the same wages?—A. No, sir; they only get a dollar a day.

Q. And the girls get two dollars a day?—A. No, sir; some get six dollars, eight dollars, and so on.

Q. Do they generally get more than a dollar a day?—A. No, sir; I do not believe any girl works for a dollar a day by the week.

Q. What do they generally get?—A. From seven dollars to ten dollars, and so on.

Q. According to their skill?—A. According to what they are worth.

Q. The Chinamen get a dollar a day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the skill of the Chinamen; do they do good work?—A. Yes, sir; they do very good work, but they are very slow. Some, of course, do bad, the same as girls, and some good. A new hand does not do as good work as an old hand.

Q. Have you been in other establishments in the city?—A. I have worked at Wheeler's about six months last year.

Q. Do they employ Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; not on fitting but on bottoms, the same as gentlemen do.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is there not a good deal of work given out, that is, fitting, from these factories, to white women?—A. No, sir; all the fitting is now done inside. That was the case a couple of years ago, but not now.

Q. Do these Chinese dress cleanly who work in the room with you?—A. No, sir; some are very dirty; they spit all over the floor.

Q. Is their dress equal to the work they are engaged in?—A. No; not really that.

Q. How many girls were at work in Mr. Einstein's when he em-

ployed Chinese in your department?—A. Last year there were only fifteen girls, and a great many Chinese. I do not know how many Chinese there were then at fitting.

Q. Have you worked at any other place where there were Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. Do they not generally employ girls in these factories? Where they employ Chinese men exclusively, do not generally girls work there?—A. Yes, generally; there is a shoe-factory down on Market street—it used to be there—where they do not employ anything else but Chinese, at Wolf's.

Q. Then the establishment of these Chinese shoe-factories here in San Francisco for years past has had a tendency to give employment to girls?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you worked in shoe-shops, Miss Hayes?—A. About four years.

Q. You say that there are about two hundred and fifty girls employed now in the whole city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many were there five years ago?—A. There were a great more five years ago; there were hardly any Chinese five years ago.

Q. In this department of fitting?—A. Yes, sir; a girl could make good wages about five years ago to what she can now.

Q. You think, then, the girls could be substituted in this department for the Chinese? You could compete with them and make a living?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are satisfied with your wages?—I am satisfied with my wages, but I like to see other girls doing well.

CHARLES S. LANCASTER sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. How long have you been engaged in the shoe-business?—Answer. Nineteen years.

Q. In what States?—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri.

Q. How long have you been in this State?—A. About six months.

Q. Where did you last work?—A. Ogden, Utah.

Q. How long did you work in Ogden, Utah?—A. Just about one year.

Q. While you were there, did you observe the immigration of shoemakers; which way they were coming and which way they were going?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the result of your observation?—A. During the year that I was in Ogden I was six months of the time foreman of a firm. The other six months I was in business for myself. During that time we had not a single application for work coming from the West, and we had quite a number going east. Last winter, January, February, and March, there was half a dozen or more who applied to me personally for work coming from this city.

Q. Showing, then, that the emigration of shoemakers was going east rather than coming west?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you got any statement as to the comparative price of goods between five years ago and the present time?—A. I have a small list; my information is very imperfect, though. I have been here but a short time. I was appointed on a committee, and collected what facts I could.

Q. A committee of shoemakers?—A. Yes, sir. I have here the prices now ranging and five years ago in the same classes of work, in the ladies' department and men's work.

Q. Read the list of prices that were five years ago and the prices at

the present time.—A. The prices known as ladies' French kitt button boots, we are making them now for $9, for bottoming them, making the shoe, per dozen; and formerly it was $12. Women's kid bals. are now $8.50, and it was $10.50; gentlemen's Oxford ties, $8.50; it was $10.50. Neilson ties, $8.50; it was $10.50. Ladies' 3× cloth, fox-kid buttoned boot, $7.50; it was $9. 1× quality, $5.50; it was $9. 1× bals., $5.50; it was $8. Imitation sewed, $10; it was $18. Misses' French kid, 3×, $7.50; it was $9. Misses' Neilson ties, $7; it was $9 five years ago. Those are the prices that were paid and are now being paid to Buckingham and Hecht. Porter's shop-morocco, leg calf-boot, imitation stitch, $14; it was $28. French calf-top-sole plain, leg boot, $11; it was $23. Second quality calf, $7.10; it was about $15.

Q. These are the prices of making per dozen?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Compared with now and what former period?—A. Five years ago.

By Mr. KING:

Q. As to the market-price of the goods sold to the public, what is the difference in their prices between to-day and five years ago?—A. I am not able to state.

Q. Is there anything you desire to state in relation to your trade?—A. Nothing else, excepting in regard to the supply of mechanics here. There is no difficulty in getting all the help we want at the prices.

Q. Do you think that white labor can compete with Chinese labor at the present prices?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If the Chinese, however, should form combinations among themselves, it would have a tendency to drive you out of employment and force the manufacturers to employ them?—A. It would.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have they ever done that?—A. Not to my knowledge.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Have you heard of instances where they have threatened to form factories of their own?—A. They have factories here. I believe it is the general custom with them, when they are discharged, to club their means together and start in on a small scale for themselves, and by that means they can undersell the manufactories here. They can sell for less profit. In fact, if they can just make running expenses, their rents and manner of living are not so high and costly; and if they get paid for their employment by that means, they can undersell white labor in the wholesale trade.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What was the price of living here five years ago in comparison with to-day?—A. I am not able to state.

Q. What was the price of rents here five years ago in comparison with to-day?—A. I was not here then.

Q. Where do you get thi sinformation?—A. From the subcommittees of several shops.

Q. Have you any committee appointed by the shops from which statistics will be brought before this commission in reference to the cost of living now and five years ago?—A. No; we have not.

Q. You have no such committee?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I would ask whether the rate of wages for shoemakers and, in fact, for all kinds of mechanics has not suffered a reduction throughout the whole country within the last five years?—A. Yes, sir; it has.

Q. Has not this reduction in the price of labor in the different mechanical trades and common labor been at least 25 per cent. within the last three years, taking the whole country together?—A. I am not prepared to state in regard to other trades and industries, but I should think it would be somewhat near that; 20 per cent. at least in the boot and shoe business.

Q. Are you carrying on the business now?—A. No, sir; I am a journeyman at the present time.

Mrs. HENRY J. HUMPHREYS sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. Are you married or single?—Answer. Married, but not at present. I am a widow.

Q. Have you a family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Anything in general that I can get to do; it makes no difference—scrubbing, or washing, or anything. I sew for a living at present because I cannot get anything else very well, unless I go out and work.

Q. You cannot find anything else?—A. Washing, I suppose, I can find, but I cannot attend to it the whole time. I have my boy to attend to, and bring him up, and cannot very well go out and do work, so I am obliged to do almost anything I can get to do at home. If I could get good pay, I could afford to pay somebody else to take care of him.

Q. You are sewing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what kind of manufacture?—A. Ladies' underwear; it is the only thing I can get and take out to do, and do at home.

Q. How is that affected by Chinese labor?—A. More so than any other branch of business in San Francisco.

Q. Are the Chinese employed in manufacturing it?—A. Mostly all.

Q. What rates of wages are paid to Chinese for manufacturing?—A. We get probably a dollar and a half on the dozen, a little more than the Chinamen, but we have to pay rent and take care of our families.

Q. Is not your work better than Chinese work?—A. I think so, because they prefer white labor when they can get it at Chinamen's prices, but not at any more.

Q. Do you not know how many Chinese are occupied in that department?—A. I could not really tell. They have within the last six months started up little manufacturing places of their own; they do not sell them any cheaper than the white stores, but still the people imagine they can get it a little better or a little cheaper from them.

Q. Is there any difficulty in obtaining white women to do all this sewing?—A. O, no; just advertise and you will get them by thousands.

Q. Are there thousands out of employment?—A. I think there are. I went to one place on the corner of 18th, a large manufacturing place, up-stairs. I saw the bill. The man advertised for two hundred sewing-machine operatives. He said, we make no difference as to description of work; as long as it is machine-sewing we can do it, and do it at home. I had been out of work for some time, and I was glad to take almost anything so as to carry it home and do my work there along with the sewing, and I applied. When I called it was only about a quarter past 8 and the man said that he had already hired the two hundred, and had more than that to apply, but he did not have work for the whole.

Q. Did you go there at 8 o'clock of the same morning that the advertisement appeared?—A. It was only a quarter past 8 that morning, al-

lowing a quarter of an hour to get in. I think my branch of business is the worst imposed on business in San Francisco. People who have families are obliged to support them, or obliged to almost commit suicide, as I have heard a good many women say they would do if they did not get something to do in a short space of time. I know of people living now on a crust of bread. People do not know this without going in person, and women pay very high rent. They are willing to earn their living if they can get work. I heard the testimony of the lady in regard to shoe-fitting. I state, from my own information, that I think if they would take me to learn for three weeks I would go for nothing so as to get $12 a week. I have got a bundle of work here. It has taken me a month. I did the sleeves of twelve nightgowns. There are twenty-four sleeves. You have first to tuck those twenty-four sleeves on one side, sew them up together, and it will take the whole day, from 8 o'clock in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, providing you get your lunch, and the other three days to make the nightgowns. I got them done last night. I went to a little meeting that was held. I did not know really what it was.

Q. Was it to a meeting to procure witnesses, a ladies' meeting?—A. I do not know what it was. I was surprised to find myself there, and to get my name up. I did not know anything; still, I like to have ladies get work. It does not make any difference to me or other ladies whether Chinamen are here or not, as long as we can get enough to live with.

Q. How much did you get for these nightgowns?—A. $3. I have not got it yet, but will get it when I go down to the shop.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. For how many days' work?—A. Five days' work. I have the bundle here and can show it to you if you wish it. I thought perhaps my word was not enough.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is that an average of what you can make?—A. I worked all day until 10 o'clock at night every one of those days, but last night I left off about a quarter of seven to go to the meeting, and this morning I finished it.

Q. You work about 14 hours a day?—A. When I feel like it I do, but I generally make out a whole day—from 8 o'clock in the morning to 12 o'clock, and at 12 I get me a little lunch. Then I go right to work again. It does not make any difference whether I go to work at half past 12, I commence again as soon as I get lunch.

Q. You make the $3 in about five days?—A. Four days' hard working, but if I would only take the regular amount of working hours that are given I could not accomplish it in that time.

Q. Pardon me for the inquiry, but what rent do you pay for your room?—A. I do not pay for the room. If I had to pay for the room I am afraid I would not have any room.

By Mr. KING:

Q. How much would you pay for it?—A. If I kept the whole house? I have four rooms. I let out two.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You keep the house and rent rooms?—A. Do you suppose I could make my living on $3 a week or $4 a week and pay for my rooms? Certainly not. I should have to make somebody else pay for my room pretty soon.

FRITZ STEIN sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I am of the staff of the California Democrat, reportorial.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. That is a German paper, is it not?—A. Yes, sir; a German paper. I have been living in China. I was first in Hong-Kong and then I was called away. I had a house in Shanghai. I was sent there as book-keeper. On the 2d of January, 1873, the German steamer Sedan shipwrecked near the coast of China, about 20 miles from the Lamyit Islands, on a rock about 10 feet under water. I afterward found out it was the Reef Island rock. The steamer got down then in about twenty minutes. I sprang into the boat. I guess I was the last that went into the boat, and soon after a big wave went over the stern, and one of the boats, the captain's, went down on the bottom. Four of the boats were filled, crowded with people, and when the stern got down there were about forty Chinese hanging on the iron bar of the bowsprit. All the other boats were filled and entirely crowded. We had in our boat twenty-nine, of which two were women, twenty-seven men.. It was more than the boat could take, or ought to have taken. We were only a few fingers broad out of the water. We could set sail and get off, but then there were two of the other boats. They remained near the sinking steamer. Then when we came to Shanghai it was reported by the others. One of the boats went to a neighboring island and there was taken off from them their clothes and everything they had. They had been boarded by one of the pirates there of the Chinese on the Lamyit Islands. They took off all their clothes and left them naked there, and they had been rescued a few days afterward by another steamer and had been brought to port. All the others they saw—these forty men hanging there at the iron-bars were sent by the Chinese from the Lamyit Islands. They had taken off all their clothes and everything and were then put living in the water and let them drown, and all these forty, who could have been saved easily by their own countrymen, were drowned. This was stated at the time, and it has been reported in the Illinois Staats Zeitung and other papers. I have seen that they had no heart at all. In this case they drowned their own countrymen in the water only for their clothes.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. This ship was wrecked on a rock off the coast of China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The survivors fell into the hands of pirates, Chinese pirates?—A. It was their business to be pirates, at least I know they were Chinese. If it was really their business as pirates I guess they were pirates. We were then boarded by other vessels. Other vessels tried to get our boat ashore.

Senator SARGENT. [To Mr. King.] Direct the witness to the points you wish to prove by him.

Mr. KING. He was sent here by a committee, and I really do not know what he was sent to state. [To the witness.] I do not think we need any more of your testimony.

The WITNESS. I have to state about the commodore in Yokohama. The commodore stole over $22,000 and went off with his bondsmen. I know that in Yokohama. It was in the beginning of 1875.

Mr. KING. We do not care for that particularly, I think, Mr. Stein.

JOHN D. CONDON sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What has been your business?—Answer. Cabinet-maker by trade.

Q. A worker in wood of all kinds?—A. Generally speaking, yes, sir.

Q. Do you know how the Chinese affect workers in wood generally, cabinet-makers, sash, door, and blind makers, &c.?—A. They do not directly affect cabinet-making proper; but if we embrace all wood-work, they are certainly affected to a great extent in doing all of our common varnishing. That branch of industry is chiefly occupied or done by Chinamen.

Q. In the sash, door, and blind department, how is it?—A. That is pretty nearly exclusively in the hands of the Chinamen.

Q. Do you think that white labor can be used profitably in that industry?—A. Yes, sir. I can see no reason why it cannot. I know of factories in this town where they exclusively employ Chinamen in making cigar-boxes expressly.

Q. That is a part of your same trade, is it not?—A. General wood-work. We can work at that as well as cabinet-making.

Q. How many Chinese are there engaged in sash, door, and blind manufactories?—A. That is a fact I have not ascertained; but as near as I can judge from what I have seen, the larger proportion of that work, such as sash, door, and blind making, together with boxes of various kinds, is manufactured by Chinamen.

Q. Are there any white men who are at work at all at that industry?—A. As a general thing, there are a few foremen in the shops.

Q. Are there any who work at it as journeymen?—A. Yes, sir; there are some.

Q. Can they make a living at the wages paid the Chinese?—A. No, sir; they cannot under any circumstances. Even the best workmen cannot make a living at the wages they pay the Chinamen.

Q. What are the wages which are paid the Chinamen?—A. Their average wages are about a dollar or one dollar and ten cents a day. There are places in the city where the Chinamen take the contracts, and they employ their own help. They work by the piece.

Q. Do Chinamen ever work by the piece?—A. O, yes; as a general thing they work by the piece pretty nearly all the time.

Q. Is there a sufficiency of white labor to carry on that industry, provided the Chinese were excluded?—A. Certainly; the greatest trouble we have got to contend with now is to try to keep the white men away from the shops. There is not a day that they do not come trying to get work. For instance, one case came under my observation where the firm advertised for two white boys, that is, in the painting work, which belongs to the furniture branch. There were over a hundred boys who applied for work within three days. I saw them there at a quarter to seven o'clock in the morning, upward of thirty boys. Of course we only wanted two, and to the rest we could not give employment, and those boys, so far as my opinion of human nature goes, were a very good class of boys, and were serious about asking for employment.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the difference between the wages of the Chinese and the white workmen?—A. The present wages of the white mechanic, I presume, it would be fair to estimate at $15 a week.

Q. Two dollars and a half a day?—A. Two dollars and a half a day. I judge from myself. I do not pretend to be the best workman; that

is, I can hold my own on an average, and that is about as much as I can make at present.

Q. The Chinamen get how much?—A. At those trades, taking box-making, the average wages would be, probably, a dollar a day.

Q. What is the difference in relative speed and efficiency as workmen between the two classes?—A. Certainly the white men are much ahead of them in speed.

Q. In what proportion?—A. I would say that a white man could invariably do as much as two of them. I have found it so. I worked for Messrs. Cole & Co., over in the State's prison. I had a great many of the Chinamen working for me at the time, and I found that they were very slow in proportion to the rest of the community. Furthermore, I would state in reference to opium-smoking, that I have had them lying under the bench for an hour, and after they had recovered they were so stupid that they were not in fact worth anything for another hour afterward.

Q. Would they take their opium-pipes into the workshop and stop their work in order to smoke?—A. They have small pipes made for that purpose in the prisons.

Q. You are speaking of the prisons?—A. I am speaking of the prisons.

Q. Are they allowed to smoke in the prisons?—A. No, they are not allowed. It was optional with us to have them reported, for which they would have been punished.

Q. What is their character as workmen; are they good workmen?—A. I am not able to state as to their efficiency as workmen. My own opinion is that they are not good workmen.

By Mr. KING:

Q. You were foreman employed by Cole & Co. to superintend the convict labor?—A. I was one of the foremen there; there were three white men there.

Q. Have you ever noticed the conduct of white foremen to the Chinese?—A. Yes. There is another fact in connection with this subject which I should like to state, which is generally not understood. I will state, for instance, that a foreman having more or less Chinamen working for him, as a general thing does not treat the Chinamen as he would a lot of white men, and in the event of having them for any length of time he gets kind of arbitrary to the Chinamen; and then, again, as such has been the case here recently, they discharge those Chinamen and employ white boys, and as a general thing he carried out the same system of tyranny, so to speak, to the boys as to the Chinamen, and the boys did not feel as though they were treated as they should be treated, and consequently there was a rupture and they were discharged.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The boys would not submit?—A. Not as a general thing in the manner in which the Chinamen submit.

By Mr. KING:

Q. You think, then, that white foremen over the Chinese finally acquire such a habit as to prevent them from conducting decently toward white labor afterward employed?—A. Certainly, to a great extent. I have seen that myself.

Q. It has the same effect, then, upon the white overseer that slavery had upon the slave-driver?—A. O, yes; I presume that that was just the case there. I would make a statement further, as my attention has

been called to the fact in reference to what was said by the attorney on the other side. I have been connected with the trades unions here for a number of years. I am secretary to the Mechanics' State Council, a copy of the constitution of which you have in your hands from General Winn last evening. There is no provision in the various constitutions of the trades societies in the city or State that prohibits boys from becoming apprentices. This is an error on the part of the attorney on the other side.

Q. It limits their number?—A. I have known of instances. From 1862 to 1867, in New York City, among the molders, they all tried at that time to run a lot of boys, from the fact that they had a good deal of work on hand, making shot, shell, &c., for the Government. The molders' union then made rules to the effect that they allowed one apprentice, I believe it was, to eleven molders; that is, journeymen molders, mechanics. It would not be consistent to suppose that the members of these trades unions would make a law against our sons, because we must have employment for our sons, and it is to our advantage to use them the best way we can.

Q. There is no such law in this State?—A. There is no such law in this State.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Then you say that the trades unions among the different trades here have no regulation as to the number of apprentices that are to be taken?—A. No, sir.

Q. They exercise no control in that respect?—A. No, sir; I have been and am now a member of some two or three trades unions, and I know of no such law.

Q. Do they assume to regulate the prices in the shops?—A. That is one of their objects, to encourage and to defend their fellow-craftsmen in trying to hold the prices of labor. Their idea is that the wages are to be of that character that will give them a decent living.

Q. Do they fix the price upon different things and prohibit their members from working for less?—A. That is to say, run a scale of prices?

Q. Yes. Is that their purpose?—A. I have not any knowledge of that fact.

Q. It is not the case in those trades unions to which you belong?—A. No, sir. Even under the eight-hour-law system which was very extensive here in this State some years past they had no regular set prices to demand for eight hours' work. I know of no law that makes such regulations. As a general thing the cabinet-makers work by the piece; but recently we have been in a very bad condition from the fact that business is very dull, and the workingmen imagine that that is to a great extent owing to the large number of Chinamen coming here, because by destroying or rather reducing our wages it certainly must destroy our power of consumption, and the retail dealers eventually will be sufferers as well as we. Hence the general depression in our midst. That is the view we take of it.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Have you noticed the effect of the Chinese competition upon immigration so far as it relates to your trade?—A. Certainly. I have known cabinet-makers in San Francisco who could get no employment at box-making. I have known them to go to a shop and sit there until they could get the price of a meal's victuals from one of the cabinet-makers. There are many instances of this kind where they were out of employment. There is an immense overplus of labor in the market at

present right here in San Francisco. We have been trying to estimate the amount, and as near as I can state it there are from ten to twelve thousand white men out of employment, representing nearly all branches of industry.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is that attributed to the presence of the Chinese?—A. To a great extent.

Q. Are there not a great many men out of employment all through the East at this time, and have there not been?—A. That is true. We understand that there is a general depression, not alone in the Eastern States, but all through Europe at this time. For instance, in a letter written recently by Celia Logan, a correspondent of the Call here, to the ladies of San Francisco, (I presume some of you have read the article,) she requests them to make room for the American ladies of New York, who, she states, are in a starving condition there. She wants the people here to discharge the Chinamen in order to give room to those American ladies out of employment in New York.

Q. Is it not understood that times are better and that there are fewer men out of employment in San Francisco than in the Eastern States?—A. I believe it is fair to presume that such is the case. We have prided ourselves that we were in a better condition than a majority of the workingmen in the East; and we have invariably noticed, I will state, that for the last two years business has been more or less prosperous in this city, owing to the fact of the white immigration. I think we relied chiefly upon that to consume our production as well as our manufactures; and when that ceases to come, depression immediately sets in. We have had the experience here. I have been here in this city about ten or twelve years.

Q. Has there been any considerable falling off in the immigration to this State from the East?—A. O, yes; they are going back every day—those who can get means to take them back.

Q. There is an excess of immigrants over emigrants, is there not, now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The trains coming west carry more than those going east?—A. I believe that is the fact.

Q. The number coming west has hardly diminished, has it?—A. I do not know; I cannot exactly state just now whether such is the case or not.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You are a cabinet-maker?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think an American cabinet-maker can compete with a Chinese cabinet-maker?—A. No, sir; he cannot.

Q. Do the Chinese use any furniture made by cabinet-makers?—A. Not any, with the exception of little stools or something of that kind—benches. They do not buy any of our furniture that I know of. Probably it might be safe to say that the Chinese merchants use a little of it, but not as a general thing.

Q. Would a hundred Chinamen use as much cabinet-furniture as a family of six American mechanics?—A. No, sir; they would not.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you read the newspapers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you not noticed a monthly statement of the travel from the West to the East, and from the East to the West? The Call publishes it, and the Chronicle and all the papers publish the travel—that is, overland by the cars.—A. Yes.

Q. What does it average a month in favor of California?—A. I believe that the exports exceed the imports.

Q. That those leaving exceed those coming?—A. I believe such is the present condition of things. I do not state it as a fact; but such is my belief.

Q. Do you not know as a fact that they average over five thousand in our favor?—A. I do not know that.

Q. Where did we get our sash, doors, and blinds ten years ago?—A. Chiefly from the East.

Q. We consume a great many?—A. Yes, sir; a great many now.

Q. Is it not rather an advantage to California that we can produce those articles here and retain the money that we would otherwise send East for them?—A. Under the present system?

Q. Under any system.—A. I would say had they been manufactured here by white men it would certainly be in favor of us.

Q. How do you make the distinction? Is not a twenty-dollar piece in gold, the product of a black man's labor, just as valuable as a twenty-dollar piece, the product of a white man's labor?—A. Yes; to the manufacturers, only, not to the general community as a point of prosperity.

Q. Do you think that we are making these articles cheaper now than we were able to obtain them when we brought them from the East?—A. I do not know. I do not think so. I do not think Chinese cheap labor has any tendency to lower the scale of prices to the consumer.

Q. You do not think, then, that there is any competition so far as that is concerned in the supply and demand?—A. There are only a few who get richer to the detriment of the many.

Q. They do that in all countries, do they not?—A. Most exclusively here, under this head.

Q. Your prejudice, then, goes against the Chinese being employed in any capacity whatever?—A. I do not want you to have it understood as prejudice; that is my opinion as a citizen of the State.

Q. This testimony is for the East?—A. I understand that.

Q. You would prefer to go back to our system of ten or twelve years ago, and buy from the East, rather than manufacture here by Chinese?—A. I would. It would be better for Eastern manufacturers to have the work than to have Chinamen here do it.

Q. How many were engaged in your branch of business ten years ago?—A. I want you to understand I did not state that the Chinese were directly engaged in my business, that is cabinet-making proper. There were not a great many at that time. Ten years ago there were not so many Chinamen in the State.

Q. What has caused this increase?—A. I do not know, unless it has been the great donations made by Congress to the Pacific Steamship Company, and the inducements held out to them by some wealthy men here.

Q. What has produced this increase in the number of your brother mechanics here? Under what system have they been brought here to work?—A. You ask me, if I understand you aright, what inducement was held out to the Eastern or European mechanic to come to this State?

Q. You state there are a great many more of your class of mechanics here than there were six, eight, or ten years ago?—A. Certainly.

Q. What has brought them here? What has increased the number? There are several hundred more.—A. There are several thousand more.

Q. How does it come that they are here to-day?—A. Such inducements as attracted the attention of all men seeking to advance themselves. I presume that is a fair answer.

Q. If that is your answer, why did they not come here fifteen years previous to ten years ago?—A. The State was not in such a state of development; there was no such inducements as have been since.

Q. Then the development of these lines and branches of mechanical establishments and industries has brought this labor here?—A. I do not understand you.

Q. You said the development of these industries here brought these mechanics here to embark in those labors?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has it not been brought about by the establishment of industries in which Chinese labor is performed? Has it not brought white men to supervise them; has it not brought girls to work in shoe-shops?—A. That is, you mean to say, the Chinamen establish those industries?

Q. No. They were established by white men. But suppose they were established by any one else, have they not brought white men here?—A. Certainly.

Q. There is quite a large immigration here from the East—families, farmers?—A. Not so much now as within the last two years, perhaps.

Q. Where are the principal manufactories of sash, doors, and blinds?—A. In San Francisco. There are some up in Truckee.

Q. Is there not one large establishment in El Dorado County?—A. I believe some places have recently been established through the interior.

Q. Are not more than two-thirds of the sash and blinds made in the mountains?—A. That I cannot answer.

Q. You say the Chinese smoke opium in the State prison; have you ever seen them smoke opium in Chinatown?—A. O, yes; I have seen them smoke in Chinatown; likewise on the boats plying between here and Oakland, and to Sacramento by Vallejo.

Q. What kind of pipe do they use?—A. Of various descriptions. This pipe I spoke of was somewhat peculiar. I fail to describe the character of it.

Q. The pipe used in the State prison?—A. No, sir; not in the State prison. I am speaking of where I saw them on the boat from here going to Sacramento. I have seen them on the boat, and they all smoked their opium until they laid right down.

Q. I thought you said that was the case in the State's prison?—A. I know of one case there, one Chinaman. I had been informed he was an old convict there, and I asked him why it was that he could not get outside. He was quite a healthy man. He said, "I prefer to live in the State's prison." He would merely go out on a visit when his time expired. He could get along better there than outside.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 28, 1876.

LEVIN MARSHALL sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. How long have you been a resident of this State?—Answer. Since 1853.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Tailor.

Q. How long have you followed that occupation?—A. I have followed that occupation since 1862.

Q. In this State?—A. In San Francisco.

Q. How many Chinese are there in the custom trade in this city?—A. I cannot tell how many there are.

Q. About how many, according to your opinion?—A. In the tailoring trade there are at least a thousand of them.

Q. Is that in the custom trade?—A. Custom and manufacturing.

Q. How many white tailors are there?—A. Not many now.

Q. How many?—A. I do not believe of all that manufacture now there are a dozen; not quite a dozen. There is one by the name of Levi, two by the name of Cooper——

Q. How many were there before the Chinese monopolized that trade?—A. Before that there were a hundred tailors.

Q. What effect has Chinese competition in your trade had upon immigration among the tailors of this State?—A. In fact, they all had to give it up.

Q. Were any obliged to leave the State?—A. Last year I had about twenty girls and five men to work for me, and now I have nothing to do myself. I used to get nine dollars a dozen for boys' pants, and now I make them for five dollars and a half; for men's I used to get fifteen dollars, and I now get six and a half to seven and a half. That is the highest I get. I used to get fifteen dollars for them. I could not work for six dollars and a half upon pants and hire hands.

Q. How much, on an average, are tailors' wages per week? I suppose they work by the piece?—A. They used to make from fifteen to twenty dollars, after paying off all the hands and the rent.

Q. How much do the Chinese make per week?—A. About seven dollars and a half.

Q. Are the clothes manufactured by these Chinese tailors any cheaper to the public now than they were when manufactured by white tailors?—A. They are not any cheaper for the public. The manufacturers here are making the money, but it is no saving to the public.

Q. Is there any part of your trade where girls have been employed heretofore?—A. I had girls all the time before, from fifteen to twenty in busy times.

Q. What effect has Chinese labor upon the employment of girls?—A. Girls that used to get from eight to ten and twelve dollars a week work now for five dollars.

Q. Are there as many girls employed as formerly?—A. You cannot get any at that price.

Q. Then the Chinese have driven the girls out of the trade?—A. Altogether.

Q. What is the price of making sack-coats, per dozen, with white labor?—A. I used to get for boys' jackets twelve dollars a dozen. They are making them for five bits apiece—seven dollars and a half a dozen.

Q. How much for men's sack-coats per dozen?—A. For men's coats we used to get a dollar and a half and two dollars and a half, and some three dollars. Now they pay a dollar and a quarter and a dollar and a half for double-breasted coats.

Q. Each individual coat?—A. By the dozen; the same by the piece.

Q. How much for pantaloons a dozen?—A. Pantaloons a dozen, boys', $3.50; men's, $5.50 to $6.50.

Q. That is white labor?—A. That is Chinese labor.

Q. How much for white labor?—A. The whites make men's pants for $9, when they used to get $15 for them. You cannot go idle altogether, and must do something.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long have you been engaged in the tailoring business in this State?—A. In this town since 1862.

Q. How many were engaged in it in 1862?—A. In 1862 there was not much manufacturing here. Clothing was manufactured more in New York until 1865; they got out here and commenced to manufacture, and then everybody got work—men and women.

Q. How did they commence manufacturing in 1865; with what kind of labor?—A. With white labor; all white.

Q. How many laborers were engaged in it then?—A. There were a good many; I cannot tell exactly the number, but there were plenty.

Q. How many are there to-day?—A. To-day there are very few.

Q. Less than there was in 1865?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you any statistical information as to that fact?—A. There are manufacturers of clothing, one by the name of Levi, two by the name of Cooper, one by the name of Lyons, which is four, Monas is five. Those are about what manufacturers in boys' and men's clothing there are here.

Q. Do these firms employ Chinese?—A. No; they are tailors.

Q. How many tailors do they employ?—A. Some five, some six.

Q. How many would there be in these firms you have named?—A. Altogether about thirty or forty, and the rest is all manufactured by Chinamen.

Q. Do you know of any white journeymen who are bosses and foremen where the Chinese work?—A. All the work is manufactured by Chinese.

Q. I mean overseers?—A. Those overseers I mentioned are tailors, and they have got white hands; but the manufacturers give all their work to Chinese—pants, coats, overcoats, and blanket coats.

Q. Who manufactures the better class of clothing; what class of tailors, Chinese or white?—A. The most of them Chinese.

Q. Fine coats and vests?—A. Fine coats, custom tailors; white labor, some of them.

Q. How many firms are there of that kind now in the city that manufacture fine clothing such as the Chinese do not make?—A. There are but a few of them. The most of them all manufacture principally by Chinamen. Of pants and vests no white man gets that work at all.

Q. Are there fifty of those places?—A. No; I do not think there are.

Q. Are there forty?—A. Probably.

Q. Forty places where they manufacture the better articles of clothing?—A. Yes, sir; custom work; nothing but custom work.

Q. Those forty places employ how many hands?—A. Each of them has a tailor, but they give out their custom work.

Q. To whom?—A. To white s.

Q. You are a tailor. Have you any trades' union or association?—A. No, sir. In custom work I never work. All I work is manufactured shop-work. That is the principal work I do.

Q. How many women were engaged in the manufacture of clothing in 1862?—A. I do not know exactly. I have never been around among the different places. I always attended to my own place.

Q. Do you know how many there are now?—A. Now there are not many.

Q. What do you call many?—A. There would be about twenty now engaged in the tailoring business.

Q. Do you know that there were not any in 1865?—A. There were plenty at that time.

Q. Have you ever looked at the census in reference to that fact?—A. No, sir; I never looked at it.

Q. What is the difference in price in procuring such clothing as you speak of, that the Chinese make, between this coast and the East?—A. A. They are making with Chinese cheaper here than in the East.

Q. What do they make pants for a dozen here?—A. The Chinese make them for $3.50, $4.50, and $5.50 a dozen.

Q. What do you mean by making pants—the material cut and furnished to the Chinese?—A. It is cut and furnished to the Chinese for making them.

Q. They finishing the button-holes and everything?—A. Everything complete, and return them ready to put up.

Q. How many pairs do they make in a day?—A. It depends on how many hands.

Q. How many pairs will one Chinaman make in one day?—A. One man would make about three pairs a day.

Q. How many pairs would a white man make?—A. A white man would not make any more.

Q. A white man cannot make any more than a Chinaman?—A. He cannot make any more.

Q. Do the Chinese turn out as good an article as the whites?—A. For shop-work they turn them out as good, because they have got it all in their hands. Nobody makes pants and vests now except the Chinese.

Q. We got our clothing in the Eastern States before we commenced manufacturing, you state?—A. Yes, before they commenced to manufacture here they were made in the East.

Q. Do we import any from the East now?—A. Some come out from the East.

Q. Then they come in direct competition with the manufacture here?—A. Yes.

Q. Then do they not manufacture cheaper in the East than we do here with Chinese labor? How can they bring it here?—A. The cloths manufactured in the East they make in the East and the cloths manufactured here are made up here.

Q. Exactly; but how can they pay more to make them up and bring them here, and compete with Chinese labor? You seem not to be clear and I will let that pass. You say the cloth is made here?—A. The cloth that they manufacture in New York they make into clothing in New York. Of course it saves them paying the expense of transporting the cloth, and they get the trimmings cheaper there.

Q. Is there any cloth manufactured here which is made in the East?—A. Plenty.

Q. Was there any before we commenced Chinese labor?—A. In San Francisco, Oregon, Marysville, and everywhere—all the cloth was made up here.

Q. Then we imported all our cloths before this manufacturing commenced?—A. We imported them all.

ERRIC WESTINE sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Tailor.

Q. How long have you been tailoring?—A. In this city I have been tailoring for over five years.

Q. How many Chinese do you think there are in the custom trade?—A. I do not think there are very many in the custom trade. They are mostly in manufacturing.

Q. How many in manufacturing and custom trade together? How many Chinese tailors are there in the city?—A. At a rough estimate I should think between a dozen or fifteen now.

Q. Do you know what effect Chinese competition has had here upon the immigration of tailors and tradesmen of that kind?—A. I think that it keeps a good many away from here.

Q. Why do you think so?—A. Because they do not think they are able to make competition with the Chinese.

Q. Have they driven any away from here?—A. I think they have.

Q. Five years ago, you say, you were living here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were the Chinese employed then to the same extent that they are now?—A. In the custom trade I think they employed more then than they employ now, because the employers are getting tired of them. They have tried them, and I do not think they can make good use of them in that branch of business.

Q. Do you think that the manufacture of clothing can be carried on profitably by white labor on this coast?—A. I do.

Q. Do the clothes that are manufactured by the Chinese cost any less in the market than those manufactured by white labor?—A. I do not think they do. I think the profit goes to the manufacturer.

Q. If there were no Chinese on this coast would there be a sufficient quantity of white labor to carry on the tailoring and manufacturing business?—A. Yes, sir; plenty.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Why was there not sufficient labor five years ago, before you came here? Was there not a sufficiency then of white labor to carry it on?—A. I think there was.

Q. Why had it not been inaugurated and established then?—A. Manufacturing was established five years ago.

Q. Not to the extent that it is to-day, I understand?—A. No; the city is growing, and so is manufacturing, all the time.

Q. How many tailors are engaged now in custom-work, in these first-class tailoring establishments on Montgomery and California, and other streets?—A. I should think they number between three and four hundred.

Q. White tailors?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever live in a city of about 250,000 inhabitants east?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever live in a city of 100,000 inhabitants?—A. No, sir.

Q. You could not give the ratio, then, of the number of white tailors necessary to fill the requirements of cities east?—A. No, sir; I could not.

Q. What place have you lived in?—A. I lived in Galva, Ill.

Q. Where did we get our manufactured clothing before we commenced the work here?—A. From the eastern cities, I should judge.

Q. What is the price per day or week for journeymen tailors?—A. They are mostly working by the piece, so that the wages may average from $15 to $20 per week if they have work. They do not always have that, though.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Can they find work readily?—A. Not in the present dullness of trade.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the difference in the price of labor of tailors in the East

and here? Is it more here than it is east?—A. The prices in New York are reduced about the same as here.

Q. Are any tailors idle there, from your information?—A. I think there are.

Q. Is that brought about by cheap labor of any sort in New York?—A. I should judge it was from the general dullness of trade, the depression.

ROBERT H. GILLESPIE sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Broom-maker.

Q. How long have you been in that business on this coast?—A. It is pretty nearly fifteen years since I first started.

Q. How many Chinese do you think are engaged in that business on this coast at the present time?—A. There are about forty-five in this city, and about the same number outside of it.

Q. Have they monopolized the trade?

Q. How about the wages of Chinese and white labor? Compare them.—A. Between Chinese and white labor, at the present time, there is very little difference; there is not a quarter of a dollar on a hundred brooms.

Q. What was white labor formerly paid before the Chinese competition?—A. It was so that men working by the piece could make from $15 to $25 and $26 a week.

Q. How much can they make now?—A. Very few can make $15.

Q. Do the Chinese make that?—A. They made as high as $14 some two years ago, when some of the factories first employed them by the piece.

Q. Is the price of brooms to the public now, with Chinese labor, any less than it was with white labor?—A. No, sir; it is not.

Q. It is no benefit to the public, then, in the cost of the material of the brooms by the use of cheap Chinese labor?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is that an occupation that furnishes any employment to women or boys?—A. Yes, sir; we have five girls employed in our place.

Q. The employment of Chinese has a tendency to drive out these girls from the broom factories?—A. Yes, sir; it has.

Q. As to the consumption of brooms, who use the most?—A. As near as I can find out, the Chinese on the Pacific coast use about seventy-five dozen brooms in one year.

Q. The entire Chinese population?—A. The entire Chinese population; and, as near as I can figure it, there are one dozen brooms used to between fifteen and sixteen whites in one year.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you mean white adults?—A. The white population.

Q. In this city?—A. No, sir; on the coast.

Q. Men, women, and children?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many brooms are manufactured and sold?—A. There are about 70,000 dozen on this coast.

By Mr. KING:

Q. State anything else in connection with the broom-making trade that you may think of.—A. In 1865, I think it was, the broom factory on Drumm street, Thomas Ward's place, was the first one that employed Chinamen, and so it has been working on ever since, until finally nearly every factory in the State that employs anybody employs Chinamen, with one exception—that is the factory on Sacramento street, where they have got all whites. Most of those places that have got Chinese

have only just got whites enough to watch the Chinese and keep them from stealing and overcounting on their work, and that they expect them to do for nothing over what they pay them by the piece. In 1864 and 1865 broom-corn was higher than at present and brooms were lower, and all manufacturers were making more money then than what they are now. At the present time brooms are at a pretty good figure and broom-corn is very cheap. The reasons that I give for it are that the middle-men and the wholesale dealers are the parties who make the profit, and therefore compel the manufacturers to grind the labor down.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Is labor cheaper now than it was then?—A. Yes, sir; it is.

Q. Is broom-corn cheaper?—A. Yes, sir; broom-corn is cheaper.

Q. And brooms are higher?—A. Brooms are higher.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do you not think that the supply and demand even of brooms regulate the price, rather than the cost of manufacturing them?—A. No, sir; I do not, because all the surplus stock that they have on hand they ship to foreign ports.

Q. That is the supply and demand?—A. They can always get demand for them there.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say they can always find a demand for California manufactured brooms in foreign ports?—A. They do.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Is the demand greater now than it was formerly?—A. It has only been within the last six or seven years that they have been shipping any brooms. They used to consume all they made here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. This broom-making, then, is a new feature in our manufacturing, comparatively?—A. It is not so very new. It commenced here in 1860 or 1859.

Q. It has reached now a condition by which we manufacture and ship to foreign ports brooms?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We did not do it then?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do they raise the broom-corn here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been in the business here?—A. It will be fifteen years in February since I first started into it.

Q. Where did we get our brooms before we commenced manufacturing sufficient to supply the coast?—A. From the East.

Q. How many brooms do we ship to the Australian ports, say in a quarter or six months?—A. About twelve thousand dozen a year.

Q. Then we compete in English colonies with our brooms?—A. Yes, sir; because there is but one very small manufactory there.

Q. You say Chinamen did make fourteen dollars a week in manufacturing brooms?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do they make now?—A. There are some who make as high as ten dollars.

Q. How many brooms can they make in a week or a day?—A. There are different kinds; some kinds they can make six hundred a week, and other kinds they can make but three hundred.

Q. How many can an expert white man make in a week?—A. Of the kind that the Chinese make three hundred, a white man would make about four hundred; and of the others a white man would make about eight hundred, and the Chinese would make about six hundred.

Q. Is there any difference in the wages here and East in the manufacture of brooms at the present time?—A. I cannot tell at present. Six years ago the wages were higher East than here at that time.

Q. You say there are seventy thousand dozen made here annually?—A. About that number.

Q. What was the number you said was shipped to Australia?—A. Twelve thousand dozen.

Q. Do we ship to any other foreign ports?—A. Calloa, the Sandwich Islands, New Zealand, and Chili.

Q. How many thousand dozen are sent to those ports in the aggregate?—A. About twenty thousand dozen are shipped out of here every year to foreign ports.

Q. All foreign ports?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Leaving fifty thousand dozen to be consumed here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You mean brooms and brush-brooms?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know of the conviction of any Chinamen for stealing brooms, or the arrest of any for stealing brooms?—A. No, sir.

Q. You mentioned that white men were detailed to watch them. When did Chinese labor first enter into this branch?—A. Excuse me; I know of a manufacturer here who went out to the mission, and brought in one of the Chinamen that he had to work for him at Vallejo who had two hundred dollars' worth of his tools. He did not convict him, though, or have him arrested.

Q. When did the Chinese first enter into this broom-making?—A. In 1865, I think.

Q. Did we ship any brooms previous to 1865 to any foreign country?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. The raising of broom-corn here is becoming an industry, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You spoke of the middle-men making the money, and that broom-corn is cheaper really here than it is in the East?—A. Not at all times.

Q. Did not the middle men, as you call them, make a ring on broom-corn a year ago, and buy up all the crop?—A. No, sir; that was the manufacturers.

Q. That is what I take the middle-men to be.—A. I meant the wholesale dealers; the wooden-ware dealers.

Q. Was it done to reduce the price of labor, or increase the price of brooms?—A. It was to increase the price of the brooms and to freeze out those small factories.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say there are twelve thousand brooms sent to Australia?—A. Yes, sir; Australia and English ports, about that number.

Q. Do you know whether they have Chinese in Australia or not in numbers?—A. I cannot say. I have heard that they have had Chinese there.

Q. You are aware, by what you have read in the newspapers, that they have a great many Chinese there, and they are using means, by law and otherwise, to reduce the number?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They have Chinese in Calloa, have they not, in large numbers?—A. I do not know.

Q. Have you heard that the cooly trade between Hong Kong and Calloa has been carried on in great numbers?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know about the Chinese in the Sandwich Islands? Have you read of their being there in great numbers?—A. I was there in 1858, when there were Chinese landed there. I saw them put into the chain-gang or taken off to the calaboose.

Q. As they were landed from the vessel?—A. Yes, sir. They were obliged to work on the reef for three years before they belonged to the islands.

Q. Then from what you heard and know about the presence of Chinese in those places does not prevent the necessity of their importing brooms?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think the broom-trade would have grown up here if the Chinese had never been here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About 1860 most of our industries in the way of manufacturing started?—A. About that time, 1859 and 1860.

Q. Before that time the people paid their attention quite largely to gold-mining and pursuits of that kind?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Much more than now?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After that time there seemed to be a change in the State, and they went to manufacturing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think that manufacturing would have been gone into if the Chinese had not been here?—A. Yes, sir; just as largely as it is now, and more so.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did not most of the firms that commenced with white labor fail?—A. No, sir; none of them. One or two have failed with Chinese labor.

Q. I am not speaking of broom-making, but manufactures generally, that the Senator is referring to. They tried white labor first, and then substituted Chinese in almost all cases?—A. I could not speak as to things outside of my business.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What do you know about matters in Australia?—A. Very little.

Q. How do you know what you do know?—A. Through the papers.

Q. How do you know what you have said about Chili or Peru?—A. About their shipping?

Q. About anything there?—A. All that I know about their shipping, is about shipping brooms from here.

Q. That is here; but I am talking about matters in Chili and Peru?—A. I have not said anything about Chili or Peru in regard to any other matter except in the broom business.

Q. What do you know about the presence of Chinamen in Chili or Peru?—A. I do not know anything about that. I spoke of the Sandwich Islands.

EDWARD L. CORTAGE sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. My occupation is a 'workingman in a broom factory.

Q. For whom do you work?—A. For Gillispie, Zan & Co., 114 Sacramento street.

Q. How many Chinese do you think there are employed on the coast in broom-making?—A. Somewhere between ninety and one hundred. I cannot exactly tell to a *t*, but there is pretty nearly that amount, exclusively of Oregon. There are a few small factories. I do not know that they have one, two, or three, but they all have some Chinese.

Q. What is your opinion as to whether that industry can be carried on without the use of Chinese labor on this coast?—A. It can be carried on just as well without Chinese, because it has been carried on without them to the same full extent to what it is carried on now.

Q. Can we compete with the eastern manufacturers by white labor?—A. We have driven them out of this market by white labor.

Q. State anything else in connection with broom-manufacturing, so far as it is affected by Chinese labor, that occurs to you.—A. Gentlemen, I had no notion to come up here until yesterday at dinner-time I was invited to come. My object is not to run against the Chinamen. I am in favor of anybody making a living that possibly can, but I am a married man and have a family of four little children suffering here, and I would like to see them do something in the world. Years ago I could average $20 and $21 a week. By being a married man I have been expressly favored by my employer. I must say he is a gentleman in every respect. I know he would not discharge me if he could help it; but it is said what you call the power behind the throne will compel us to take Chinamen. We have carried it so far that it is almost impossible to employ a man without the Chinamen going beyond him. My average wages for the last week is $14.89. I put in about fourteen hours a day, including traveling backward and forward from Oakland. If the Chinaman has a mind to work for my firm he gets employment and I have to compete with him. He offers to work for about one-third less the price I am working for now. That would reduce my wages to a little above $9, not quite $10, and I think it is impossible to live on $10 a week in this country.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You state that California could carry on this industry without Chinese, as it has been done before by white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many years ago was that?—A. I started in business pretty nearly eight years ago, in 1869. There was ten years when nobody employed Chinamen but one man. He had sometimes one and sometimes two Chinamen. Another firm shortly afterward increased their men to the amount of twenty-two white men and controlled, so to say, the whole broom-trade, because there were only three firms engaged, and they shut up the Chinese shop entirely.

Q. Could the white labor on this coast in your line of business supply the demand for brooms, if there were no Chinamen engaged in the business?—A. Yes, sir; but the broom-makers who were formerly here are scattered to the four winds of the world; some in Australia; some in South America, and some in Eastern States.

Q. What is the difference in the price of making brooms in the Eastern States and in California?—A. I cannot say; I never worked in the Eastern States; I have only got hearsay for that, and will not put it in evidence, unless you treat it as hearsay.

Q. What do you say from hearsay?—A. According to hearsay, in the big cities of the Union the prices were pretty nearly on an average all the time until 1869 or 1870, when the Eastern prices came a trifle down. Nowadays they are generally hired by monthly work, and attend to everything, even on the farm. The prices paid in Saint Louis are exactly the same paid here now; there might be a quarter of a cent on some kind of work more, or a quarter of a cent on another kind of work less, but it is about the same thing. We have one man in our shop who came out here about two months ago; I have his statement for that; he has sound judgment and is honest and worthy of belief.

Q. It is about the same as in Saint Louis?—A. About the same as in Saint Louis. For New York and Chicago, I can say nothing.

Q. We have a foreign market for brooms? We are shipping, as Mr. Gillespie has testified, some 20,000 dozen?—A. Somewhere near that; sometimes more, sometimes less.

Q. Could we do that and pay the rates which you say you have got, $20 a week and $21? Could we ship to foreign ports and compete with the Eastern markets, and with the European market, and pay those wages?—A. Fully as well. Europe never exported brooms to any of those countries where we export them. The market is too far away. It takes six or eight months to go out there, unless they are sent by steamer, and most of their brooms are spoiled by mold or rats, and our brooms would always command a better price. I think they pay a bigger price for them.

Q. We do ship large quantities from here?—A. Large quantities are shipped from here.

Q. In what part of the Eastern States did you reside before you came here?—A. I resided in Hoboken, State of New Jersey.

Q. What is the difference in living there and here? Is there much difference as to the cost of supporting a family?—A. I can tell you but little about it. I was a very young man when I lived there, and boarded. I am twenty-two years here now.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You say that the lower wages of the Chinese operate to reduce your wages?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you cannot live upon the wages which they receive?—A. Not very well. $10 a week for a family, a wife and four children, is hardly sufficient to live on. Rents in our days for white men are seldom less than $15 a month. If a man wants to live anywhere decently with three little rooms he has to pay that, and if he has a trifle of elbow-room to give his children he cannot live for less, unless he moves in the fourth story of a tenement, and then it will cost him $12 a month, where they all live together.

Q. So the competition is in living? You could not afford to live like a Chinaman?—A. No, we could not, because a Chinaman is single and can live on 19 cents a day, at the same rate as our prisoners live in the jail.

Q. He could live better in his mode of living than you can upon your wages?—A. So could I if I was single. If I was single I could live on $4 or $5 a week, by putting it down to the lowest possible figure.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You do not like a bare struggle for existence? You want some comforts for your family?—A. I do not talk particularly for comforts. I like to clothe them decently and give them an education. I have a tolerably good schooling, because I was instructed in the German language; but I want to learn my children something a little better than merely to be in competition with Chinamen, if they are capable.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you been engaged in broom-making ever since you have resided in this country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you own the house you live in?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have a little home of your own?—A. I have a small home of my own.

Q. Most of the sober, laboring, industrious mechanics here have homes of their own?—A. That is one reason why I came here to the committee. It was stated by some one here that nothing but the vagrant and dirty class came here to testify against the Chinese. I can bring employés and others to show that I have worked steady in that shop since it has been started. I have been with that firm and never lost a day except

by sickness once eight days. I have been there from seven in the morning every morning until six o'clock, and take some work home and work in the evening trying to make something a little decent. I never was arrested or even a witness in a police court in my life.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I believe the statement was not that the witnesses were of the dissolute classes, but the statement was made or implied that those who think the Chinese ought not to come here in great numbers belong to the dissolute classes?—A. It was something of that sort.

Q. That you think is not true?—A. On my part it is not true.

Q. In your observation it is not true?—A. Not from my observation. I have been here to the committee only for the first time to-day.

Q. In your observation among intelligent mechanics, honest, sober, working-men, do they favor the introduction of Chinese or are they opposed to it?—A. They are terribly opposed to anybody that causes them to struggle for a living. I do not know whether this would be in point or not, but when I moved to Oakland a family had come from Chicago, and settled in Oakland and bought a little lot and had a house built on it. They bought it on the installment plan. They were working for a company, a large concern There were two sons, one of them seventeen and the other nineteen, and their father to work. They had pretty nearly worked it out when the three were thrown out of employment by the Chinese. They had to sell their home and go back to the Eastern States.

Q. What do you mean by the installment plan?—A. They pay from $25 to $30 and $40 at a time.

Q. They occupy it and pay no rent?—A. No rent.

Q. What they pay goes to building-money?—A. Building-money, but of course they can never build unless they pay for it.

Q. It is by means of that installment plan that so many working-people are able to get homes?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Did you ever know any one mechanic who was in favor of Chinese immigration, a working mechanic?—A. No, I know only one, and I think he is only gabbing, because he gets his cigars for nothing.

By Mr. KING:

Q. What countryman are you?—A. I am a German.

Q. What is the feeling among your countrymen on this coast, do you think?—A. I have talked with a great many of them. They all think Chinese immigration is an evil, if not at present, in future. The most of my countrymen want to make this their home and settle down, but they consider that it is an injury to their children to have them grow up with this condition of things around them. Most of them have families.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. If there were not Chinese engaged in this business, with the few white men engaged in it, you could very easily raise your wages?—A. We could have done it before, but we were too sensible when paid well to do such things. The very man who engaged the Chinese first, was so far reduced down that he wanted to earn a little, and he was the first man to try to create a row by getting others to go in to raise the wages. Furthermore, if you will allow me to make the statement, I heard you ask a former witness if a Chinaman was ever

arrested for stealing. Yes; there was at Mr. Cummings's establishment when it was up on Sansom street. A Chinaman had a row with him about some settlement, and in turning him out the Chinaman lost his balance, and he saw the top of a whisk-broom tipped with velvet under his coat, and Mr. Cummings pulled it out. He had him arrested for stealing, but if he got convicted I do not know.

Q. There was some trouble about wages?—A. He got one week's wages behind, and the Chinaman wanted to leave and wanted the wages right away, and Mr. Cummings told him to come next week, and they had a few words and he took the Chinaman and shoved him out of the door.

By Mr. KING:

Q. And when he was shoving him out this whisk-broom fell from under his garments?—A. Yes; and he had him arrested for stealing.

DENNIS MCCARTY sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a boot-maker.

Q. How long have you been in that business on this coast?—A. Nearly eleven years, between ten and eleven years.

Q. What is your opinion as to whether or not that trade can be carried on profitably by the use of white labor?—A. I think it can.

Q. How many Chinese are there in that business?—A. I think at the present time there are between two thousand and three thousand in the city.

Q. State anything else that you wish to mention in connection with that trade.—A. I am connected with the United Workingmen's Co-operative Association, and we are employing altogether white labor. We are confined almost entirely to the manufacturing of men's boots. That is the line of goods the Chinamen have not got into as yet, but in ladies' work and misses' work and children's work they have, I may say, almost the entire control. The slipper business they have altogether, and in this other line of work, ladies' shoes, misses' shoes, &c., they have got the entire control. We make only a small portion in our business of that line of work, only that which it is really necessary for us to make. One year we employed a few Chinamen to make that line of work. At the prices that we have paid white labor for that line of work we could not sell them, so that we put on a few Chinamen just to make up that class of work, cheap shoes, and we employed them for one year. After that year we had some white men apply to us for that line of work, and they said they would make them as cheap as the Chinamen so as to get employment. So we discharged the few Chinamen we had, and we have employed the white men ever since. We employed only some fifteen Chinamen for one year. Now we have altogether between sixty and seventy white people on the class of work that we have worked on, as I have said, men's boots, which the Chinamen have not got into as yet, but I suppose it is only a question of time when they will.

Q. What is the comparative rapidity with which whites and Chinese labor, and what is the result of their labor as compared?—A. From the experience we had with them I think that a white man will do about one-fourth more work than a Chinaman will. They work in teams of four men. The Chinaman would make about thirty pairs and the white men by working very hard would make forty pairs of these misses' and children's shoes, which I would consider about a fair average. The same number of Chinamen would do about three-fourths the amount of work

that white men would. Some five or six years ago there were no Chinamen employed at all in this business. We had then in the neighborhood of eight hundred white men; but the manufacturers considered that there was more money by employing Chinamen, so that they gradually introduced them and I think to-day only about four hundred to five hundred white men are employed; whereas, if the Chinese were not in that business, we would have, I think, about two thousand white men in that line of business here now.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long have you worked in business on this coast?—A. Between ten and eleven years.

Q. How many white shoemakers were there here in 1861–1862?—A. That was before I came here; I could not say.

Q. How many were here when you came?—A. I am speaking now of the manufacturing work. I do not speak of the custom line at all. That is not affected at all by Chinese labor so far. When I came here one hundred men would cover the whole amount in the factories.

Q. And how many are there now at work, white men?—A. I suppose there are between four and five hundred. But manufacturing then was in its infancy here; it was just beginning at that time.

Q. You say that you are connected with the co-operative shoemakers' association?—A. Yes, sir, the United Workingmen's Co-operative Association.

Q. What is the return of the capital invested in that manufactory?—A. It varies. It depends in a great measure upon the price of material and also on the losses that are sustained by people who take out their goods. I suppose the average with us has been about fifteen per cent. a year. We have some years not had anything and some years we have had more than that; but I should think that 15 per cent. was a fair average.

Q. The business is gradually growing better?—A. No, sir; I think not.

Q. You think that the average return, then, for your association is about fifteen per cent.?—A. It has been that. I consider that a pretty large return, and the reason is we work with close economy. We sell our goods at our manufactory, which saves the expense of a wholesale house, whereas other firms in the business not doing a great deal more would have the expense of a wholesale house attached, with two extra salesmen, a book-keeper, &c.

Q. You say your association is engaged mostly in the manufacture of boots, and that the Chinese are engaged mostly in the manufacture of slippers and shoes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could not a co-operative association make twelve per cent. on the capital invested and take that business of shoes away from the Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. You could not manufacture shoes, then, at the present rates the Chinese do and clear twelve per cent.?—A. We could not manufacture them and pay cost.

Q. Then how is it that you make such a large profit on your association return?—A. Because, as I stated, the Chinamen are not engaged in boot-making.

Q. You have pretty much the exclusive control of that department?—A. No, we have not. The other white manufacturers make boots too; but our entire business is mostly boot-manufacturing. We, of course, have only a portion of the trade of the city.

Q. Messrs. Einsteins have substituted white shoemakers for Chinese?—A. I understand they let all their Chinese shoemakers go.

Q. Why have they been so long in getting rid of the Chinese and substituting whites? Why did they not make a clean sweep when they decided they would do it, and put them right on?—A. I cannot state about their business. I suppose they are not manufacturing so much now as they did then. I know they could not replace three hundred and fifty Chinamen immediately with so many white men. It cannot be done because there are not so many white men lying idle on the coast.

Q. They have been three or four months substituting white men?—A. I do not know that they have substituted white men.

Q. It was given in evidence yesterday that the last Chinaman left the shop last Saturday. Then they could not procure white labor immediately?—A. They could not do it immediately because there are not so many men lying around.

Q. What is the difference in the wages of shoemakers East and here? How does it correspond with California rates?—A. The wages of shoemakers East varies a great deal; it depends upon the season a good deal. In the hurried season there their wages run up, and they command pretty good prices. That is the way it was when I was there. In the busy season they make very good wages. In fact sometimes I have made better wages there than here at certain seasons. At other seasons the wages are dull. Prices fluctuate there.

Q. You say that a white man will make one-fourth more shoes than a Chinaman?—A. That is our experience with them.

Q. Does the Chinaman really, then, come in competition with the white man?—A. Yes, sir; he does.

Q. If the white man can manufacture one-fourth more in a day than a Chinaman, what wages would he make?—A. At the same rate of wages he would make one-fourth more, if they are paid the same price for the same article.

Q. Would not that equalize it with the eastern prices?—A. I think not.

Q. You think the eastern prices are higher than that?—A. Yes, sir, I think they are.

MICHAEL HAYES sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. About twenty-five years.

Q. Have you ever been interested in mining and followed that occupation?—A. No, sir; I never followed that occupation. I am in business.

Q. You are acquainted with miners' wages, &c., and the ground worked by miners?

Mr. BROOKS. What is the use of asking Mr. Hayes about such things? He has lived in this city here all his life. Thousands of men could testify better than he on those subjects. I do not believe he was ever in a mine in his life. [To the witness.] Were you, Mike?—A. Yes, sir. I visited the mines on many occasions, but I never worked in them.

By Mr. KING:

Q. What is your experience as to the use of Chinese and white labor in the mines so far as you have observed it, if you are acquainted with the subject?—A. I think permitting the Chinese to work the placer-mines is a great injury to California and a great injury to the United States, in fact.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. It reduces the price of gold?—A. I do not know that it reduces the price of gold either, but it reduces the quantity that finds its way into the banks of the United States.

By Mr. KING:

Q. State whatever views you have on the subject. I am not acquainted with them.—A. I have seen the Chinese working the placer-mines. In fact they have control of nearly all the placer-diggings; that is, where small wages are earned, in the various counties where I have been.

Q. Why are they disadvantageous on that account?—A. Because they take from the ground what will never return to it again. They are depriving people who may come hereafter of the opportunity to earn a livelihood here. There is very little inducement for people to come here now, on account of the price of wages.

Q. Do they send this gold out of the country?—A. It is presumed they do. I will explain. Some few years ago if a river-gulch, a placer-claim, did not pay more than $5 a day the parties would throw it up and sell it to the Chinamen and hunt better diggings. The Chinamen have from year to year worked at those abandoned claims. If they had not worked them out that gold would be still there for persons who would be satisfied to earn from two to three dollars a day. They have taken the gold out; it is not there now for the new-comers; and so they are continuing to work the placer-mines year after year.

Q. Where does this gold go? If it has any circulation in the State it is not an injury.—A. It was shown by the record that when the steamer Republic was burned between Japan and China, and I think Captain Warsaw so testified, many Chinamen were drowned from the weight of bullion about their persons. No man can learn what the Chinamen take back to China, or what the Chinese companies extract from the mines.

Q. State as a general rule whether they leave this gold in the country or whether it is taken to China?—A. It is my impression and the impression of most people that they carry it to China or send it to China through the Chinese companies.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. How would that be effected if they were permitted to become citizens?—A. If they were permitted to become citizens it would have no effect on their desire to reside in the country, because a Chinaman will return to China with five or six hundred dollars with him, and he there, with that amount, becomes a man of standing, while five or six hundred dollars is a very small trifle, you might say, here. There he would settle down and purchase himself almost all the luxuries that the middlemen in this country may have. Therefore there is no inducement for him to stay here. I believe the elective franchise would be used as merchandise for sale to any party who would pay him.

Q. In your opinion, then, he is not fitted for it?—A. No, sir; I do not think he is fitted for it.

Q. You think he cannot be fitted for it?—A. No, sir; it is not his nature.

FRANK M. PIXLEY sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. You will please state what you know about the broom-making business.—Answer. I am called, as I understand, to explain a

single incident. About ten or eleven years ago my brother, who is a poor man and a mechanic, engaged in the business of manufacturing broom-handles at the corner of Brannan street. He employed about six workmen. Their wages were from three to four and a half dollars per day, according to their skill in running turning-lathes.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. He employed white men?—A. White men. My brother is a man of family, having a wife and two children. He has been taught to live in a certain way, in accordance with our civilization. Shortly after he had gotten into the business some one else established a broom-factory, and employed four or five Chinese to work in it. In a very short time these Chinese became so expert in the manufacture that they established the trade themselves, with one white man as foreman. The capital required was not large, and the result was that the six or seven Chinamen, under a white man, took up the business. They were required to keep a horse and wagon to dispose of their wares. This horse was kept in a stable. The Chinese lived in the same stable with the horses, fed and cooked for themselves in an upper loft, and slept there, and so reduced the wages that much; thrusting, in this particular instance, my brother out of the employment. This is a single incident, and the only one that I have been called upon to prove, tending to show, as it did convince me, (this was about eleven years ago,) that no white person with a family can compete with Chinese in that branch of business. I think they cannot compete with Chinese in any branch.

Q. What do you think would be the effect if the Chinese should be excluded? Would a sufficiency of labor flock to this coast to fill their places, or otherwise?—A. If no Chinese had come to California, it is my judgment that our trades and manufactures would have grown a little slower than they have; that some people would have made less money than they have, but that they would have grown, and to the present extent, with white labor; and while they may have been less remunerative to some of the capitalists, they would have been more highly remunerative to the laborers. Just as much money would have been made, but it would have been distributed among the laboring or working men more than it is now. To remove all the Chinese workers from their various industries would create a temporary embarrassment undoubtedly at present; but that embarrassment would be but temporary, and we should soon fill their places with white, intelligent European and American laborers.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you think it would test the experiment to stop the importation of Chinese, and treat those who are here with the equal protection of the laws?—A. I think your statements in regard to the unkind treatment of Chinese have been most grossly exaggerated, and that they are not true. So far as my observation has gone, no Chinaman has ever been killed; there have never been any riots against them, and there has never been anything like a popular opinion that justified the persecution of the Chinese. The cases are exceptional where ill-regulated white boys have been guilty sometimes of that kind of conduct.

Q. That is not any answer to my question, which is a fair one, I think, whether stopping the importation of Chinese would test the question which you present. You have said that you think it would not be wise to send those who are here away and deprive the manufacturers of Chinese labor?—A. I did not say it would not be wise. I think it would be the wisest thing that could be done to send them all away. I think it

would be attended with temporary embarrassment to present employers and the various industries, however.

Q. I ask you whether it would test the wisdom of that to stop the importation of Chinese and give those who are here the equal protection of the laws?—A. I think it would be very much tested to that extent to stop any from coming. The Chinese problem would solve itself in process of time, because they are adult males, producing but very few children. They are not raising a generation of Chinese here to any extent. Many would return, many would die, and many would be scattered over the various States and cities of the Union; and we would thus be greatly relieved if we could prevent any more from coming.

Q. I understood you to say, in the course of this examination, that you do not advocate the exclusion of the Chinese who are here?—A. I do not. I think they are here under the guarantee of law and treaty, by invitation of our treaties, and by pure forbearance and indulgence; and that now we are estopped from driving those away who have thus come here.

Q. And you would not refuse them the equal protection of the laws?—A. Not at all. I would give them the fullest protection.

Q. When you speak of our civilization, do you mean the civilization of California?—A. No, sir.

Q. What civilization do you mean by "our civilization?"—A. I mean the civilization that has grown up within the last six hundred years in Europe, and perhaps longer, which has been brought from Europe to this country and has developed here; in general terms, Christian civilization.

Q. Are there not many parts of Europe where women are harnessed with dogs to carts?—A. I have never seen women harnessed with dogs to carts. I have seen in Belgium and Germany women with dogs; for instance, in Belgium, in the selling of small commodities, or gathering of refuse in the street, the peddling of milk and vegetables. The kind of work that is done a great deal by hand-cart men here, is done in that country by dogs in carts, with women attending them.

Q. You have never seen women harnessed with dogs in carts going to market?—A. Not at all. The woman will assist in pushing the cart over difficult points, uprising ground, or anything of that kind.

Q. Do you not believe that that is so?—A. I traveled very thoroughly through Germany, Belgium, and all parts of Europe. I simply say I never saw it.

Q. We receive immigrants from there, do we not?—A. We do.

Q. You have no objection to their coming here?—A. On the contrary, I would be glad to see more of them here.

Q. Are there not some parts of Europe where a husband will not speak to his wife in the street, and where she is not allowed to mention his name or address him by name?—A. I do not know of any such place. You know that I do not speak all the modern languages of Europe.

Q. I am not speaking of personal knowledge, but from your reading.—A. I never heard of an instance like that.

Q. Are there not some parts of Europe where a portion of the inhabitants live in a cabin with a pig, and eat mostly potatoes?—A. I suppose you refer to Ireland. I never saw that. They have their cabins of the poor, they have their pigs and their poultry, and they live poorly, very poorly in many places.

Q. You would not object to receiving them as immigrants because they have been compelled to live more meanly in that country than they can live here?—A. Not at all.

Q. That would be no objection to them?—A. Not at all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you or have you not observed that when persons who live poorly in Europe come here, they readily adapt themselves to our scale of comfort, according to the means which they can earn by their wages?—A. There is no doubt that the European immigrant, however poor he may be, immediately takes a position in society, so far as comforts and home are concerned, and brings about him all the refinement, and educates his children, and clothes himself up to the fullest possibility of their earnings. And there is this observable, however poor may be the European immigrant, the second generation is an improvement, and the third generation is American. We are all immigrants for that matter; or our ancestors were immigrants.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. I read in the paper here before me, the morning paper: "On Thursday evening, about 10 o'clock, a Chinaman was knocked down and cruelly beaten by a man on the corner of Peck and Eighth streets. The cries of the Chinaman for help aroused the residents of the block, but the assailant made his escape." Do you not read such items in the papers nearly every day?—A. I read them frequently.

Q. Did you not read within two or three days past that a Chinaman was assailed in Merchant street, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, in the heart of the town, and knocked down a cellar-way and very badly beaten, and no arrest made?—A. I did not happen to see that circumstance.

Q. You say that these outrages do not take place. Do you not know, as a matter of fact, that they do?—A. I did not say that they did not take place. I say they are grossly exaggerated by your statements.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you read the account in the paper the other day of a gentleman of this city going home who was garroted and robbed of his money and watch—a white man who was robbed? I think he was one of the editors of one of our papers.—A. Yes, sir. In reference to this question of the persecution of the Chinese, I am only surprised that there is not more of it. I think our laboring people are a long-suffering and forbearing people, that they have not created much more of a muss than has already been created. Perhaps it may not be unfit to state to the commission that our city has been as near to a disgraceful and bloody riot as it could possibly be, and that it was avoided by people who have not had the credit of saving the town from such a scandal.

Q. Will you state who they were who saved the town?—A. Well, no.

Q. Why should you not mention the fact?—A. This man, who was on the stand the other day, Mr. A. M. Winn, was one.

Q. What objection is there to mentioning the names of those who were the saviors of the country?—A. There were men, leading men, in this anti-Chinese movement who could have stirred up a riot, who, by the lifting of their thumbs, could have cleaned the Chinese quarter out. They did not do it, but, on the contrary, exercised their best influence from their known friendship to the people opposed to the Chinese, and mollified their passion in hopes that Congress would give them some more permanent and better relief.

Q. Who were they who were going to create this riot?—A. People who were driven to starvation and poverty, with their wives and children, deprived of employment by the influx of Chinese immigration—men to whom this question comes to the breakfast and dinner table, to whom it is the question of bread.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Why do you not substantiate the charge that people are brought to that degradation here? You have the opportunity now.—A. It has been established by every witness on the stand.

Q. Have you not been charged with making a speech here in which you claimed that the people were justified in going down and burning the Pacific-Mail steamers at the dock?—A. On one occasion, some fifteen years ago, in speaking of the incursion of these barbarians on the coast, I said if Chinese prostitution and the introduction of gamblers, and criminals, and thieves could not be prevented in any other way, it would be better to burn the steamers from China at the dock. I have never yet modified that opinion; and I question very much to-day whether, had that been done fifteen years ago, it would not have so startled civilization and our law-makers that they would have earlier taken this matter into consideration and saved us from Chinese immigration.

Q. As a laboring class, what is their character?—A. They are patient, industrious, hard-working slaves, respecting our laws, through fear, and being compelled to labor for their own support.

Q. Are they a superior of the African race socially?—A. No, sir; they are not. They are the inferior of any race God has ever made, in my opinion.

Q. Suppose the State of Virginia, or the State of Tennessee, or any other Southern State (you know the great labor question there is now the problem) should to-day exchange one hundred thousand negroes for one hundred thousand Chinese laborers, what effect would it have on that State? Take the State of Tennessee.—A. It would demoralize the State of Tennessee; and the introduction of a hundred thousand colored people would to that extent elevate and help them, and be very much less of an evil than the hundred thousand Chinese that we have on our coast.

Q. Assuming the fact that the great labor problem in the South is unsolved, that the negro there is lazy and will not work, what would be the condition of the State of Tennessee five years hence, as to its production, if a hundred thousand Chinese laborers were imported there, in comparison with that number of negroes?—A. I think it would be infinitely worse to have the Chinamen.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Do you not discriminate between these Chinamen who come here?—A. No, sir; not at all. I understand, of course, that some of them are superior, some of them better; but the same organic construction is from the highest mandarin to the lowest prostitute. They have the same religion; they have the same habits; and if you take from a mandarin his education and his opportunity and place him in the other position, he becomes the same.

Q. You find that some of them here are men of education, men of ability, who manage business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you proscribe that class of Chinamen entirely?—A. If by some judicious tribunal we could bring the very best and better class of Chinese to this country under the treaty, men who come for business, who come for pleasure, who come for the higher pursuits of commerce, I would have the door opened to them.

Q. But you would limit and restrict the laboring and more ignorant class?—A. Yes. There are 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 Chinese. They are separated from our coast by a narrow and very mild sea. They

can come here for $12 apiece. To throw open our continent and its broad area, all its mineral wealth, its agricultural resources, and its mechanical employment to the importation of this people is simply to invite upon us the barbaric scourge that once visited Europe.

Q. Do you think the business interests of this country would be rather improved and benefited by the immigration here of the better class of Chinese?—A. I have no doubt that the immigration which has already and that which may promise to come enables certain industries to flourish and certain people to make money; but looking at the money-making as a principle so much below the other considerations, the moral and the social and the political dangers, I do not think it ought to enter into the consideration of the community and the intelligent people who discuss the question.

Q. You find men here engaged in higher pursuits, merchants, bankers, &c., among the Chinamen?—A. There are merchants, but no bankers, that I know of.

Q. They do some banking business among themselves?—A. Probably.

Q. Do you not think the business interests of this community are benefited by that class?—A. I think not. I think it had better be done by our own merchants and bankers.

Q. You think it would be good policy on the part of this Government to restrict that class of men?—A. To discourage them, yes; to restrict them, no.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean by the word "restrict?"—A. I mean to say to absolutely inhibit them from coming. We have this question to-day; it is here upon us. There is no use in talking of what we have done. We have 250,000 Chinamen here. I would treat it as a practical question, and I would regard humanity toward those who have come. I would respect the invitation we have sent them. I would respect the treaty that has existed; but I would so direct future legislation that practically the Chinese should not come to this coast. Europe is separated from Africa by the Mediterranean; and in the history of the twelve centuries of which we are better informed the African has not been permitted to come over and effect a lodgment on the European side. I think that was wise policy on the part of the European governments; and I think it would be wise for us to draw the line here and let the Pacific Ocean keep us separated from the possibility of the encroachment of this Asiatic population.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. Would you not obtain all the relief substantially that you desire by limiting the importation of the laboring classes?—A. I think that is the great evil, in comparison with which the other would not be considered. There would be no commission on this subject if it had not been for the importation of these unskilled laborers and their influence upon our laboring classes. It is the laboring class that is feeling this difficulty, and that is the class upon which is founded the very superstructure of our society under our form of government.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. I understood you to say that the Chinese are the lowest of all created intelligence?—A. I think there are none so low. There are parts of Africa where the standard of intelligence is lower, but the standard of morals is better; that is, they are more honest. These people have got the perfection of the crimes of four thousand years, of a

civilization that has grown out of a redundant population. As, for instance, why do we treasure our girls, and why do they murder them? Because they have so many they cannot feed them. Why do our parens die for our children while they sell them for whores?

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You do not suppose that occurs with the better class of Chinamen?—A. I think not. I think it is the necessity and poverty of the lower class that compels the woman to sell her child; and then with long use and growth of that system, it has blunted their moral sensibilities, until they look upon raising a female child for prostitution as I look upon raising a Jersey cow for sale. That is the result of their long years of that kind of civilization.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. As a nation, have they not more and a better civilization than the African? They have both had the same opportunity, the same liberty to build up a civilization.—A. The same opportunity?

Q. Both have been free men at home.—A. The ways of Providence are inscrutable, and the luck of nations so changed that I cannot tell.

Q. Yet the one has built up a civilization?—A. Of this kind.

Q. With arts, sciences, and all that?—A. It has built up such a civilization that I think it would be better if it had the absence of civilization that Africa has.

Q. They have arts, sciences, and a literature peculiar to themselves?—A. They have their Chinese literature, which, as you have seen brought out here, is the teachings of Confucius and Mencius.

Q. They have arts?—A. They have some arts.

Q. They have sciences, have they not, at home?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that so with the African?—A. No, it is not so with the present African; yet Hannibal was an African; Carthage was an African city. Many parts of Africa, in the early ages, attained a civilization that the Chinese have not attained.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Carthage was a Phœnician colony.—A. It was a Phœnician colony, but it was in Africa.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. I am speaking of the African race. Have they ever built up a civilization at home with arts and sciences of any kind?—A. No.

Q. You spoke of the morals and the religion of the Chinese. Is not the Chinese religion an improvement on the paganism, or the want of religion, of the native African?—A. The Chinese religion, if I understand it, is pure fatalism.

Q. What is the African religion?—A. The African religion is worse; fetish, if they have any at all.

Q. Do you not think that contact with the white race would improve both of them, or either of them?—A. I do think the contact of 40,000,000 of our civilization with 400,000,000 of the Chinese civilization would improve them. I think it would reduce ours to their level, and not elevate ours, but theirs; that is the danger.

Q. You have not much faith, then, in the power of our civilization?—A. Yes; our civilization has accomplished great results. It is possible of greater accomplishment; but there are certain things which it cannot accomplish. It cannot accomplish the christianization or civilization of China.

Q. You think they are beyond the power or strength of our civilization?—A. No; they are simply crystallized into their own opinions. Long centuries of time have convinced them that theirs is better and higher than ours, and that we are the outside barbarians and the inferior. You have got to attack a prejudice that is ingrained in them, as I say, the growth of 4,000 years.

Q. Are you afraid of error as against truth? Do you not think that truth would ultimately win when brought in contact with error?—A. Truth gets along so slow, and error gets along so fast, that we cannot wait.

Q. Which would triumph in the end?—A. I do not know which would triumph in the end, nor do I think it practical to inquire, for in the mean time our laboring people are starving.

Q. It is a question, then, of labor?—A. It is a question of labor now, and in future it would become a question of civilization.

Q. You were asked in regard to the outrages committed upon the Chinese. You say you have read them daily?—A. O, yes.

Q. Do you think the intelligence of this community sustains such conduct?—A. On the contrary, Senator, when I saw this great laboring class, numbering some thirty thousand of our working-people, worked up to a pitch of desperation, almost, and fanned by considering the question among themselves up to a point when they were almost ready to say, "We will not endure this longer quietly, but take force and work it out," then I say the better sentiment of this community rose up to vindicate the rights and protect the lives of these Chinese. In the great meeting of the 5th of April, if you could have heard the remarks of the speakers on that occasion, I think there was not one of them who did not call upon the people to maintain order, to be quiet and to wait for a peaceful and legal solution of this difficulty. The second resolution which they passed, which is in evidence here, declared that we are a lawful and law-abiding people, that we recognize the obligation and binding force of the treaties by which the Chinese came here, and we propose to respect it, and continue to protect them.

Q. It would be unjust, then, to a large majority here to hold them responsible for such outrages?—A. It is unjust.

Q. They do not approve such conduct?—A. If you saw a Chinaman assaulted in Montgomery or Merchant street, and if there were three white people there, two of them would turn in and defend the Chinaman against the assailant.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You state that as a fact?—A. I state that as a fact.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. And yet the outrages do occur?—A. And yet the outrages do happen in certain portions of our town. We have got an element of wild young men here, and they dislike the Chinaman.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Speaking of the want of civilization in Africa, is that affected by the want of fertility of the land, by extensive deserts, &c., to any extent, in your judgment?—A. Africa is a *terra incognita;* it is unknown; it is unexplored. There are vast regions there and vast tribes of people that only within the explorations of a few years have really been brought to our attention.

Q. You know from those authorities that vast deserts, scarcity of rain, &c., exist?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you not aware that China is a fertile country?—A. It must be one of the most productive regions of the world, judging from the amount of human life it sustains.

Q. How would you think, then, that those facts would bear upon the power of the people civilizing the country?—A. Those are the elements that enter into the growth of nations and the development of civilization.

Q. Then in that respect the negro in Africa has been at great disadvantage you think?—A. Well, yes.

Q. Have you read the statements of philosophers that a nation in order to be civilized needs that its country shall be penetrated by large rivers, and shall be accessible to the coast by means of these rivers and to the outside world?—A. I believe it is a maxim that commerce is a great civilizer. Wherever you can carry trade and commerce you can carry arts and manufactures and incentives to the pursuits of labor.

Q. Is it not a fact that Africa is not cut by these large rivers, so that commerce is almost impossible?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. What part of it?—A. The entire part of it.

Q. Have you read Baker and Speke?—A. Very few navigable waters come down to the ocean.

Q. They might be made navigable. Take the Nile, for instance. Is there not navigation of the Nile where they have penetrated those rivers and lakes?—A. So we understand from Livingstone and Stanley and others, that there are great internal bodies of water.

Q. Which might be made navigable?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is not the interior fertile?—A. I understand that many parts of Africa are fertile, but, as our Senator says, there are vast and almost impenetrable deserts there.

Q. In Central Africa?—A. Not in Central Africa.

Q. That is what I am speaking of.—A. I am speaking more of Northern Africa.

Q. There is less civilization in Central Africa than any other part?—A. So it seems.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The Nile is the navigable river of Africa?—A. The great artery, I understand.

Q. Has not that been the seat of the civilization of Africa?—A. In the earlier times, as indicated by the remnants of great cities and architectural ruins, Thebes, I believe.

Q. It is the seat of what civilization there is in Africa at the present time?—A. I think it is.

Q. Does not that prove the rule that these great navigable rivers are necessary to the civilization of a country?—A. I think if you two Senators should discuss this question from your own learning, rather than from any evidence you get out of me, it would be just as well.

Q. Does not Livingstone speak of the great deserts which he crossed with very great difficulty which separated the different tribes of Africa?—A. Yes, sir; not only great deserts, but great jungles, impenetrable forests, and morasses and marshes, and countries where the mosquitoes, and a class of annoyance of that kind, rendered the penetration into Africa almost impossible in many places.

Q. Have you read Buckle?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the statement he makes of the effect of jungles, morasses, earthquakes, omnipotent and terrible manifestations of nature in producing superstition upon the residents there?—A. Yes.

Q. Has Africa those conditions?—A. Africa, I should suppose, more than any other portion of the world, has those conditions.

Q. Senator Cooper called your attention to the fact that there might be river improvements and lake improvements by which navigation could penetrate to Africa. Are you not aware that no people make these improvements who have not at first attained civilization enough to show the necessity for them?—A. I think civilization commences on the coast of any country, and as they engage in commerce and trade they find the necessity of markets for their exports, and the necessity of going to the interior for them gradually follows, and in process of ages a trade and commerce grow up that extends to the interior parts. In the process of time it may come to Africa.

Q. Are you not aware that the coast of Africa generally, by what you have read, is troubled by very infectious vapors very deadly to white men?—A. Undoubtedly Africa has all the diseases incident to tropical and swamp countries.

By Mr. MEADE:

Q. You are aware that it has been the *desideratum* of the European nations for many centuries to control the East Indian trade?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you not think prohibiting the immigration of Chinese traders here would tend to throw that trade which we are now acquiring into the hands of other nations?—A. think not. I think if the English had prohibited the people of Hindostan and of the Peninsula from coming to London or England it would have made no difference in the development of their trade. It comes entirely in another way.

Q. Do you think the introduction of these traders here encourages this trade with East India?—A. I do not think the introduction of the 150,000 Chinese we have now has any appreciable effect upon our oriental trade.

Q. I am speaking of traders?—A. Nor has the introduction of their traders had any appreciable effect upon the trade, but, as I mean always to say, all these questions of trade, and commerce, and money-making, and manufactures, and industries, in my mind, are subrogated to greater and higher considerations. I would desire to keep this coast and this country as the heritage and home of an emigration that can become united with us, that can assimilate with us, and that can make a great State and a great people, highly civilized, and belonging to our race, and not to come in contact with any other civilization. In other words, as I have often said, as I like my wife and my children and my family better than I have a right to like anybody else's wife or children or family, so I like my country better than anybody else's country, and my people better than anybody else's people. I do not think the particular ground of the brotherhood of man or the fatherhood of God could sway me from the belief that we got this country for ourselves; that it is our country, and that we should exclude this people, without considering their trade or their commerce, or their souls to be saved. I think the case of our State to-day is parallel with that of Virginia. One hundred and fifty to three hundred years ago Virginia had a broad acreage, a splendid soil, an inviting climate, but few white people; labor was dear. They wanted cheap labor, and through the merchants of Boston and New England, then engaged in the slave-trade, negroes were imported there, and the result, after 100 or 150 years, has been a war and a desolation that has injured our country more than all the other things united in the world. Now, we have the parallel of it here. We are a broad empire. We

have a splendid climate, rich land, and there are some people who indulge in the heresy of thinking we ought to have cheap labor. I do not think so. They send to China for it. We are planting the seeds of Mongolian slavery here, that will grow up to be just as formidable and is growing more rapidly than it did on the eastern coast; for it took Virginia 100 years to get as many Africans as we got Chinamen here in ten years.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Is it a fact or not that Chinese labor is really a species of servile labor, different from the white labor of the country?—A. It is entirely different. In one sense technically you may say it is free.

Q. I mean in fact.—A. In fact it is not free labor. In a technical legal sense it is free labor. A Chinaman comes here, and has a right to contract with the Chinese six companies or to contract with anybody else. He enters freely into the contract, I presume, except in instances of fraud or superinducement; but in one sense it is free. You cannot certainly under our laws buy and sell a man to the performance of labor either for a term of years or for life. You cannot control him. If he will invoke our laws, the moment he does he is as free as anybody; but, at the same time, they do not speak our language nor understand the philosophy of our law. We do not speak their language, and cannot communicate to them even their rights. It is growing upon this coast, and as it develops it will tend to increase a power under the American civilization superior to the American law.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You illustrated the effect of Chinese immigration by the State of Virginia and the immigration of the African race. Was the effect there to reduce the civilization of Virginia to the African standard?—A. No, it was not.

Q. Why?—A. Because it grew there very slowly in Virginia. I will not undertake to give the statistics; but, as I say, it was nearly a hundred years in growing there as it has grown here in ten years. You know how slow and imperceptible the growth of slavery was; but in the mean while the increase of the white population of Virginia was more rapid than that of California. It has been a long distance to get whites out here, and now we bring Chinamen for $12 a piece, and we bring them from a hive where there are 400,000,000.

Q. Suppose you should treble the population of the inferior race, do you think the higher civilization would be brought down, or would the lower civilization be elevated by contact?—A. I have some peculiar views upon that point. I have an idea that the poorest Mexican who comes here, the most ignorant and illiterate belonging to my race, has the same rights and the same authority to become himself a leader. I have no more right to keep him under me than he has to keep me under him. I would elevate the whole. I would not have a condition of things here as in India.

Q. Suppose that to be so, he is of our higher civilization. Have you any fear of his contact with an inferior civilization? Would he go down or bring the other up?—A. I think, to make the question a practical one, if you ask me my opinion, with the Chinese it would tend to deteriorate us and retard our growth, and perhaps permanently to menace and affect us.

Q. Do you think the European civilization is endangered by contact with the Asiatic civilization?—A. I think the civilization of California, which is the question we are testing now, is endangered. I think it may

be overrun. Should it be possible that in some period of political madness they should give to these people the right of the elective franchise, at the next gubernatorial election we would have either a Chinaman for governor or we would have a man elected by Chinese votes, and in two years from now, when we re-elect our mayor, they would elect a Chinaman. If you let them be voted to-day, the adult male Chinese population outnumber the voting population of San Francisco. I would take away from politicians the temptation to strike this blow at civilization.

Q. Do I understand you to believe that if they were enfranchised they would exercise that privilege freely of their own volition?—A. Freely of their own volition at once. They are a shrewd, subtle, keen, intelligent people. Anybody who undertakes to underrate them as inferior, mistakes this whole problem.

Q. They are not the inferior race?—A. They are not the inferior race. Tested by many things they are the superior race. They have kept up a form of government many thousands of years, while it has defeated the intelligence of Europeans to maintain a dynasty for more than 500 or 600 years. Tested by the power of supporting life upon a given area of territory, they are superior. I have never indulged myself in considering the Chinese question in the belief that they were an inferior race. They are not inferior. In many respects they are superior.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. When you spoke of their inferiority, you referred to their vices.—A. To their vices.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You do not believe, then, that they could be bought and sold if they were trusted with the elective franchise?—A. Clearly I do; bought and sold.

A. And yet they are the superior race?—A. Yet they are the superior race.

Q. They would be buyers rather than sellers in that case?—A. Understand me. I say as to many things they are our superiors, but as to government and the knowledge of our institutions and respect or love for them, or regard for them, they would have none. Politics here would become merely merchandise. The election of legislatures would be to them to make a code in which they should have immunities; to make municipal officers would be to elect a chief of police who would let them gamble, and play tan, and have lotteries, and whore-houses, and a chief magistrate who would wink at all their iniquities.

Q. And you think they would vote to carry that out?—A. Undoubtedly they would.

Q. Instead of selling their votes to somebody else? Suppose a purchaser came along and offered them a better government?—A. I think they would have to bid very high.

Q. He could buy them, in your opinion?—A. In my opinion. For instance, suppose we could give a dozen of them to-morrow the elective franchise, those who have been here 20 years. They would be a very small factor in the great question. They would be for sale. Suppose, then, they should add 4,000, 5,000, 6,000, or 10,000 a year up to the period when they would control politics, and they would be for sale. They would sell their votes. They would place them where they would do the most good for themselves, and when they got in a majority, where they could control the politics of the country, they would take it and elect their own people.

Q. Independent of the other, the selling, consideration?—Independent of the other consideration, because that would do them the most good.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Wherein are they inferior as a race?—A. As we understand, they attained the acme of their civilization a long time ago, and they have stood still. We are a progressive nation. They invented type, and yet they have not carried it to the extent of a power-press. They invented gunpowder, and yet they did not carry it to the extent of developing the machinery of war for its use. They invented the compass, and yet they never extended their commerce over the world guided by the compass; so that they are an anomalous and a curious people to us. We do not understand them. I do not. I do not undertake to understand them, but I say in many things they seem to have attained a wonderful superiority.

Q. Is it not possible that the principle you stated a few minutes ago may have some influence on their commerce? Is it not the fact that up to the time of the discovery of America their civilization was about up with the rest of the world?—A. I have read Abbé Huc, who penetrated very far into the interior, and who was among the first travelers in China. It strikes me that it is a very questionable civilization. It is so utterly repugnant to our ideas of civilization, except when you regard some point in the abstract, that we can make no comparison with it.

Q. Go back two or three centuries in our own civilization, and it is very repugnant to our present notions.—A. No doubt two or three centuries ago we were like the barbarians in the forests in Germany; but we have grown and developed.

Q. After the discovery of America commerce became much more extended; intercourse between different nations of our people became much more extended. May this not have been influenced a good deal by the fact that our civilization has progressed more rapidly in these latter centuries?—A. That is not a question for this investigation or for me to answer.

HERMAN SILVERBERG sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. What is your occupation at present?—Answer. Foreman at the Standard Shirt Factory.

Q. How many Chinese are there in this city, in your estimation, engaged in manufacturing shirts?—A. Do I understand you, white shirts or colored shirts?

Q. Such as are made at your factory. What kind are they?—A. We make all classes of goods; white, colored, and everything in that line. As to their number, I have no idea in the colored line. Of white shirts I suppose there are somewhere in the neighborhood of a hundred employed.

Q. Are there many more in the other shirts?—A. Yes; many more in the others, which includes clothing, overalls, &c.

Q. Have you any Chinese employed at your factory?—A. I have.

Q. How many?—A. We have in the neighborhood of seventy or eighty in the interior, and perhaps double that number outside.

Q. Can the shirt-manufacturing business, in your opinion, be carried on by white labor?—A. It can.

Q. How much wages are paid to white hands?—A. They are paid by the piece.

Q. How much does a fair workman earn per week on an average?—A. An experienced hand can earn from $8 to $10; some more.

Q. How much do the Chinese earn?—A. They earn the same.

Q. If the Chinese were absent from the city, do you think you would have enough white labor here and that enough white immigrants would come here to carry on the business?—A. Not at present.

Q. Do you think there would be enough eventually?—A. Eventually there might come a class of skilled labor here that could do the work.

Q. Chinese labor was not skilled when it was first employed here?—A. No, sir; but it was the class of labor that was here, and they were instructed in that business, for there were no others here to do it.

Q. You say that this class of labor engaged in your business has been instructed by white labor?—A. They have been instructed by white labor.

Q. Do you employ many boys and girls in factories of this kiud?—A. The work is done almost exclusively by female help.

Q. How many such factories are there in this town?—A. There are several on a smaller scale; I do not know the number.

Q. What is your opinion as to the effect of the employment of Chinese labor in your business upon white immigration skilled in your trade?—A. I believe that as many as can get here could get employment at better rates than they get in the Eastern States.

Q. White?—A. White.

Q. Do you think Chinese competition has the effect of preventing white immigration at present?—A. I think not.

Q. State anything else in connection with the trade that you desire.—A. I have nothing to state.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long has this occupation of these manufacturing interests which you represent been carried to the extent that it is now?—A. In California?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I believe about something over a year. It started three years ago.

Q. Previous to that time where were we supplied from with those commodities?—A. From Philadelphia and New York.

Q. How many females are engaged in your business, directly and indirectly?—A. As a whole?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I have not the slightest idea.

Q. Give your opinion.—A. I do not know. There may be three, or four, or five, or six hundred; somewhere in the neighborhood of five or six hundred.

Q. How many were engaged in it four years ago?—A. Perhaps twenty-five or thirty.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. In your experience, are the Chinese industrious or otherwise?—A. They are industrious.

Q. How long does it take them to learn a trade?—A. In our trade they become experienced hands from a year to eighteen months, some of them not so long as that.

Q. Do they learn as readily as the white race?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As quickly?—A. They learn as readily as whites.

Q. Do they make as good workmen afterward?—A. I have not had the experience to judge between the two.

By Mr. KING:

Q. How much experience have you had?—A. I have been in California here with Neustater Brothers four years.

Q. Are you acquainted with the prices of labor in the East?—A. Not late prices.

Q. How much are they paying apiece in the East for this shirt-work?—A. I have not a correct idea, therefore I do not think I will give it.

Q. Do you know how much they will earn there per week?—A. I do not know.

Q. How do you know that all labor is better paid here?—A. From all sources labor is better paid here. I am better paid here than I was at home.

Q. I mean the laborers, the women who manufacture the shirts.—A. There are one or two girls who are working for us who say they get more here than they did at home; that is the extent of my knowledge on that subject.

Q. You pay white help no more than you pay Chinese help?—A. White help is employed in separate departments, not in the same class of work with the Chinese.

Q. How do you employ your Chinese?—A. They are employed by the piece.

Q. But in what manner do you obtain the number of Chinese that you desire?—A. I could not state. I have not engaged in the business.

Q. Do you know whether they are contracted for by one man?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you know how their wages are paid?—A. Their wages are paid to each, individually.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. I want to know how these men are instructed, by whom?—A. These men, a few of them, are accustomed to the business, and they instruct the others. I suppose that at first they learned from whites.

Q. You have to begin at the very bottom with them, do you not?—A. We never began with ours; there were a few of them experienced, and they taught the others.

Q. Do the Chinamen, when they come here, understand the language that you use?—A. No, sir.

Q. You cannot talk with them and give them instructions?—A. None.

Q. There are a few Chinamen who learn the business and teach the others?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do these Chinamen whom you employ there come to the store for employment?—A. No, they have been brought there by friends of theirs who have worked there; when we want more help it is the same as an advertisement to tell one of them you require more help, for they are forthcoming.

Q. You tell some one of the workmen that you want more and they bring their friends with them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the trades that are taught here these Chinamen have to be taught right from the bottom up, do they not; none of these trades are pursued in the same way in China?—A. No.

Q. Nobody who comes from China can be put at once to work at our trades?—A. In regard to other trades than my own I have no knowledge. I can only speak of my own. They certainly have no knowledge in China of making such shirts as we are accustomed to wear.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Did your firm advertise that you did not employ Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you never advertise that?—A. No, sir. We advertised that we were willing to employ all the white labor that we could use. We were willing to do that providing that they would come here and give time to learn the business.

Q. How much time will it take?—A. It depends altogether upon the price and the aptness of the person to learn.

Q. How many applicants have you had for work when you advertised?—A. We have had a great many applicants. Some of them have come there and staid one or two days, and thought they could not afford to lose so much time and have gone away. We have perhaps of 60 or 50 applicants about 12 remaining who have become fair workers.

Q. How long was it before they became fair workers?—A. It took some of them two months or three months.

Q. How much was paid them in the mean time?—A. They were paid by the dozen.

Q. At what rates per dozen?—A. There are different details, different parts done, which the commission would not exactly understand. Different parts are done by different sets of hands, each separately.

Q. How much do you pay these new hands?—A. According to the grade of the shirt, from $2 upward.

Q. A dozen?—A. A dozen.

Q. How many dozen could they make in a week of that kind?—A. Do you refer to experienced hands?

Q. No; I am referring to these new hands.—A. They would make perhaps at least one dozen, one and a half, afterward two and three. We have some girls out there now who make 4 dozen after being there four or five months. After being there four or five months they are enabled to earn from $8 to $10 per week.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do your hands do the work in your factories?—A. That is, except in one branch of the work, which is done almost exclusively outside.

Q. What is that?—A. Needle-work, hand-work.

Q. Hand needle-work?—A. Yes.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Who does that outside?—A. White help.

Q. How much are they able to earn?—A. They are a class that do not work steadily. They are mostly women who have families or girls who have to help their mothers or parents at home, and they do it when they have spare time.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. They do not occupy their whole time?—A. Very few occupy their whole time at that business.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I want to set you right in reference to your testimony as to the price per dozen. You have stated that the making of each department of a garment is confined to several different branches, for instance, the tucking, filling, and hemming?—A. No, not that.

Q. Do you claim the making of an entire shirt for the price you have stated?—A. I do not claim the making of an entire shirt for the price I have stated. It is considerably more than that, because the bosom is

made separately, the muslin is made separately, and the finishing work is done separately. There are three different parts before the shirt is made.

Q. Then it is so much a dozen that you pay for one of these particular parts?—A. No, for each particular one there is a different price. We call the one I have stated making the shirts, that is, after certain parts are done.

By Mr. KING:

Q. State the price for each of those different parts per dozen.—A. There are different prices. In making bosoms it depends upon the amount of labor it requires, from ten cents to two dollars a dozen. It depends upon the amount of labor put upon the bosom. For finishing, from $1.25 to $2 is paid; sometimes higher, but very seldom.

CORNELIUS A. MAHONY sworn and examined.

By Mr. KING:

Question. Have you been engaged in the smelting business?—Answer. I have been engaged in the smelting business in Peru, on the island of San Lorenzo.

Q. Something has been said about the employment of Chinese in Peru; how about it?—A. There are a number of Chinese in Peru. At present, I believe, the government has stopped altogether the further importation of any coolies into Peru, but in 1872 and 1873 there were from 70,000 to 80,000 on a rough estimate. I believe there is very little official detail as to the exact number, but there was something about that number in Peru at that time. The Chinese there all come under labor contracts. In point of fact they are simply slaves. Their contract binds them to serve for eight years. They get, generally, a bounty of $20, or something of that kind; some small sum in Macao where they are shipped. Macao is a small island at the mouth of Canton River, and they are shipped there by Portuguese authorities. Their contracts are generally made, as I understand, before the Portuguese authorities there and before the Peruvian consul. They then are brought on board of ships and confined in a manner that would recall the horrors of the middle passage. They are brought over to Peru. In the year 1872, I have some figures here, the number of Chinese who came was 14,530, and of that number there was an average of about ten per cent. of death-rate on the passage. These Chinese there are just the same class as the Chinese here, that is as far as personal appearance, their intellect, their disposition to morality, and physical condition generally as well as moral condition is concerned. They are exactly the same classes here, and are charged with being river-pirates, or of that class, in fact the lowest order. The firm who were the proprietors of the smelting-works in which I was engaged was the firm of Don Juan Ugarte y Cie. They are the largest cooly importers in Peru, or were, because I believe the traffic has now been stopped, and I understand from a gentleman with whom I was speaking about six months ago that the firm has been broken up. I had under me about from thirty to forty Chinese.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know what kind of measure has been taken to prevent the importation of coolies there by the government?—A. I believe in 1873 there was a dispute between the Portuguese authorities and the Peruvian government. The dispute arose as to the treatment of those coolies on shipboard, at the Chinchas and Guañape islands, where they were employed in the guano-trade. That was got over, and in 1874 the im-

portation was very large. In the mean time a strong sentiment was growing in the country against the Chinese. The laboring people, the peons, considered that the Chinese were likely to reduce the price of labor just as the people here think now, and they did in fact; because a Chinaman's contract bound him to work for $4 a month and two pounds of rice a day. Consequently it was very likely that a peon who wanted a little comfort, who wanted a little meat with his dinner, and wanted a comfortable habitation, naturally felt that he was suffering; and in Peru, as revolutions are easily got up, (for lighter causes than Chinese immigration are likely to cause them,) it brought a certain pressure on the government. It was the congress, I believe, of 1875, which passed the act putting an end in future to all this importation of coolies into Peru.

Q. Have you ever seen that law?—A. I only know from a gentleman who succeeded me in the management of these works, who came over here and was employed in this State. I think he is in Kern County. He told me it had stopped; that the congress had passed a law prohibiting it. In fact I have not read many Peruvian papers since I came here, and the abstracts of the Peruvian news published here is so scant that I cannot get at it.

Q. You cannot give us the provisions of that law?—A. Not at all.

By Mr. KING:

Q. What year was it?—A. I believe it was passed by the congress of 1875, and, of course, the Peruvian consul here would be able to give all information in regard to that law and its effect. The gentleman previously mentioned told me, in connection with the subject, that this firm was no longer able to carry on, because of the law. I do not know that this is the fact, not having been in Peru; but as regards the status of the Chinese in Peru, and the contracts made with them, the peculiar feature was that they never brought over any women. No Chinese women at all were brought over; and indeed I saw but one little Chinese girl in Peru, that was all. The result of this was that crimes of the most horrible and unmentionable kind were common among them, which it was found impossible to prevent. They were in point of fact Sodomites. I must, in justice to the Chinese, say that they were treated very badly in Peru in many cases. In the Guañape islands the unfortunate wretches have thrown themselves by the hundreds into the sea in distraction. They used to get a lot of negro overseers armed with whips, and they would beat them around and all that kind of thing.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. That is on the Guano island?—A. The Guano island, the Guañape, and other islands down there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You speak of the crimes committed among them in the absence of women. What did you refer to, sodomy?—A. Yes, of the worst kind.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did not the government of China send a commission to Peru two or three years ago to stop the cooly traffic?—A. Two years ago I was not in the country. I understand they had negotiations as to the stoppage of the trade.

Q. That trade is stopped?—A. That trade is stopped.

Q. From what ports of China did these immigrants come?—A. I do not know what ports of China they were gathered from, but all were brought to Macao, and I believe were from very short distances from

Macao. I have not been engaged in the shipping of coolies myself. I cannot give any testimony as to the exact ports from which they were received, but from whatever ports they were received there, their condition, intellectual qualifications and general moral and physical condition was exactly the same as it is here apparently to me, except that there is a class here that did not exist in Perú, they coming there in a kind of slave condition. I allude to the merchants and some respectable Chinese that are here.

Q. Is Macao a Portuguese port?—A. It is a Portuguese settlement.

Q. Has the Portuguese government done anything in your knowledge to stop the traffic there?—A. Not to stop the traffic, but to regulate it.

Q. It is pretty effectually regulated, is it not?—A. They published a law or regulations, all of which I have seen in a paper published in Callao, the South Pacific Times. These I know were not observed. I do not know what measures they took to enforce them, but I do not believe such a thing as a death-rate of ten per cent. on board would have occurred if the regulations had been carried out.

Q. Have you heard of a cooly-ship leaving the port of Macao in the last two years?—A. I have not.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Is there any law in Chili forbidding Chinese from coming there?—A. I do not know what the law in Chili is, but I know the Chinese do not come there; that is, the Chinaman that you will see in the streets of Valparaiso will be a very isolated specimen. I have been in Valparaiso, and in parts of Chili where there are large copper mines. If they could get Chinese cheap labor there they would get it, because the labor is necessarily cheaper where a man only gets four dollars a month and is to find his own clothes. But in Peru the feeling against the Chinese, while I was there in 1873 and 1874, was, if anything, stronger than it can possibly be here, for the reason that the people believe that it tends to lower not only the rate of wages but their social status, and feared an intermixture of population. So much is that so that the contracts always have as a stipulation that at the end of the term of eight years the cooly shall be returned to China, and if he is not he has got to sign an additional contract for eight years more. Otherwise he would be packed off to China.

By Mr. KING:

Q. It is compulsory with him to go back?—A. It is compulsory with him. There are cases, I believe, where some Chinamen have been allowed to stop in Lima, but they are so few they amount to nothing. The rule is that they are to be sent back. I believe if they were allowed to go free and compete with labor there, there would be an insurrection almost immediately. It is only this fact, they being a degrading and lower race, that satisfies the people at all. As regards the question of their physical capabilities of labor I think Mr. Harry George here made a statement that they work in factories. That they work I have no doubt, but that they are fit to work along with white men in such work as smelting or any work of that kind is not the fact. I say a man cannot work on rice and do hard manual labor. I gave them just as good meals as any man who wanted to do hard work could get. I disregarded the contract. I think they were on this diet about a fortnight when the spokesman came to me and wanted more rice according to the contract. I told them that I would cut off all the meats and beans and give them only rice. They then weakened on the rice diet and things continued as before. But as regards the labor they could do

under these circumstances, placing them on the same conditions as white men, they are not capable of doing anything that requires physical strength. You cannot teach them to exercise their judgment about any mechanical work. For instance I had one of them to strike in the blacksmith's shop. His hands went up and down like a human machine and he struck, struck, but if you wanted him to make anything he was an utter failure. He had been there for months and appeared to learn precious little. Anything that was repeatedly done he could do, but to suggest a new idea, to say to him "Here is a drawing; I want you to manufacture something," if he had not seen it he could not do it, but if he had seen it he could do it after a little practice. The tools used in smelting are heavy. I found it absolutely necessary to use lighter iron in order that the Chinamen might work. That is on account of their physical condition.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Does it not make some difference in their physical ability owing to the manner in which they have been fed before that, the food they have been brought up to?—A. I considered that matter, but if a man does not get strong in ten months with a good diet and not very hard work I do not think his physical condition will improve. They commenced work at seven o'clock in the morning and finished at five in the evening, with intervals. They appeared to come to us with a constitutional scrofulous taint about them. They were always weak in the joints or getting sores, or getting into a nasty and fearful condition. We used to send out of thirty four or five in a month to the hospital over at Callao, and there was no reason for that that I could see, except that they must have been originally of a very poor, degraded class in China. As regards their educational qualifications, they do not learn English fast; but it is the fact that they do learn Spanish. A Chinaman will learn Spanish, but his idea all the time appears to be to get back to China. Even in death, when a man dies they say he has gone back to Canton. Their whole idea appears to be that of returning to China. The question has been asked here if they have any tendency to make their homes in any country. Decidedly not. Their tendency is always to return, and they look forward to it, and talk of a dead man as having gone back to Canton, continually. As I mentioned before, there are no Chinese women in Peru, which, of course, must have a bad effect on their moral condition. I have been to Chinatown here, and I must say that I consider the condition of the Chinese here, where they are perfectly free, where they have no task-masters over them, where everything is left to themselves, worse than their condition in Peru, where they are, to a certain extent, bondsmen. In other words, in a large number of cases, in fact, I might say in the majority of cases, they are made, in that country, to keep a certain amount of cleanliness, such as making them sweep out their quarters. They would never sweep them out if not made to do it, and turn out their mats, and shake them, clean the whole place, disinfect it, and all that kind of thing. In regard to their disregard of the sick, I have known a man to die there, in their quarters, and those Chinamen would never say a word until an Englishman came and told me that this Chinaman was dying. I saw that he was in a dying state, and, in point of fact, he did die subsequently. I think he died the next day, but he had been lying this way, I suppose, for a considerable period, and they never appeared to care anything about him. He was taken off and buried in the sand, and there was not a single Chinaman who

came to follow his corpse to the ground. They seem to be quite careless, and have no care and no sympathy for one of their sick.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you ever see a Chinese funeral here?—A. I have.

Q. Did you ever see long lines of carriages and hacks in these funerals?—A. I saw the funeral of a Chinaman here, and I believe he was an eminent merchant.

Q. Do you not see it almost weekly?—A. No; I have not seen it since. I have seen three Chinese funerals here.

Q. Have you not seen it since?—A. No.

Q. How long have you lived here?—A. Two years and a half.

Q. Have you frequented the parts of the city where the Chinese funerals go?—A. Yes; up Kearny street.

Q. Do you ever go down Dupont street?—A. It is not a very cleanly locality, and I am not in favor of walking down Dupont street when I can get a better street.

Q. What is the condition of the native classes in Peru and Chili? Are they industrious?—A. They are industrious. They will do more work than a Chinaman. They are very easily taught. I do not allude to the Indians. I allude to the peons and cholos.

Q. The peons do the most of the work?—A. No. The cholos do the most of the skilled labor. Mr. Harry Meigs employed a large number of the Chinese in the construction of a railway. He imported a great number, I believe.

Q. Peru is being opened up by railroads constructed with Chinese labor?—A. I cannot call it opened; I refer to the Oroya Railway. It is a small road, and leads to nowhere. I look on the Oroya Railway as a job.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. There are some subsidies there?—A. Yes; large.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Your experience, then, as you have related to this commission, is wholly in reference to cooly traffic between Macao and those countries you have named?—A. My testimony altogether refers to the general condition of the coolies in Peru and to the method by which they are brought into Callao. What I have seen, and I have been all through Chinatown——

Q. We are talking about Peru. Have you ever seen any immigrants roaving in those ports free, without being under bonds?—A. Never.

Q. Then they have all come as coolies?—A. They all come as coolies.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What are these peons and cholos?—A. A peon is a term generally applied to a workingman. A cholo signifies a half-breed, that is, a half-breed between an Indian and one of the Spanish, or descendants of the Spanish, people who settle in the country.

Q. Is not a peon, properly speaking, a bondman?—A. No; a peon in Peru is not a bondman. There is no such thing as a bondman, with the exception of the Chinese, in Peru.

Q. Are not the peons bound to do labor until their debt is paid to their employer?—A. No; I never heard of such a thing, and I think I had very good opportunities of knowing. I was associated pretty much with Peruvians, and they were men who had a perfect knowledge of all those things. I think I have already stated that I consider that the

state of Chinatown is much inferior to that of any Chinese quarters even inhabited by the Chinese that are absolutely kept in bond. That is to say, the Chinese, left to themselves, will not keep themselves clean, and those in bond are made to keep themselves clean.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The coolies which are brought to the Spanish forts are taken all over the country, are they not, to work on the plantations?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They do not necessarily come into a community as they do here?—A. I think that the number of Chinese living in either Lima or Callao is very small.

Q. You do not find them gathering in clusters like they do here?—A. No; except where they are gathered by their employers.

Q. They are scattered all over those countries, are they not?—A. Yes; over the sugar-plantations and works of that kind.

Q. There are no Chinatowns there?—A. No; we have nothing of what you know as Chinatown there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the form of government in Peru?—A. It is a republican.

Q. Do all classes, except Chinamen, vote?—A. I believe all classes vote. I was never there at an election. The government has been so disturbed there of late years and the constitution has been so often violently overturned that an election is rather a dubious business.

Q. By their form of government, are the peons entitled to vote?—A. Every Peruvian is entitled to vote. A peon is not a bondman.

Q. He is a free citizen?—A. He is a free citizen. In regard to a statement made by Mr. Brooks a little while ago, I wish to say that I do not know that Mr. Brooks has been in Ireland, but I have been in Ireland and am an Irishman. He mentioned about pigs living on the same floor with peasants. The fact of the matter is that that is a mere travelers' tale. I have been in numbers of cabins, and they have always what they call the pig's sty, in which they keep the pig, and the pig's sty and the cabin are not attached by any means. Moreover, the mere fact of this immigration to this country has affected, to a wonderful extent within the last twenty years, the condition of our laboring classes in Ireland. I think the true labor problem is not the cheapening of labor, but its distribution; that its solution is to be found, not in the bringing here of a worthless class to overwhelm white labor, but in the taking of the men who have no employment in the East and bringing them here, giving all our own people meat and bread, and enabling every man to bring up his children as good citizens.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 9, 1876.

GILES H. GRAY sworn and examined.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Gray will explain the Page bill. He is surveyor of the port.

The WITNESS. The Page bill mentioned is the act of the 3d of March, 1875. It is entitled "An act supplementary to the acts in relation to immigration." The sections in relation to immigration are found in the United States Revised Statutes, section 2158 and following. In August, 1875, the collector of the port directed the surveyor, myself, by letter, to enforce the Page law, which I have mentioned, which we then proceeded to do by making every investigation that we could with reference to females arriving from China upon the China steamers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. What is the substance of the provisions of the law to which you refer?—Answer. They prohibit the immigration or landing of prostitutes and convicts from oriental countries.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Diseased persons, lepers, also?—A. The act does not mention lepers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Does it mention diseased persons?—A. No; not diseased persons.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Paupers?—A. No paupers; simply convicts and prostitutes.

Mr. PIPER. The original immigration-law mentions prohibiting the landing of paupers, and this was a supplementary act.

The WITNESS. Previous to this time there had arrived upon these steamers from 200 to 400 women, frequently, the steamers arriving twice a month.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you mean that four hundred at a time arrived, or that number altogether?—A. At a time. During that quarter—the 1st of July to the 1st of October, 1875—there did arrive one hundred and sixty-one females, and we had no information which would enable us to prohibit the landing of any of them. No complaint of any kind was made to us by any citizens in reference to those women, nor has there ever been any complaint made to the customs authorities with reference to any women who have arrived here at any time. The next quarter—that is, the last quarter of the year 1875—the number of females was reduced to forty-four, and in the first quarter of the year 1876 it was reduced to fifteen. In the second quarter of 1876 the number was thirty-two, and in the third quarter of 1876 the number was only twenty-four. The women which have been landed since we have commenced to enforce the Page law I have every reason to believe are respectable women, and they are all accompanied by a letter—a certificate like this, [producing a letter,] which I shall show to the committee. The envelope contains a letter from the consul, a photograph of the woman, and a certificate in English and Chinese. The letter says:

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Hong-Kong, May 10, 1876.

SIR: I inclose, for the information of the inspector of emigrants, a declaration and photograph of Wong Lau Si, a Chinese female, who is emigrating to the United States by the British ship Shalimar, and who has been passed as a person who may emigrate to the United States in accordance with law.

Very respectfully, yours,

D. H. BAILEY, *Consul.*

Hon. THOMAS B. SHANNON,
Collector of Customs, San Francisco.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is that a lithograph letter?—A. No, sir; it is written with pen and ink. The certificate—the English portion of it—is as follows:

Declaration of Chinese females who intend to go to California, or any other place in the United States of America.

Surname, name: Wong Lau Si.

Residence in Hong-Kong, and story of house: Second story of house No. 18 Shoung Hing street.

Names of the people in the same house:
When and from what place I came to Hong-Kong: I live in Hong-Kong.
Person or persons with whom I came:
Name, country, and occupation of my father: Lau Chin Sing, of Tung Koon.
Name, country, and occupation of my husband: Wang Sai Heung, of Sun Ning Tung Hau.
Names and address of the sureties: Yik Lee and Wing Fong.
Relatives or friends from whom inquiries may be made: Yik Lee and Wing Fong.
Person or persons with whom I am going: My husband.
Object of my going: With my husband.
Place to which I am going: San Francisco.
To whom I am going, (street and No. of house:)
I do hereby declare that the above statements are true, and that I am not kidnaped, decoyed, or forced to emigrate to the United States; that I have not entered into a contract or agreement for a term of service within the United States for lewd and immoral purposes; nor am I going for the purpose of prostitution, and I do herewith submit my photographs, as required by the United States consul.
(Signature) WONG LAU SI.
(Signature of surety)

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Can you identify the photograph which accompanies this certificate?—A. Yes, sir; that is the one that came with this certificate, (exhibiting a photograph,) because I kept these together. After the people have landed I am not so particular about the certificates.

Q. This photograph is apparently of a girl 12 or 13 years old.—A. Very well; it came with this certificate.

Q. I only wanted to identify it.—A. I think I have another package here just as it arrived, [exhibiting.] There is the picture, [producing a photograph.] This woman arrived by the last steamer, which has come in since the committee have been in session. Here is a picture of a man with his two wives, and, although he applied for both to come to this country, only one of them was permitted to come, the one with the cross above her picture. She arrived, was compared with the photograph, and allowed to land. If the committee would like to have me read the letter accompanying this certificate, as it is a little different from the other letter which I read, I can do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Read it.

The witness read as follows:

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES, HONG-KONG.

SIR: I inclose the declaration and photograph of a Chinese woman who is emigrating to the United States with her husband on the steamship Belgic. The man has two wives, but I have declined to grant a certificate to the second wife. The one allowed to come has an asterisk marked over her head in the margin of the photograph. It is my opinion that she is not going to the United States for lewd and immoral purposes.

Very respectfully, yours,

D. H. BAILEY,
Consul.

Hon. THOMAS B. SHANNON,
Collector of Customs, San Francisco.

The WITNESS. A certificate similar to the one I have read accompanied that woman. Here is a similar package (producing) just as it arrived, in the same way. We are informed by letters from the consul that any woman who desires to come to California must file a written application; that that application is referred to a committee of examiners appointed by the consul.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I should like to have these photographs marked, so that they can be identified.—A. I can leave the photographs, if you like.

Q. Do you know what became of this woman (holding up a photograph) after she landed?—A. No, sir.

Q. That you know nothing about?—A. No, sir. When a vessel arrives here no woman is allowed to go ashore until after the mail has arrived and she is compared with the picture. Sometimes it is twenty-four hours before they can go ashore. I was describing the way in which the woman comes to California. She files a written application; this application is referred to a committee of examiners appointed by the consul; they take such testimony as they see proper, procure the photographs, compare them, and if the testimony is satisfactory, they then permit them to come, and forward to us a letter and the photographs. Here are three photographs, (exhibiting,) but I have not the letter, which arrived on the 19th of November, 1875. The women did not arrive, but the photographs arrived on the China on the 19th of November, 1875. These are the photographs of three females prohibited from sailing on the China.

Q. Give me the name of the person whose photograph you exhibited, the child of twelve years.—A. Wang Lau Si.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Who is her husband?—A. Her husband is Wang Sai Heung. On one occasion we had a telegram from the consul, saying that thirteen women had been smuggled on board of the steamer and would arrive by a certain steamer. When the steamer arrived it was thoroughly searched, but the women were not found. I only mention that to show the care which the consul is exercising to prevent prostitutes from coming here. This bunch of pictures (producing a number of photographs) are the pictures of some of the women who have been certified to and have arrived here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have all these arrived under this Page law?—A. All of those arrived under the Page law, and more.

Q. How is that law working in reference to prostitutes being brought here? What is the number now arriving, and what was the number when the law went into effect?—A. I stated that the number has been reduced from one hundred and sixty-one to twenty-four.

Q. This last quarter, 1876?—A. This last quarter. I do not believe there are any prostitutes arriving here at all now. I see almost every woman that arrives.

Q. You think the Page law has effectually stopped that source of immigration?—A. I do.

Q. How long have you been surveyor of the port?—A. Over three years.

Q. How long have you resided in the State?—A. Twenty-five years.

Q. What is your profession?—A. Attorney-at-law.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You say no complaints have been made at the custom-house in relation to Chinese women?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does it interfere at all with the officers in the performance of their duties, whether there be complaint or not?—A. No.

Q. If there are no complaints that illicit opium is coming in, preliminary to its arrival, that would not be an excuse in the performance of your duties?—A. No. The object of the statement which I made is that the law provides for the inspection of a vessel if any complaints are made by two citizens, or something like that. If the committee will allow me to read the law, that will explain why I made that remark.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. The law does not say that?—A. I will read just what it does say:

Every vessel arriving in the United States may be inspected under the direction of the collector of the port at which it arrives, if he shall have reason to believe that any such obnoxious persons are on board; and the officer making such inspection shall certify the result thereof to the master or other person in charge of such vessel, designating in such certificate the person or persons, if any there be, ascertained by him to be of either of the classes whose importation is hereby forbidden. When such inspection is required by the collector as aforesaid, it shall be unlawful, without his permission, for any alien to leave any such vessel arriving in the United States from a foreign country until the inspection shall have been had and the result certified as herein provided; and at no time thereafter shall any alien certified to by the inspecting officer as being of either of the classes whose immigration is forbidden by this section, be allowed to land in the United States, except in obedience to a judicial process issued pursuant to law.

This is the portion that I referred to:

If any person shall feel aggrieved by the certificate of such inspecting officer, stating him or her to be within either of the classes whose immigration is forbidden by this section, and shall apply for release or other remedy to any proper court or judge, then it shall be the duty of the collector at said port of entry to detain said vessel until a hearing and determination of the matter are had, to the end that if the said inspector shall be found to be in accordance with this section, and sustained, the obnoxious person or persons shall be returned on board of said vessel, and shall not thereafter be permitted to land, unless the master, owner, or consignee of the vessel shall give bond and security, to be approved by the court or judge hearing the cause, in the sum of five hundred dollars for each such person permitted to land, conditioned for the return of such person, within six months from the date thereof, to the country whence his or her emigration shall have taken place, or unless the vessel bringing such obnoxious person or persons shall be forfeited, in which event the proceeds of such forfeiture shall be paid over to the collector of the port of arrival, and applied by him, as far as necessary, to the return of such person or persons to his or her own country within the said period of six months.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. When was the Page law passed?—A. The 3d of March, 1875.

Q. What were the general arrivals of Chinese women up to that period?—A. All the way from two hundred to four hundred.

Q. On a vessel?—A. Periodically. There would be as many as that on every vessel; but there would be some vessels where there would be a larger number, and then there would be other vessels with very few on board.

Q. Have you any statistics to show the amount of women who have arrived?—A. They are at the custom-house.

Q. Can you furnish them?—A. No; but the collector can furnish them. I am not officially obliged to keep those certificates; but they are public information. I think they are before the committee now.

Q. What is the general occupation of these women as shown by this memorandum from the officer at Hong-Kong? Is there any leading one occupation more common than the rest?—A. Previous to the Page law I was not accustomed to notice that fact at all.

Q. Do you not know that of those arriving previous to the Page law nineteen-twentieths of them were put down as seamstresses?—A. I have heard that; I do not remember seeing it. The men, I notice, are laborers.

Q. But the women?—A. As to the women I do not remember; but very likely that was the case.

Q. You know as a citizen that there are no Chinese seamstresses here?—A. I do not know that.

Q. As a rule, I mean?—A. No; I do not know that.

Q. Do you know of any Chinese seamstresses?—A. No; I do not know anything about them at all.

Q. You think the authorities at Hong-Kong are exercising diligence now to prevent prostitutes from coming?—A. I have no doubt of that.

Q. You think these women you have given us the pictures of are not prostitutes?—A. I do.

Q. Would you be surprised if I should show you that a large percentage of these are in our whore-houses in San Francisco?—A. I do not know. I suppose you do not ask me for my opinion. I give the facts as I know them.

Q. O, no; we wander into opinions in this investigation.—A. I do not know.

Q. These pictures that you have given us, together with those held by the officer, you propose to leave as exhibits in this case?—A. I will leave with the committee just as many of the pictures as they need. I do not care to leave them all, because sometimes people call there to see how this business is done.

Q. You will leave them temporarily with us until we can examine them, and we shall select such as we would like to have left as exhibits in the case.—A. Very well.

Q. Do you enforce or attempt to enforce this provision that prevents the arrival of persons here under a sentence for conviction of felonious crimes? Do you know whether the authorities there attempt to enforce that inhibition?—A. I do not.

Q. Does their certificate indicate anything of that kind?—A. We have no certificates as to men at all. No; I am in error about that. We have certificates as to men, but the certificates as to men are not as full as those of the women. There is not a Chinese passenger arriving here who is not accompanied with a certificate from Mr. Bailey, the consul, certifying, in substance, that they have not entered into any contract or agreement for a term of service within the United States, &c. I cannot recall the language of it exactly. The certificate shows that they are not included in these limitations; and I think it goes on to say that they are not contract-laborers or contract-coolies.

Q. Or criminals?—A. Or criminals. We can produce one of those certificates for the men. It has a heading; and then perhaps under it the name of eight passengers; giving the names and occupation and where they came from. The occupation is usually laborers; and the consul certifies that they are not prohibited under any of these acts. The certificate is full enough to cover it; so that the men are accompanied with a certificate in the same manner as the women are.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You make no examination other than the mere certificate? You take that as conclusive evidence that they come within the law?—A. No, sir.

Q. You make no examination beyond the certificate?—A. No, sir.

Q. Any man having that certificate you permit to land?—A. We do not go as far as that. The women we can compare with the photographs.

Q. I am not speaking of the women.—A. If the certificate is for a thousand men, and the same number of men as the consul's certificate calls for arrive, we permit them to land.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Suppose he should authorize a thousand to land and twelve hundred were on board?—A. We would retain them on board.

Q. Which?—A. The two hundred.

Q. Which two hundred?—A. The last two hundred.

Q. Do they bring their certificates with them?—A. We cannot tell which is which.

Q. Then the officers here have no means of ascertaining the fact that they are the ones which are properly sent on board?—A. No; we cannot tell as to the men.

Q. If they should give a thousand certificates to a thousand laborers or respectable people in China, and a thousand others who were criminals should get on board, either in harbor or at high sea, you could not tell them?—A. No, we could not tell; but under the Page law, if any gentleman should come down and point out any criminals, we should certainly hold them. That has never been done.

Q. Can you find out how a gentleman would go down and make a statement of a criminal on board, that being the first information of their arrival, there being no telegraph between here and China?—A. I do not see how some people can say that they are all criminals. I do not see how they can find that out.

Q. Do the people say that?—A. I have heard it stated.

Q. By whom?—A. I have seen it stated in the papers.

Q. In what papers?—A. In the reports of the proceedings of this commission, I think,

Q. That they are all criminals?—A. Yes, sir; that there are criminals arriving—not that they are all criminals, perhaps. I should like to make a further answer to the suggestion made by Mr. Pixley, as to what we do when the number of passengers arriving here is in excess of passengers permitted by the certificate of the consul. The only thing we can do when there is apparently an excess of passengers is to measure the vessel to see if there is an excess over and above what the vessel is allowed to carry. We have measured every ship that arrived here under these circumstances, and if the vessel has more passengers aboard than she has a right under the United States laws to carry, we report the vessel for fine; and the vessel has been proceeded against in every case and fines imposed. To that extent we have suppressed immigration in that manner.

Q. Are you in favor of Chinese immigration?—A. I do not know that I am called upon to give any opinion at all in this case.

Q. Yes, you are.—A. Not at all.

Q. That is what we have been examining. It is stated that none but the dissolute and vile here are in favor of inhibiting Chinese immigration, and we have asked the opinion of almost every witness, and a great many have been brought in for the express purpose of giving their opinions upon the advisability or otherwise of Chinese immigration. Now, I ask you what is your opinion?—A. My opinion is that excessive Chinese immigration should be stopped, or suppressed. There are Chinese merchants here who are, I believe, honest business men, and they are a benefit to the country, but there is a class of coolies which come here which might be prevented by the United States consul, and which never should come, but ought to be prohibited. That kind of immigration ought to be stopped. I have no hesitation in saying that. You can see this class as you go about the streets. They are a sort of wild race of Tartars. To bring them is like introducing savages here. But still, on the other hand, there is a class of merchants who come from Hong-Kong and Canton, who are generally found in what is called Young-wo Company, who are a very different set of men.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What proportion of the immigration is the kind you think ought to be prohibited?—A. It is the largest portion of it. I judge from

seeing them. I see them come off the ship, and they are just a wild horde. In other words, if Chinese immigration was restricted by proper regulations, I do not see any harm in it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. That is just what we are doing. You have a false impression when you suppose that the movement is to prevent Chinese immigration; it is to regulate and restrain it.—A. I do not wish to interfere with this business at all, but you insisted upon my opinion and I gave it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say the Page law went into effect in March, 1875?—A. About August, 1875. About that time the collector addressed a letter to me requiring me to enforce the Page law.

Q. Was not public opinion here, about that time, very much aroused on the Chinese question, and did not the Chinese merchants here telegraph back to stop the prodigious incoming of their people?—A. The event that you speak of was some six months after that.

Q. After August, 1875?—A. Yes, sir; after we commenced to enforce this law. We commenced to enforce the law very soon after it was passed. It was just about the time of the election when we commenced to enforce it at the request of Congressman Page. He came to the custom-house and pointed out the law to us. He said, "Here, Congress has passed this law, and you are neglecting to carry it out." We had no copy of it at that time. He procured it for us, and we consulted together and concluded to enforce it, without any public opinion at all. The event that you speak of was some five or six months afterward.

Q. I am glad to understand that. Your judgment is that this is an efficient and beneficial law?—A. There is no doubt about it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long do I understand that you have been here?—A. Twenty-five years.

Q. Have you a general knowledge of the habits and condition of the Chinese in this city?—A. I think I have.

Q. What proportion of them are working, industrious men, or what proportion are idlers and vagabonds?—A. I do not quite understand the question.

Q. Taking the whole body of Chinese immigrants, what proportion of them are industrious working-people after they get here, taking the males; or how many of them are idlers and vagabonds who are not working-people?—A. Do you mean by vagabonds persons who are dependent upon others to support them?

Q. Those you understand as vagabonds, who do not work, who do not get an honest living by labor. What proportion of those who come here are industrious working-people, and what proportion are idlers?—A. I think the proportion is the same as among white people. That is the best answer I can give. One great evil in this country is the permitting of a large number of Chinese to live upon a small space of ground. That is a mistake. They ought to be compelled by law to separate and to take space to live in the same as white people do. In other words they ought to conform to the habits of white people, of Americans, and not to bring here their Chinese customs. The Japanese come here and adopt our habits; they live as we do; they dress in our costume, and there is scarcely any prejudice against them; whereas the Chinese come here and bring their Chinese costumes and manners and

ways of living, and they do not make desirable citizens on that account.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Regarding the importation of goods from China, are the Chinese large importers? I mean in numbers. For instance, Americans, I think, all import through importing merchants; but I am informed that the Chinese, as a rule, import, each for himself, a great many small invoices. I do not know enough about the working of the custom-house to know whether it passes through your hands.—A. To some extent it does; but that is not true; they do not each import for himself. The Chinese merchants import, and the Chinese use imported goods. The invoice never comes to me at all.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. The Page bill, so called, was approved the 3d of March, 1875?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say you did not commence to enforce it until the 11th of August, 1875?—A. Not until some time in August.

Q. Why did you not enforce it?—A. We had no copy of the law.

Q. Do I understand you to say that you do not get a copy of the laws in reference to the revenue department of this country or the custom-house service until six or seven months after they are passed?—A. No, sir; I say we do; but your question is, "Do I understand you that you do not get a copy of the revenue laws?" This is not a revenue law.

Q. It is a law regulating the affairs of the custom-house?—A. The Secretary of the Treasury never notified that law to us until about the time we attempted to enforce it. Any law in reference to customs is printed by the Secretary of the Treasury and sent to us immediately; but this law was not sent to us, and our attention was not called to it until Mr. Page came himself.

Q. I supposed the attention of the collector of the port was called to every law which prevailed for him to perform his duties?—A. You would be surprised to know that laws are passed and enforced before we ever hear of them here in San Francisco, except by telegraph.

Q. You commenced to enforce this law before the last election?—A. That is about the time. Senator Sargent has sometimes sent us copies of the laws, and that is the only way we have found them out until some time after they have passed.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You began to enforce the Page law as soon as you got a copy of it?—A. Yes, sir; we did.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Was it not necessary that Mr. Bailey should have a copy in China?—A. It was necessary.

Q. How could you enforce it until sixty or ninety days after it passed?—A. We could not. The way we enforced it before we got the certificates from the consul was this: We retained the women on board to see if complaints were made. Before this law was passed the commissioner of immigration of the State attempted to enforce a similar State law, and they had Rev. Mr. Gibson there to act as a Chinese interpreter, and some one else, I forget who he was. Every woman was brought up before the commissioner of immigration, and all sorts of questions asked in reference to her previous character, what she came here for, where she lived, and who her relatives were, and all that sort of thing. Those who did not give satisfactory answers were retained on board.

It was the result of such an investigation as that which led to the arrest of, I think, two hundred women off the steamer Japan. Finally one of the cases went to the supreme court, and that court decided that the State could not interfere in that business.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Twenty-three were arrested?—A. Were there only twenty-three?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I guess two hundred arrived at that time; of course after they had passed off the steamer I did not know anything about them.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What assistance did you get from the Chinese merchants to stop this immigration at that time?—A. We always had their sympathy, and they always brought us any information in reference to the matter.

Q. They did all they could to help you?—A. Everything they could; and on one occasion, before we were accustomed to get these certificates, I had one of the merchants with me on board the steamer whenever they arrived to act as interpreter and to give us information of those people. There are some of those merchants whom I believe to be honest, and who would tell me just what was the truth.

Rev. OTIS GIBSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a clergyman, a Methodist minister.

Q. Are you connected with any particular institution here?—A. I am connected with the mission to the Chinese on this coast. I have charge of the missions of the Methodist Church on this coast.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Eight years.

Q. How long have you been in charge of the mission?—A. All the time since I came here.

Q. How long have you been in the ministry?—A. Since 1854.

Q. Have you resided in China?—A. Ten years. I went to China in 1855 and returned in 1865.

Q. In what parts of China have you resided?—A. I lived at Fuhchau and visited nearly all the ports on the coast then open, and some places in the interior.

Q. In what province is Fuhchau?—A. In the Fuh Kien province.

Q. What distance is Fuhchau from Hong-Kong?—A. About half-way between Hong-Kong and Shanghai.

Q. What opportunities did you have there of knowing the habits, manners, and customs of the people of China?—A. I lived among them, studied their language, and became conversant with the common people and with the merchants. For some six months, during the settlement of a very great and difficult riot, I was the interpreter for the American consul, who was a young man and had lately come there. In fact I did all the business of the consulate at that time during my connection with it, so that I came in contact with many of the officials.

Q. Were you in intercourse with all classes of society there?—A. Yes, sir; I think so; all classes.

Q. Were you able to converse in their own language with them?—A. Yes, sir; in the Fuh Kien dialect of Fuh Chau.

Q. Over what extent of country would that dialect enable you to converse with them?—A. It is the leading dialect of the whole province, some 25,000,000 people, perhaps. They cannot all understand this Fuh Kien dialect, however. It is not understood in Canton at all.

Q. That is the spoken dialect?—A. The spoken dialect of the Fuh Kien district is not understood in Canton.

Q. Is the written language understood all over the province?—A. It is the same through all the land.

Q. Through the whole of China?—A. Yes, sir. Since I came here I have been obliged to learn this dialect so far as able.

Q. What dialect is spoken among the Chinese here?—A. We call it the Canton dialect. The people who come from the country a few hundred miles from Canton generally have a somewhat different dialect. We commonly speak of them as the Sam-yup and the Se-yup. The Sam-yup is the city dialect, the leading and controlling dialect, and three-fifths of the people here speak the Se-yup. The laboring people here are largely of that class.

Q. Are they able to understand each other?—A. Yes, sir; they can understand each other, but not so readily quite as they can understand their own people.

Q. What opportunities have you had of intercourse with the Chinese people here?—A. I have had constant intercourse with them all the time for eight years.

Q. With all classes of that people?—A. With all who were here.

Q. With all classes who were here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you prepared any answers to the interrogatories proposed by the commission?—A. I have prepared a statement involving most of the questions, I think, which I shall read if you wish me to do so.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have heard the testimony of Mr. Gray, just taken?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you conversant with the action taken in reference to sending back these prostitutes?—A. I knew something about these matters.

Q. These twenty-three referred to? I think a large number at one time were sent back?—A. None of those twenty-three at that time were sent back. On another occasion I sent back ten.

Q. Who furnished the money to pay their passage back?—A. I will state that, on the arrival of a steamer here, the police authorities corraled, as we say in this country, a number of these women, and sent for me to come down and ask them certain questions. I went down and asked them where they came from and why, who were their parents, and if they had any friends here, &c.; if they wished to remain or go back, what their business was, and many questions of that kind. The result was that out of the whole number there were ten who said they had been kidnapped or forced to come here and wished to go back. The police authorities sent them up to the mission-house. I did not go down myself, but I sent a China boy down to the Chinese merchants to tell them that I had ten women who wished to go back to China, who said they had been brought here against their will, and I had no money to send them back. These merchants had said frequently that they would be glad to send back all the Chinese women of that class. On this occasion they sent all the money necessary and more. I have some money now in my hands to their credit. These women needed between $250 and $400, and several of them brought that sum down. I have the certificate of Mr. Bailey, the consul, in regard to the reception of these women and the distribution of the money. I think nearly all the authority and knowledge about the Chinese women being sent back has come through my assistance and influence in this city.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Were they sent back simply because they had been kidnapped?—A. Because of their statements that they were deceived in coming here and wished to go back.

Q. Not because they were lewd women?—A. No, sir; we had no right to send them back. It would be simply a voluntary matter on their part.

Q. Have you any reason to suppose that they were lewd women?—A. I presume some of them were. A large part of the women who come here are brought here for that purpose. I do not know whether my statement will transgress the statement of fact entirely. It will all be what I suppose to be true, but it will not be all in question and answer, that is, the same kind of testimony as the committee has been listening to.

I wish to say that I am not in favor of a large and rapid influx of immigration from any foreign country whatever. I believe that at times the immigration both from Europe and Asia has been stimulated to an unhealthy degree; that is, it has at times been too rapid for the best good of this country. I believe that European immigrants are admitted to full citizenship too soon after coming here. I believe that a large portion of the European immigration so rapidly admitted to citizenship and the right of suffrage is more dangerous to the institutions and prosperity of this country than is the smaller and better-regulated immigration from Asia.

As to the objection against the Chinese, that they depreciate the value of real estate, it is well known in this city and on this coast, that the Chinese everywhere pay high rents and pay promptly. An increase in any city of a population paying high rents must, of necessity, increase the demand for and the price of real estate. The Chinese of this city pay more than $1,000,000 annually in rents alone, and the white people continue to inhabit houses as good, if not better, than before they sold or rented to Chinamen.

As to Chinese cheap labor, the fact is, and all testimony goes to show it, that in California we have no cheap labor as compared with the Eastern States. The presence of the Chinese has reduced the exorbitant price of labor which prevailed in the early days of our history, and by this means they have opened industries, cheapened products, and made it possible for poor white men to come here with their families and live and thrive. It is an indisputable fact that, at the present time in California, in spite of a peculiar cry about the evils of Chinese labor, labor for industrious white men is as abundant, if not more abundant, wages are as high, if not higher, and living as cheap, if not cheaper, and the general condition of the white laboring classes is as good, if not better, than in any other part of the United States, or of this world. You might instance Chicago, Cincinnati, New York—where, in one of these cities, some 30,000 people are said to have marched in procession with torches and transparencies and mottoes, "Bread or blood," demanding work of the mayor. No such cry has ever been heard in our streets on this coast.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is it not true that, two or three years ago, there was a demand on the city authorities here by some thousands of people for work?—A. No particular cry of the kind has ever been known here. There was a time when there was a little furore and excitement here.

Q. Were there not several thousand people who marched through the

city and demanded work of the authorities here?—A. It was not at a time of great destitution. There were other causes that produced the excitement.

Q. Was not there a demand for work and a procession of exactly the same kind as that which you refer to in New York City, an organized movement of the laboring classes demanding work in the same way?—A. I do not so understand it. I am not particularly conversant with that movement, however; it was very soon after I came here. Cheap labor makes cheap products, cheap living. To illustrate: With flour at $50 per barrel, wages $10 per day, five days' work will buy a barrel of flour; with flour at $6 per barrel, wages, $2 per day, three days' work will buy the same barrel. This labor-conflict in California, in my estimation, as a general question, is simply and only a much-needed and healthy competition between the Chinaman and the Irishman. The Irishman has a vote, and so some aspiring politicians are on his side, but all the industries of the State, all the capital of the State looking for investment in industrial pursuits, demand this competition of labor as an indispensable element of investment, of development, and success.

Q. Do I understand you by that statement to imply that all the persons engaged in the industrial pursuits of this State and all the capital here demand this great Chinese immigration?—A. I did not say that.

Q. You do not mean to make that statement?—A. I mean exactly what I said, precisely. As a general statement, (there may be exceptions as there are to all general statements, but the exceptions will be few compared to the whole,) I believe that all the industries of the State, all the capital of this State looking for investment in industrial pursuits, demand this competition of labor as an indispensable element of investment, of development, and of success.

Q. When you say industries, do you mean the men who carry on industries? When you say capital, do you mean the men who own the capital? When you say there is this demand for an influx of Chinese, do you mean that the men who control these things demand it?—A. I mean as a question of political economy in this State, the industries of this State, as such, and the capital of this State, as such, generally demand this competition at the present time, and has done so all along, or else it will not invest.

Q. In other words, you state as your opinion that it would be better for the industries and capital of this State that this influx should continue, not that the men who control these things are so universally of your opinion?—A. I am not saying anything about the men who control the industries and the capital.

Q. That is your opinion?—A. Certainly, my opinion.

Q. I wanted to know whether it was your opinion, or whether you state that all the capitalists engaged in industries here were of this opinion?—A. Capital has no intelligence. When I speak of capital and industries, I speak of persons who regulate and control capital and industries. Capital and industries in this State would not invest in industrial pursuits in the State if it were not for the presence of Chinese to compete with white labor.

Q. Do you mean to say that the men who control the capital and industries of this State are of the opinion that, without the Chinese, they could not carry on their industries?—A. I know nothing about their opinion, as such; I know by their conduct. Capital does not invest without this labor to compete with other labor.

Q. Is there no capital invested in this State otherwise? Are there not enormous amounts of capital invested in this city with which China-

men have nothing to do?—A. That may be, but Chinese make it possible to invest capital.

Q. That comes back again to your opinion.—A. It is all my opinion that I state.

Q. I want to know whether you are testifying that that is the opinion of those who control capital and labor; if not, but if it is merely your own opinion, I think you have a right to give your opinion.—A. I think the statement very clear.

Q. It is clear with this explanation.—A. If you ask me to state what is the opinion of different men in this State, I would not know their opinions until I should see them. I only know by their conduct. I only know the opinion of capitalists by the streams that capital takes. To illustrate: I know an instance in this city of a gentleman who proposed to invest largely in a certain manufacturing enterprise. Before he determined to do so, he inquired the price of white labor and the price of the product that he should manufacture, and found he could not invest his money. He then inquired how much Chinese labor would cost, and he found, if he would bring in a part of Chinese labor and a part of white labor, he could manufacture with some profit. He went into the business, but he would not have gone into it if the Chinese had not been here. I think the same thing is true generally. That is what I mean by the statement. This competition in this city and this country, however, is limited to a few of the lighter and slower industries. The Chinamen make overalls and slippers and shoes and cigars and shirts, &c., but no overalls or slippers for the trade were made in this country until the Chinamen made them. The Chinamen do no labor upon the public works of the city—the grading, paving, and repairing of the streets in our cities, or in this city at least, nor upon any of the public buildings of our State. Generally speaking, there are no Chinese house-carpenters, nor brick-layers, nor painters, nor plumbers, nor glaziers, nor blacksmiths, nor foundrymen, no Chinese printers, nor book-binders, nor tailors, nor milliners, nor mantua-makers, no bankers or insurance agents, no commission-merchants of American or European goods. They offer no competition to our lawyers, nor to doctors, preachers, school-teachers, nor to any profession whatever. Instead of driving any of these mentioned laborers or professions from the field, the presence and labor of the Chinese have opened up industries which have certainly stimulated the demand for such white laborers and professional men as I have mentioned. As to the charge that the Chinese have taken employment from our women and girls, there may be single instances of that kind, but as a general charge it is not true. House-servants, sewing-women, and laundry-work are as well paid in San Francisco as in New York, Philadelphia, or Chicago. I had an experience of this kind. My wife dismissed a Chinese boy whom she was paying $16 a month, and took a girl into the house who came from the East, where she had been working on a dairy-farm at two dollars a week, milking cows summer and winter, and doing general house-work. The girl was permitted to have as good a room as my own daughter, and well furnished; she ate at the table, and had her time to do her own work; she staid with us about a year, and left us simply because she thought she could do better at sewing-work.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What wages did you pay her?—A. Sixteen dollars a month, the same as we paid the boy, but she had this advantage: She ate at the table with the family and was treated as one of the family. I have that experience in this matter. It is objected to the Chinese population that

they do not learn our language, do not attend our schools. The fact is they are taxed to support our schools but are peremptorily refused admission to their privileges. I, myself, applied to the school department of this city in behalf of an intelligent Chinaman who wished to be admitted, but the application was refused on account of race prejudice.

There are many young children in Chinatown, but neither the State nor the city is providing any schools for their education.

But many of the Chinese are learning something of our language. There are about 750 average attendants upon the various evening mission schools and private classes in the State, involving a roll-call of about 2,500. There are about 1,000 average attendants upon the various Sabbath-schools, involving a roll-call of about 3,000. These are all studying the English language. This, too, in a population composed mostly of adults, industrious working young men.

Besides these there are thousands learning our language in families as family servants. It may be safely said that we have no other foreign immigration, that, with so little encouragement, makes equal efforts to learn our language, laws, and customs. Go into almost any Chinese store in this city, and we are sure to find one or two persons who can converse in the English language sufficiently to transact business with our people. When we take into consideration the circumstances which have surrounded them in this country, and the short time the Chinese have been here, the wonder is not that they know so little, but that they know so much of our language. A young man, a son of a Chinese merchant, who has attended our mission for two and a half years has just been admitted to Napa Collegiate Institute, in this State, and is doing well. Of his own free choice, and with the full consent of his father, the young man cut off his queue and adopted the full American dress. He is doing well in his studies, and has the respect and good will of his teachers and fellow-students. There are hundreds of other young men anxious to do this same thing, but want of money prevents their doing so. Very great changes are taking place in this respect among the young Chinamen in this country.

If the rights of citizenship and the elective franchise depended solely upon a knowledge of our language, laws, and customs, and a good character as regards intelligence, industry, and morals, quite a number of Chinese would soon ask for naturalization papers, and have a right to them.

The fact that there are now in our Eastern colleges and schools between one and two hundred Chinese youths supported and schooled by the Chinese government indicates a strong national desire to become acquainted with our language, customs, and principles of government. The example of the government in this matter is not lost upon the people.

As to the general morals of the Chinese, the civilization of China is lower than the Christian civilization of our country. The standard and practice of morality by the Chinese people is not equal to the standard and practice of those who accept the Gospel of Christ as their rule of practice. But the standard of Chinese morals is higher and better than that of any other heathen nation in all the world. They are very fond of their children. They have profound respect for age and experience. They are great traders, and have the reputation in all the world of being as honest and reliable in commercial and business transactions as are the peoples with whom they have traded. Even here in San Francisco it is true, in spite of the cry against them, that the

Chinese have the reputation of paying promptly their rents, taxes, and debts.

The charge of immorality brought against the Chinese in this country, may be brought, with almost if not quite equal force, against most of the European immigration, whether the specific charge be drunkenness, profanity, fighting and quarreling, gambling, or prostitution. The same labor that has lately been bestowed in ferreting out the vices of the 30,000 Chinese in this city, if bestowed in special efforts to ferret out the vices of 30,000 immigrants from Europe of the common laboring classes, would produce a chapter of crime, vices, and misery quite equal to that presented against the Chinese. Indeed, it is not at all improbable that some of the chief manipulators of this anti-Chinese excitement are themselves guilty of the very vices which they charge against the Chinese, such as gambling, prostitution, and incapacity to hold office in this republican government.

The charge that Chinese prostitutes are demoralizing our boys, if true to any extent, is a sad comment upon our boasted superiority; upon the parents of the boys, and upon our municipal authorities, who, knowing of the existence of the evil, permit the abominable business to go on without let or hinderance.

But there is one very important and material consideration in connection with this matter of demoralizing our boys that ought not to be overlooked; that is this: there are more liquor-saloons and liquor-groceries in this city and in this country than there are Chinese prostitutes in this city and country. It is quite safe to say that all these boys who visit Chinese prostitutes take their first lessons of demoralization in some one of the 3,000 whisky-saloons or liquor-groceries licensed by this Christian municipality, kept mostly and patronized largely by immigrants from Europe. The same class of demoralized boys and in quite as large a proportion is found in all our Eastern cities, where Chinese prostitution is not known. San Francisco has a large army of promising boys and girls who scorn the taste of liquor as they do the embraces of Chinese prostitutes. Of these boys and girls we are justly proud. If they are not first poisoned with liquor they will never be found in consort with Chinese prostitutes. The statement has been made that the Chinese fill our prisons, jails, hospitals, and asylums, but the facts as shown by official reports do not exactly sustain the charge. In the State prison a larger per cent. of Chinese criminals is found than of the whites, but the comparison is made as between the Chinese on the one hand and all the whites, including American-born, on the other hand. This I consider not a fair way to estimate the per cent. It is well known that a much larger per cent. of crime, vice, and misery is found among the immigrants from Europe than among native-born Americans. It will only be fair to compare the statistics of crime, vice, and pauperism among the Chinese immigrants in this country with the statistics of crime, vice, and pauperism among the immigrants from some European country, Ireland, for instance.

On this basis we find at the present time in our San Quentin prison, 1,158 prisoners, of whom 199 are Chinese, 160 are born in Ireland, 615 native Americans, and 184 from all other foreign countries. About 400 of the whole number are Roman Catholics. From this we see 199 Chinamen to 160 from Ireland. I do not know the whole number of people from Ireland in this State, but would not estimate more than 60,000, about the same number as the Chinese.

But the Irish population has more women and children, a class always producing less criminals than men; so that, as bad as the case is

against the Chinamen about filling our prisons, the same charge stands with equal if not greater force against the Irishmen.

The official reports of the industrial school for the year ending July 1, 1875, give:

Total number	225
Native Americans	194
From Ireland	7
Chinese	4

The alms-house official report for the same time, ending July 1, 1875, the only one that I had access to:

Total number	498
Native-born	143
From Ireland	197
Chinese	None.

The hospital report for the same time:

Total number	3,918
Natives of the United States	1,112
Born in Ireland	1,308
Born in China	11

One hundred and eighteen Irishmen to one Chinaman is the way the Chinese are filling our hospitals.

The pest-house report, which is the Chinese hospital, for the same time gives total number, 22; Chinese, none.

If we continue to make our comparisons between our Chinese and European immigrants, we shall find as large a proportion of the one selling liquor as of the other selling opium, and the result in crimes, vice, and poverty, involving a taxation upon our people, vastly more from the sale of liquor than from the sale of opium.

It is a fact that the Chinese are addicted to gambling and all kinds of chance games, but there can be no doubt but that more money is lost and won in this city every day by white gamblers than by all the Chinese in America.

The remedy for this class of evils, as well as the remedy for dirty streets, alleys, tenements, &c., would seem to rest in the municipal government rather than in the abrogation of national treaties or special acts of Congress.

Gambling and prostitution are not legalized and licensed by the laws of China. I should like that to be distinctly understood. The laws and the higher mandarins generally prohibit these vices, but, as in other countries, petty officials receive bribes to permit the unlawful traffic. The municipal authorities of this city in April and May last demonstrated their ability to suppress Chinese gambling and prostitution houses to a large extent. This was done without any large increase of violence, force, or expense, but nearly all the gambling-houses, and many of the houses of prostitution, are now open again.

The Chinese excite less riots, commit fewer assaults and murders, &c., than almost any other foreign population among us. There is a class of bad Chinamen who do such things, but in far less proportion than is done by their labor competitors from Europe. Chinese riots among themselves have been few, and they have never incited nor engaged in a riot against white men in this country.

No riot of Chinese among themselves in this country has ever begun to equal the outrages of the Alameda local option election in this State,

in which drunken Europeans insulted and assaulted respectable American women, and respectable American-born citizens were driven by brute European force from the polls. Chinese immigration has never yet committed such an outrage upon American people nor upon American institutions.

As to assaults, the Chinamen commit few among themselves, almost none upon white people; but hardly a day passes in which our newspapers do not record a case of unprovoked and frequently unpunished assault upon some inoffensive Chinaman. It is a noticeable fact that some years ago, during Mr. Burlingame's stay in this city, in his journey around the world, no assaults upon the Chinamen were reported, although quite frequent just before his arrival and after his departure. Possibly the presence of this congressional committee may have the like effect upon the assaulting parties.

There is no doubt but that the Chinese constantly perjure themselves in our courts, but the class of Chinese who get into our courts are generally the most depraved and unreliable. But then there is the difficulty of a strange language, through an interpreter, and strange processes of law and practices of our courts, quite confusing to the Chinaman.

The Chinese are not the only ones who commit perjury in our courts of justice. A late judge of the county court remarked to me that perjury in our courts by white witnesses is as common as the smoking of cigars upon our streets.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the name of that judge?—A. Judge Stanly.

Q. Is he alive?—A. Yes, sir; he was in health the last I heard from him.

Mr. BROOKS. I saw him alive within a day or two.

Senator SARGENT. It was not Judge Stanly who died?

Mr. BROOKS. Governor Stanly died. The judge is alive, living in Oakland.

The WITNESS. After an experience of about twenty years among this people, I do not hesitate to express my opinion that in simple brain power and possibilities of culture, the Chinese race is equal to any other people in the world. They are capable of learning our language, laws, customs, principles of government, our theories and practices. We know nothing which the Chinese are incapable of learning.

I believe the Chinese come here voluntarily in every case, except it be in the case of the women, who are brought here and sold for vile purposes. All Chinamen claim that they come voluntarily. In China there is no system of slavery so far as the male sex is concerned.

Every unemployed Chinaman in this country to-day is open to a personal, individual engagement to work for any man who will hire him. Many of them, being ignorant of our language and customs, and suspicious of our honesty, choose to make their engagements with some Chinaman, who has a contract for a heavy job, in whom they could rely, and who is responsible for their wages, whether the white man keeps his contract or not. The Chinese who have embraced Christianity all assert, most positively, that the Chinese do not come here slaves to any person nor to any company. The thousands of Chinese house-servants all receive their own wages and use the money as they please. If they were all slaves their masters would hardly allow them to spend their earnings in gambling, as many now do. In all the thousands of Chinese cases that have been before our courts, there has

never yet been the shadow of evidence that any of these Chinamen are slaves, and such certainly would be forthcoming if they were slaves. Among all the missionaries, and all the consular agents, both here and in China, who have studied the Chinese language, and thus are able to better understand the genius and practices of the people than others are, not one has ever yet been found who for a moment believes that any Chinamen in America are slaves, or servile, except in the sense of being unskilled, menial laborers. There is no class of laborers in America to-day more free to do as they please than are the Chinamen.

They often borrow money to get here, and agree to pay high premium or interest, but the agreement is in the amount of money rather than in the number of years of service.

At the present time, the most who come, if assisted at all, are assisted by their relatives or friends or townsmen who were here before them. They come for the express purpose of making money to better their condition. They come at first, probably in all cases, with the hope and intention of acquiring a little competency and returning to their own country to enjoy it, just as all Californians in early days came here. Many of them, however, become so attached to this country, and to our ways, that they are not contented in China, and choose to come back here to live and die; and the number of such is constantly and rapidly increasing. They are willing to do any kind of labor; and as laborers they are generally industrious, faithful, and satisfactory.

I am now reading direct answers to the questions of the committee.

Instead of preventing white labor coming from Europe and from the Eastern States, I believe that up to this time we have had a larger immigration of that class than we should have had if the Chinamen had not been here.

As to health, we have no more healthy class among us than the Chinese. As to cleanliness, they are not a clean people; but in this city and county I do not think they are more filthy than the same number of European common laborers would be.

The Chinese in America are nearly all from the province of Canton, in the south of China, and sail from Hong-Kong, a British port in the south of China.

Few Chinamen in this country in proportion to their whole number have brought their families with them. It is not their custom when emigrating to any point in their own country, or any other country, to take their first wives and children with them. Their women are averse to coming. Their treatment in this country has not encouraged them to bring their families to settle here; and yet they claim between one and two hundred first wives, and there are many times that number of secondary wives. Many of these men become attached to the prostitutes whom they visit, purchase them, and live with them as husband and wife; and the children, if any are born, are considered legitimate. Lately many are marrying after our forms. I myself have married about forty Chinese couples in the last three years who have come with their license; many of them entire strangers to me.

I suppose there are 5,000 or 6,000 Chinese women in this country, the most of whom are prostitutes. They are bought and sold like slaves at the will of their masters.

There are six Chinese companies, representing the principal places from which the Chinese have come. Besides these general companies there are several societies or guilds or unions representing different trades and pursuits; such as the Washerman's Guild, an association of the Chinese laundrymen, composed of men from all the different six companies.

The Hip-ye-tong Association and the Po-sang-tong Association, whose principal business has been to stimulate and protect the gambling and the women traffic. These are different from the six companies. There is also the Chinese Young Men's Christian Association. This last has severed all connection with the six companies.

The famous "six companies" are simply voluntary associations for mutual protection and benefit. It is the universal custom of the Chinese, when emigrating to any new country, to at once form themselves into a guild or association of this kind; and every Chinaman from the same region naturally seeks membership in this guild. They at once open a hall or general meeting-place, and often connect with it a temple or altar to the local divinities of their native place. They elect annually their officers in a very democratic way. Differences that arise among members are referred to the officers and leading influential members for arbitration and settlement. Advice and aid are given to the new comer and to the sick. They are not mercantile firms in any sense; neither are they courts of justice, but voluntary associations for mutual aid and benefit. They do not claim, nor do they exercise, any judicial authority. Cases are constantly occurring where their advice and arbitration is not accepted by the parties, and the disputes are brought into our courts of justice. All the restraining power which these companies hold or exercise over the people is through an arrangement with the various steamship companies, by which no Chinaman can purchase a passage to China without first procuring a permit of departure from these companies. They claim to do this in order to prevent dishonest Chinamen from running away before their debts are paid. Any anxious creditor may leave his accounts against a Chinaman with the company to which the debtor belongs, and no permit will be granted until an amicable settlement is made. They claim that all Chinese in this country belong to one or another of these six companies, except the Young Men's Christian Association, which is supposed to have a membership of about a thousand; but they never claim, and they deny the charge, that they have imported any of these men who belong to their companies. The masses of the Chinese in this country are ignorant of and take little or no interest in our politics; but among the merchants, and especially among the young men attending the schools, are found very many who take an intelligent interest in the politics of this country.

The most of the Chinese now in America were common laborers, farmers, and such like in their own country. They were mostly poor, industrious people, just as they are here. Except it be in the separation from their families the general physical condition of the Chinese is as good if not better in this country than in China, and is constantly and gradually improving. The population of China is from 350,000,000 to 400,000,000.

There are a few pages here in answer to the question with regard to the civilization, the customs, habits, and conditions of the Chinese in China. If the commission wish it I will read it or parts of it.

The CHAIRMAN. I should like to hear it.

Senator SARGENT. Read it and let it go into the record.

The WITNESS. The civilization of the Chinese Empire is the oldest known in history. While other nations and empires have risen and fallen the Chinese Empire has continued to hold sway over its vast domain, and to keep under governmental control the largest population ever subject to a single power.

The government, which is Abrahamic or patriarchal in theory, but,

like some others of more modern date, corrupt in practice, is nevertheless sufficiently powerful to hold in check and comparative order the immense mass of four hundred millions of human beings.

To do this requires organizing and executive ability of no mean order; so that however low the masses may be, still the past history and present existence of the nation compels the recognition of brain-power in the Chinese people not inferior to that of the most advanced nations of the human race.

But as a people they are eminently conservative; what was good enough for their ancestors is good enough for them. The same school-books, the writings of Confucius and Mencius, have been used in their schools for many hundred years without change.

This has stamped a common character upon all the people. Confucius was not a teacher of science, nor yet of religion, but a teacher of political economy as applicable to the patriarchal system of government. His writings discuss in various ways the relative duties between parents and children, elder and younger brothers, husbands and wives, the magistrates and the people, the Emperor and the magistrates.

These books are studied and memorized by the scholars in all parts of the empire, using everywhere the same written or printed characters, but differently pronounced according to the various dialects of the different localities; so that the scholars of one section of the empire, reading aloud a manuscript copy of some of the writings of Confucius, would not be understood by the scholars of some other section of the empire, who might, perhaps, be listening to the reading of a manuscript prepared by themselves; then, again, this written language, common in all parts of the empire, is not a spoken language in any part of the country, except it be in the form of quotations, and the quotations, when used, often need explanation in the local dialect in order to be clearly understood. These different spoken dialects are almost as numerous as are the great cities of China, and differ almost if not quite as widely as do the spoken languages of the different nationalites of Europe.

This difference in dialect, combined with other causes, leads to a kind of local clannishness among the Chinese somewhat similar to the historic clannishness of the Scotch. And although in all parts of the empire the same text-books are memorized, the same literature in common use, and the people all subject to the same general or central government, and stamped with the same general national characteristics, yet the Chinese of one locality have but little affinity for or sympathy with those of a different locality. For instance, between the Chinese of Foo-Chow and the Chinese of Canton there exists about the same regard as exists between the Chinese people in general and the people of the United States.

As to scholarship, the average Chinese scholar knows little or nothing about geography, mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, or astronomy. His knowledge of history is confined to a bare epitome of the history of his own country and people. He knows no language except his own, and yet he is no mere novice; his memory is truly wonderful; his knowledge of the relations and duties between man and man, between the people and the rulers, is indeed remarkable; and in diplomacy the Chinese have few equals.

Schools abound in China, and because schools abound it is generally believed in this country that all Chinamen can read and write their own language, but that is a mistake. Probably not one-fifth of the population have what might be called a common school education. The masses

of the people know the written characters representing the common articles of food and clothing without being able to read a single page of literature. In a country so overburdened with population it is simply impossible for the masses to be educated.

In the arts pertaining to a high civilization the Chinese have made no progress for many centuries. Originally the manufacturing of gunpowder and glass, the art of printing and the use of the compass, belong to China, but no improvements have been made upon the original inventions, and for many hundred years no new inventions have appeared in China.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do the Chinese understand the use of movable type?—A. That is not their system. They may in the open ports now, where movable type has been introduced by foreigners. In Canton they have bought a printing establishment and set up type. Their system of printing from the first has been the same as now. They cut it on boards, the size of the page. It is cut out and stands in relief.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Wood-cuts?—A. Wood-cuts; and then the paper is laid on to the ink.

In science, government, and religion everything is stereotyped; everything runs in the same old rut. Change or improvement in anything that was acceptable to their ancestors is not desired.

The religion of the educated may be formulated as blind fatality; the religion of the masses, a heartless, superstitious idolatry. Of course their civilization is low, for it is an axiom that no people can rise above the plane of the gods they worship.

The Chinese truly verify the Scripture statement that in this world "there be that are called gods many, and lords many." The whole land is full of idols, and all the people are filled with idolatrous superstitions.

The whole civilization of China has stood still for ages, and has become like one great stagnant pool. To purify it, it needs to be moved and stirred from center to circumference by contact and friction with the Christian civilization of America and Europe. The few thousands of European and American merchants and missionaries now in China, and the one hundred and fifty thousand Chinese now in America, are but the beginnings of mighty changes about to take place in the history of that wonderfully strange people.

Occupying one of the grandest domains in the world; enjoying a healthy climate, having in abundance all products and minerals of earth; not only satisfied with, but exceedingly proud of, their civilization, their literature, and their religion, the Chinese long ago adopted an exclusive policy. They have always discouraged emigration from their own shores, and have been constantly and bitterly opposed to every attempt by outside nations to settle among them.

Even in these our days, the Chinese have entered into friendly relations with other nations, simply because they have been compelled to do so. The term "Chinese walls of exclusion" has become a sort of proverbial phrase well understood by all classes of people.

Living thus by themselves, with little or no contact or friction with the customs, the language, civil polity, or religion prevailing among other nations the Chinese people seem generally to be filled with the strange conceit that they are superior to all other nations of the earth.

This conceit is so strong, and their prejudice against all other people so bitter, that, unless under some restraint of circumstances, they seldom

fail to manifest contempt for any and all other people except their own; for any and all customs differing from their own, and for any and all learning, or science, or invention, or art differing from the established order of things in their own "Middle Kingdom."

However foolish and absurd this conceit may appear to us, it is not so very strange after all that the Chinese are filled with it. For centuries the civilization of the Chinese has been in advance of the nations and peoples of Asia, immediately adjacent to them, and with whom alone they have had intercourse.

With a people more numerous, a government more powerful, and a history of greater antiquity, a literature more extensive and refined, a better system of philosophy, and a purer standard of morals, a general civilization, in fact, quite in advance of all the peoples with which they had as yet come in contact, it is not so very strange, after all, that Christian civilization has found the Chinese thinking of themselves as standing at the head of the human race. They have schools and colleges; they understand political economy; they have an immense coast and inland commerce; they understand agricultural pursuits equal to any people in the world; they build houses, and temples, and immense stone bridges; they have a great navigable canal system, reaching through almost the entire length of the country; they make silks, satins, and cotton cloth; they are elaborate carvers of ivory, wood, &c.; they make beautiful bronze castings, and exquisite china ware; they are industrious and frugal to the last degree.

The marriage relation is recognized and honored in China. Polygamy is allowable, though not very generally practiced. A man who is able to do so will sometimes marry a second wife, because he desires a son and heir, and has no issue by his first wife. Merchants doing business in distant parts of the country usually leave their families at home at the patriarchal residence, and often take a secondary wife or concubine at the place of their temporary residence. In such cases the children, if any are born to them, are considered legitimate, and are treated as such. These secondary wives or concubines seem to sustain very much the same relation to the first wife that Hagar sustained to Sarah in Abraham's household.

With them marriage is rather a civil contract than a religious rite or ceremony. No public register is kept; no certificates of marriage given; no legalized civilian or ordained priest of religion is necessary to the performance or consummation of the contract.

The parties pledge each other in small cups of wine and perform together a whole ritual of prostrations before the open heavens and also before the family penates. There is a great deal of form and ceremony, according to the rank of the parties, but the prostrations and mutual pledging seem to be the principal parts. In taking a secondary wife or concubine forms and ceremonies may be omitted, the secondary wife taking her place in the family with as little ceremony as a hired servant would in America. Under certain circumstances divorces are allowable, and may even put away their wives for certain trivial causes; for instance, one of the seven sufficient causes justifying divorce is "a persistent habit of loquacity on the part of the lady."

But divorces are not frequent, and if a man marries when poor and afterward becomes rich, he may not for any cause put away the wife who shared his years of poverty. It is not considered respectable for a widow to marry again, and if a young girl loses her betrothed before marriage, it is considered highly meritorious in her to remain unmarried all her life. The people sometimes erect testimonials of respect to such

persons. Sometimes a young lady bereaved of her betrothed husband before the consummation of marriage publicly commits suicide, in order to make her widowhood perpetual and to remove herself beyond the temptation to marry another.

One such instance occurred at Fua-Chau during my residence there. The relatives and friends of both parties knew all about her intentions, and assisted her in making preparations. Her intention as well as the place and day of executing it were designated on invitation cards sent to the magistrates and to persons of distinction, and to all the friends and acquaintances of the interested families. Every one joined in aiding or encouraging her, it being generally considered that she was about to perform a very meritorious act.

The British consul at the port, Mr. W. H. Medhurst, remonstrated with the mandarins for allowing such a thing to take place, but they professed to fear a popular demonstration or mob if they should interfere to prevent it. Very likely they had encouraged it. A day or two previous to her self-immolation she was dressed in gaudy robes and was carried about in state through the principal streets of the city after the fashion of parading idols. A temporary stage or scaffolding was erected in the open fields, and on the day appointed thousands of people assembled to witness the sacrifice.

From a frame on the platform a strip of scarlet crape was suspended and a chair was placed under the frame. The little woman was assisted to mount the platform. She herself adjusted the suspended crape around her neck, embraced a little boy, her brother, bowed parting salutations to the crowd, smiling all the while, then mounted the chair and resolutely jumped off, her little hands still saluting the crowd as her quivering body was twirled around by the tightening cord. Although this took place within a mile of my residence, I did not have the courage to witness it. I could not bear to be present and thus seem to countenance such a wicked thing. The very thought of such an affair taking place was sickening in the extreme.

There is no practice of personal courtship between the parties about to be married as with us in America. The young men and maidens of China are relieved of all embarrassments of that kind. Older and more experienced heads make the selections of life-partners for the young and inexperienced boys and girls. They also make all the preliminary contracts, betrothals, and arrangements for the marriage.

Betrothals are often made while the children are quite young, and sometimes conditionally even before the children are born. The married woman is subject to the will of her husband, and what is often much worse, to the control of her husband's mother.

The faithfulness of married women in China to their husband's will compares favorably with the practice of the same virtue by the women of Europe and America.

Husbands are not generally so chaste as the wives. Female prostitution exists in all parts of the empire, and is especially prevalent in large cities and in all sea-port towns. This class of women is usually confined to some particular quarter of the city or to boat-population.

Poor people often sell their female infants to this class of panderers to human depravity, and the poor girls are brought up in perpetual bondage to the will of their villainous masters.

Infanticide of female children is practiced in all parts of the empire, in some sections to an alarming extent.

Proclamations are sometimes issued by the magistrates warning the people against committing the crime of infanticide, not only because it

is a crime, but also because girls are becoming so scarce and expensive that the common people cannot afford to marry and public morals are endangered. There is no infanticide of boys, neither is there any system of slavery in China as regards the male sex.

The people of China are noted for their industry and frugality. Every man has something to do. The streets of the cities and villages are full of people, but all these comers and goers are intent on some business. Few people walk the streets simply for the exercise, or to see the sights. And yet the streets of Chinese cities usually present a picture of universal industry almost without a parallel.

There are no railroads, no horse-cars, no stage-coaches. All land transportation, especially in Central and Southern China, is done by the bone and muscle of human beings. Merchandise, house-furniture, and building-material are all packed on men's shoulders. Travelers who are able to pay, and feeble ones unable to walk, are carried about in sedan-chairs on the shoulders of men. These chair-bearers and burden-carriers have stands in different parts of the city to which a person can send for a conveyance, just as we Americans patronize expressmen and livery-stables.

In his habits of living the ordinary Chinaman is exceedingly economical and frugal. In all Central and Southern China rice is the principal staple of food. Rice and vegetables, fish, pork, and fowls compose the principal diet of the people. The cost of living is small compared with the cost of living of the average American. The average Chinamen in his own country can live nicely in most parts of the empire on from seven cents to fifteen cents per day. That will give him all the rice and vegetables he can eat, with a small allowance for fish or meat daily. Chinamen know how to cook rice better than most people.

The price of labor corresponds to the cheapness of living. Fifteen to twenty cents per day is very good pay for a common laborer. Literary men of good ability can afford to teach for salaries from six dollars to ten dollars per month, and board themselves. House-servants among the Chinese receive from two to four dollars per month and found. Serving in white families in China, in the open ports, Hong-Kong, Canton, Amoy, Fuh-Chau, Shanghai, &c., they receive from three to ten dollars per month, according to the ability of the employer to pay, and the ability of the servant to please. Mechanics and stone-masons receive from twenty to forty cents per day.

The cost of living in China and the price of labor is from three to five times less than in most parts of the United States. The currency of the country is adapted to this cheap rate of living and low price of labor.

The currency used in all parts of the empire is a brass "cash," about the size of a twenty-cent. piece, quite thin, with a square hole through the center. These are strung together in hundreds, and the hundreds tied in pairs or links like a log-chain, and sold in packages of 400, 600, 800, or 1,000 cash. A Mexican silver dollar is worth about 1,000 brass cash; so that a single brass cash is about the value of one mill of our money.

This is the common currency in the retail transactions of every-day life in all parts of the empire. Mexican dollars and American trade-dollars are also in circulation, but before they have been long in circulation they become what is known in China as "chop-dollars."

With a cold-chisel each banker punches his name or stamp on the face of every dollar he handles; and this process, often repeated, soon spoils the face of the poor dollar, covers it with Chinese letters till not a letter of the original superscription can be seen, depreciates its weight and

value, and retires it from the retail-market. The banks in changing brass cash for silver dollars always take the dollars by weight, not by count. They are exceedingly expert in detecting counterfeit coin.

In large mercantile transactions payments are made in sycee, *i. e.*, in bars, lumps, or masses of silver by weight, bearing the stamp of the house issuing it.

There is one custom prevailing among the Chinese in financial matters which is worthy of imitation; *i. e.*, a universal custom of squaring accounts at the close of each year.

The rule is, that debts must all be paid at that time. If payment cannot be made, mutual arrangements are made to continue the account. The power of this custom is so strong that it frequently produces fatal results. The debtor, unable to pay or to make satisfactory arrangements to continue the account, becomes mortified and discouraged and commits suicide as the only means in his power of cancelling his financial obligations.

It cannot be said that the Chinese generally in their houses and personal habits of living are a neat and clean people. They seem to us very careless, even filthy, in some of their habits, and quite squeamish and particular in others. A Chinaman's stomach turns at the sight and smell of strong cheese, but he regards fish, in advanced stages of decay, with much less disfavor. They bathe their persons often in warm weather. It is a very common custom among all classes in the summer-time, at the close of each day's work, to take a sponge-bath from a little bucket of warm water.

They do not believe in cold baths under any circumstances—"cold-water cures" have no advocates nor patrons among the Chinese. Their clothing, also, especially in warm weather, is frequently washed and kept comparatively clean. But, on the other hand, the water-carrier might not think it out of place to wash his feet in the water-bucket, and after a good rinsing bring water in the same bucket for you to drink.

While living in Fuh-Chau, China, I saw an instance of this kind. Our cooly, or man-of-all-work, was called from digging in the garden to bring a turn of water from the well. Both my wife and myself happened to see the performance. He drew both buckets full, coolly washed his feet and legs in one bucket, then emptied out the water and rinsed the bucket with the water from the other. This done he again filled both buckets and brought the water to the house for family use. On being remonstrated with for the dirty trick, he respectfully suggested that our objections to the performance were not founded on good and reasonable grounds. He was sorry that he had offended us, but maintained that the water in the well came out of, and through, the ground, and that his feet and legs were covered with the same kind of dust and soil as the water of the well, and therefore there could not be anything really dirty about it, and as to the dust and soil getting into the water-bucket he had been very careful to rinse the bucket clean, and had brought clean, pure water to the house. However, he would scrub the bucket, and do better next time; but my wife would never use any water out of that bucket again. So some new ones were bought, doubtless to the amusement of the philosophic water-carrier.

A Chinaman will often scrub his teeth and rinse his mouth in the same dish and same water in which he has just washed his face, and they generally have clean teeth.

The Chinese dish-washer might not think it amiss to wipe his face and your dinner-plate with the same cloth. But then who has not heard of that same class among white people doing just these same or worse things?

In the cold weather the Chinese do not bathe their persons so frequently nor wash their clothing so often, and the consequence is that they become exceedingly filthy, and the clothing and persons of the common people often become alive with vermin. It is an exceedingly disgusting, but not an uncommon sight in China, to see some chair-bearer or other common laborer employing his leisure moments in biting with his teeth the seams of his clothing in a wholesale slaughter of vermin, the offspring of his own filth. But the same thing is done in Rome and in Cork.

The Chinese are not the only filthy people in the world. A man who employs a gang of white men and a gang of Chinamen in the mines of California, told me this day that the Chinese were more cleanly in their camps and in their persons than the whites.

Mr. W. H. Seward, in his "Voyage Around the World," thus sums up the civilization of China:

> The Chinese, though not of the Caucasian race, have all its moral and social adaptabilities. Long ago they reached a higher plane of civilization than most European nations attained until a much later period. The western nations have since risen above this plane. The Chinese have made no advancement. Although China is far from being a barbarous state, yet every system and institution there is inferior to its corresponding one in the West. Whether it be the abstract sciences, such as philosophy and psychology, or whether it be the practical forms of natural science, astromomy, geology, geography, natural history, and chemistry; or the concrete ideas of government and laws, morals and manners; whether it be in the æsthetic arts or mechanics, everything in China is effete. Chinese education rejects science. Chinese industries proscribe invention. Chinese morals appeal not to conscience but to convenience. Chinese architecture and navigation eschew all improvements. Chinese religion is materialistic, not even mystic, much less spiritual.
>
> If we ask how this inferiority has come about among a people who have achieved so much in the past, and have such capacities for greater achievements in the future, we must conclude that, owing to some error in their social system, the faculty of invention has been arrested in its exercise and impaired.

This I believe to be a clear and correct statement of the facts concerning the civilization of China, but not so clear nor correct a conclusion as to the causes which have produced the general stagnation which exists as might be given. The prime cause is not to be found in "some error in their ancient social system," but in their false religion, the universal prevalence of a debasing idolatry. The minds of a people constantly given to the study and practice of the endless ceremonies and ritual of innumerable gods made with men's hands will never be interested in the study of nature's God. "No people can rise above the plane of the gods which they worship." The Chinese civilization long ago rose to the level of their gods, and can never rise higher till their dumb idols shall be discarded and the God of heaven be recognized in the thought of the people as the only wise and true God.

We have now 150,000 of this people among us, very few of whom are women or children. The larger part are of the ignorant but industrious masses. We will now look at them in this country.

The work of Christianizing the Chinese nation was at first slow, but very great progress has been made, and now the work is progressing much faster than ever before. As an instance, the mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Fuh-Chau, was established ten full years before a single convert was baptized, but now it numbers about two thousand active church members and probationers scattered throughout the province, and about twice that number of attendants upon the regular Christian services. In this one mission there are some seventy native preachers, several of whom are ordained, and of whom Bishop Harris says, for intelligence, enterprise, self-sacrifice, devotion to their work, eloquence, and general ability and influence over the people they will compare favorably with an equal number of Methodist ministers in any of the

conferences of America. Many of the preachers are now supported entirely or in part by the native churches. They have proved their sincerity by enduring persecution, even to blows and imprisonment, for the sake of their religion. These Chinese Christians are not often found in the service of the mercantile community nor in the employ of ship-captains.

The mercantile community at Fuh-Chau are served nearly always by Canton men who came up with them as tea-men to start upon, and have continued to furnish that class of help. Besides, the Fuh-Chau Chinese people have never had any instruction in the English language and they cannot serve them.

These Chinese Christians are almost never seen by this class of Americans and Europeans. I candidly doubt whether Captain King ever saw a Chinaman, either in China or America, who was recognized as a Christian. Sometimes for their own credit they report themselves as being Christians, thinking it will be a recommendation to them.

The missionary work in China is all done in the Chinese language. Few, if any of the Chinese Christians can speak the English at all, and that excludes them generally from European and American service.

The persons who testify that there are no Chinese Christians, are persons who know nothing about the matter; have never visited the mission, and have never come in contact with Chinese Christians. These same persons, if called upon to testify, would likely say that there were no real Christians in the world, or that Christianity itself is a humbug.

There are now over 12,000 communicants of the Protestant Christian churches in China, and a line of Christian chapels and communities all along up and down the coast, so that a traveler can travel by land from Canton to Shanghai and stop at night a large part of the way at some Protestant chapel, and be entertained by a Chinese Protestant family, and surrounded by a small Protestant community.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the distance?—A. From Canton to Shanghai is. I suppose, eight hundred or a thousand miles. You can travel all the way from Amoy to Fuh-Chau and stop every night at a chapel.

In California there are about three hundred Chinese who have been baptized and received into the different Protestant churches. If we include those who belong to the Chinese Young Men's Christian Association, and the various associations for learning Christian doctrines, the number comes up nearly to one thousand. Their character is such that many Chinese who are not Christians, falsely claim to be such or to belong to the mission schools, in order to gain the confidence of their employers. I have had persons come to me to find a boy who had served in their family and stolen, they thinking he belonged to my mission; he had told them he belonged to it—that he was a Christian. On investigation, finding out who the Chinaman was, I would learn that he had never been to the mission and I never knew him. The thing occurs every month.

The most of these men make sacrifices and endure contempt for the sake of the truth. One young man in my employ as a native assistant at San José, lives in the face of a constant offer of much larger wages if he will stop preaching and enter a Chinese mercantile firm. His character is such that the anti-Chinese society at San José took him for the most reliable authority on Chinese matters, and reported his statistics as a part of their testimony.

Another young man, now earning fifteen dollars per week, proposes to leave his employment and take service as an assistant preacher of the gospel at six dollars per week.

I knew an instance of a young Chinaman in this city who was cruelly whipped by his mother-in-law, to make him renounce his faith in the Christian religion, but he remained firm, gained the confidence of his father, and is now a trusted and efficient clerk in the Chinese customs in China. I have never known of more than one or two instances of Chinese Christians relapsing into idolatry. I do not believe that any Protestant missionary or gentleman acquainted with the facts of the case, ever stated that most of the Chinese Christians were hypocrites and soon fell back into idolatry. The Chinese Christians of the Methodist mission, as to general integrity, honesty, and character, will compare favorably with the Christians or the other Methodist churches of this city. The yearly increase is also about the same in proportion as that gathered in other churches from the adult male population.

Something has been said about the cruelty and piratical character of all Chinese, their unwillingness to aid their fellow-men in suffering.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have reference now to Captain King's testimony?—A. I do not know who it was; I have heard it stated two or three times.

Q. You heard Mr. King's testimony?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You heard him make that statement?—A. I think I did.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. He gave the instances, naming vessels?—A. Yes; it was Captain King. I remember it now. They have public granaries from which the poor are fed at public expense in time of famine. They have lately imposed severe regulations requiring all vessels, sailors, soldiers, and officers—civil and military and naval—to aid and succor shipwrecked vessels, to save life and property, giving rewards to those who obey, and punishing those who neglect to obey. In the recent floods that destroyed so many houses and people, the officers required all boats to assist the suffering and rescue the drowning. Those who refused were immediately punished. The dealers in rice formed a ring and raised the price so high as to distress the people. The mandarins immediately published a fixed rate for rice and food. Any violation of the rule was followed by confiscation of property.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. From your observation of these people here, do you think that the vicious element among the Chinese is more difficult to control than the same element among the white immigrants?—A. No, sir.

Q. How does it compare in that respect with the vicious element in the foreign population as to the ability of the municipal government to control it?—A. I think they are as easily controlled as the vicious among the foreign immigrants from any country. They are more subject to law.

Q. Are they not in their own country habitually obedient to the law, respecters of the law?—A. That is the character of the people generally.

Q. What do you think of the capacity of the Chinese, morally and intellectually, to understand our political institutions?—A. I think they are perfectly able to do so so far as brain power and capacity is concerned. There is no doubt of it.

Q. Are they not accustomed in China from the lowest ranks to rise to the highest offices owing to their ability?—A. That is the general rule. There are one or two exceptions. There is a class of boat people who

do not have the same privileges with others, but all the people, as a general thing, have an equal chance.

Q. May not a poor laboring-man, a small farmer, rise to the highest offices?—A. Yes; the son of the poorest man may rise to the highest office.

Q. Do you know in what rank in life Confucius started from?—A. His father was a scholar, what they call a literary man, but poor, as I remember.

Q. Mr. Toland, in his testimony before the legislative committee, said something in regard to the condition of affairs in Shanghai, China, in 1862. Do you recollect the statement?—A. I was in Shanghai in 1862.

Q. What were the facts in regard to that statement?—A. It was the time of the rebellion in that northern part of China, and the imperial army and the army of the rebels had scoured the country all round about and devastated the fields, consumed the means of living, and tens of thousands had been driven into what we call the foreign city of Shanghai and its surroundings. There was great suffering, cholera prevailed, and it was a time of wonderful distress and destitution. Thousands of people were dying for want of food. I might say with regard to the city of Shanghai, when you speak of it, there is a Chinese city with a wall around it separated from the Shanghai of commerce. The Shanghai of commerce is a foreign city largely with some Chinese residents, and many poor people and criminals that this gentleman testified about were in the foreign part of the city largely, and, as I understand it, for I was there at the time, they were persons who were driven in by this devastation of the war and were compelled to beg or steal or die.

Q. It was not then the normal condition of that place?—A. Anything but that.

Q. Was it at all characteristic of China or illustrative of Chinese society?—A. No, sir; on the contrary, I was through the city of Shanghai, the Chinese city, at the same time in 1862, when it was full of enterprise and full of industry.

Q. Would the character given by him to half the people in China as beggars and thieves apply with any degree of correctness to the Chinese city?—A. Not at all, as I understand it. It might apply to this outside population driven in by the war, but not to the Chinese city of Shanghai at all.

Q. Is it true, as stated by him, that the common people in China do not marry?—A. No, sir; it is respectable for all men to marry, and every man who is able has his boys married. There are men who are not married, but it is not so respectable. It is a desirable thing for all in China to marry. The habit and custom is for all people to marry. All girls of respectable families are married.

Q. Are the men and women who live together there and cohabit, generally married according to the laws of their own country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it rare for a man and a woman to live otherwise than as man and wife there?—A. As a general thing they do not live together at all unless they are man and wife, except professional prostitutes. There are professional prostitutes in those cities. With that exception all men who live with women are married as a general thing.

Q. The professional prostitutes, however, do not live with men?—A. No, sir; not in the sense of family living. They are visited by men.

Q. Is there such a thing in China as a man living with a woman as his mistress?—A. I do not know anything of the kind. I never heard of anything of the kind.

Q. With the great mass it is almost universal there in regard to children that they are legitimate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How does that compare with some parts of Europe?—A. I think there are much fewer of what Chinese consider to be illegitimate children in China than in almost any other country, but it must be understood that there is a system of polygamy, concubinage, and the children of concubines are legitimate.

Q. They are within the pale of law?—A. Yes, sir. It might be safe to say that all children in China are legal children. There may be exceptions, but there are so few that it would not amount to anything.

Q. What opportunity would a white policeman have in China to learn Chinese customs?—A. None at all when I was there, except among these vagrants who were driven in by the war.

Q. Have not the Chinese a very elaborate written code of law?—A. I believe they have a constitution.

Q. Is not that revised every five years by the board of judges?—A. I do not remember. There are six boards regulating the whole division of government, divided into six departments. Each of the six boards has its regular constitution.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the six boards or six departments. Do you mean that those departments correspond to our Departments of the Interior, Treasury, or anything of that sort?—A. There is a naval department and a foreign department.

Q. Is there a treasury department?—A. There is a treasury department and so on. I do not know that I could name the exact six departments.

Q. These boards consist of what?—A. Of a number of men who are appointed, and who regulate that department of the government, under the Emperor, of course; but the Emperor really is simply a creature of theirs.

Q. Is one man at the head of each department?—A. I do not know about that. I suppose there is a chairman of each department, but there are a number of men who have the control of each department.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. The court consists of a number of men?—A. A number of men; high officers.

Q. Instead of having one minister of a department, they have a board who has charge of that department?—A. That is what I understand, although I have not read up on that subject lately.

Q. Are you aware that every five years the board re-assembles at the capital to revise this code of law and propose amendments?—A. I cannot speak of that, for my memory is not clear at this moment. I have read a great deal about Chinese matters, but do not remember it all.

Q. Is there not a regular judicial system of courts?—A. Yes, sir; all over the country.

Q. With appeal from one to the other up to the Emperor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the general estimation of the character of white persons who entered service in the Chinese army in China?—A. Not very reputable among American people.

Q. You have spoken of the Chinese converts in China. Is there any attraction, any advantage to a Chinaman to become a Christian in China?—A. Only as he expects to get to the kingdom of heaven. There is nothing else.

Q. There is no temporal advantage to him.—A. No, sir; on the contrary it is generally a sacrifice.

Q. Have there not been persecutions of those who profess Christianity?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In this country have they any temporal temptation to become Christian?—A. On the contrary they have everything the other way.

Q. What is the effect among their own people? How do they stand with their own people when professing Christianity?—A. They are in a measure tabooed, scoffed at.

Q. Are there not foundling asylums in all the large cities of China?—A. I think there are; there are in all the cities that I know of.

Q. What is the object and the purpose of these asylums?—A. The foundling asylums are to save the castaways.

Q. Children that are abandoned?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Infants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are these asylums supported by the government or by private subscription?—A. Rich men make large contributions, and the government will also aid.

Q. Are they not mainly supported by private subscriptions?—A. Largely.

Q. With an elected directory?—A. I do not know about their government and control, but they are supported largely by subscriptions and contributions.

Q. Are they not in their constitution very similar to our orphan asylums here, that they mainly depend upon the subscriptions of charitable people and elect their own officers, and the government occasionally assists them?—A. That is the way it is done. That is what I said, that the government aids, but principally they are supported by the contributions of rich people.

Q. You have spoken of the peculiar custom that the Chinese have so unlike our own, of paying up all their debts at New Year's so as to have a clear score at New Year's?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the impelling power that makes this so obligatory upon them?—A. Custom.

Q. Nothing but custom?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is there any way of compelling payment of debt there more than among us?—A. No, sir.

Q. You say their inability to comply with this custom frequently impels them to suicide?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is merely a moral force?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, they are not subject to any penalty?—A. No, sir.

Q. If they do not pay their debt, can they be sold to slavery or subjected to any punishment?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is simply a disgrace?—A. A disgrace.

Q. As to the trade in China, what has been the custom in regard to that trade of dealing in goods by sample?—A. I only know about that what I have heard.

Q. Most of our testimony has been of a hearsay character. As a matter of public information are not cargoes of tea usually sold by samples?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not the custom in China to sell all goods by sample?—A. Tea and things of that kind especially.

Q. Bought and shipped in cases unexamined?—A. Yes, sir; while I was there.

Q. That has been the custom, as you understand, of their trade?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That, of course, implies that the goods always conform to the sample?—A. With regard to these great transactions in tea, and all the great mercantile transactions, they must of necessity involve great confidence by our merchants in the compradors. A Chinese comprador is sent up into the country with two hundred and fifty, three hundred, and five hundred thousand dollars in bulk to buy tea, and there is no security except his honesty and integrity. That class of men in China have a good character among European and American men of business for reliability and honesty. There may be exceptions, but I never heard of them. I knew of the case of Russell & Co., who were burnt out at one time, and their books were all burnt up. They had large sums of money out with different Chinese compradors. The compradors were up in the country buying tea, and they were very sorry to hear about the house being burnt up, the books, &c., and they brought their own books and put them at the disposal of the house, and they got from them the names of those who had purchased and were able to open up their books again so far as their transactions with these compradors were concerned.

Q. They purchase their teas in the interior?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where they are packed and put in cases and sold in cases?—A. These teas are brought down in chops; they are prepared for the market in the country. One box is taken off, and it goes through the hands of the tea-taster—three boxes sometimes. The chop is put in a large ferry-boat and taken down the river to the ship. One box is taken off as a sample and passes through the tea-taster's hand, and then it is sold.

Q. Who does the tea-taster act for?—A. The purchaser of the tea. Every house that buys tea keeps one or more tea-tasters.

Q. Chinese houses?—A. No, sir; American mercantile houses.

Q. Are they sold by the weight which the cases represent, as marked upon the cases?—A. They are sold by the Chinaman's purchase-weight.

Q. How do the Chinese goods hold out in respect to complying with the sample and in regard to weight?—A. I was never in mercantile business there, and do not know so positively about those things as others might. I never heard of any complaint particularly, except once I heard of one chop of tea that went down the river, which was said to have been a bad article; that it was changed after they had got it in hand. The matter was investigated, and it was found out that one or two Chinamen were connected with that fraud, and one white man, who was the captain of the boat. Who was to blame I do not know; both parties were implicated in the transaction. I never heard of any other case.

Q. You were speaking of infanticide. Does that extend through all China, or is it confined to certain provinces?—A. It is confined largely to certain provinces, though it is said to exist more or less all over the country. I do not think it prevails so largely in some parts, and perhaps it is hardly known at all. It is practiced among the poor who are not able to bring up their girls.

Q. Does it prevail in any other part of the world?—A. I have heard that it does; I do not know.

Q. How does the position of women in China compare with their position in the eastern part of Europe?—A. Quite as well, or better I should say.

Q. How as compared with the Servian province, Russia, or Belgium?—A. About the same; I should say quite as good.

Q. Was not this exclusive policy in regard to commerce adopted after the expulsion of the Jesuits; up to that time were they not open to trade with other nations?—A. I do not now remember when they commenced their exclusive policy, but they have been for many hundred years exclusive in their policy.

Q. You spoke of paying a white servant $16 a month. What has been the regular rate of wages paid to house-servant's here for the last five or ten years?—A. I understand that for a common white servant in a family $25 to $30 if she comes and does general work; all the way from $20 to $30. I tried to get five or six white girls at $25 a month and could not get any.

Q. Did you state how many children there were born here of Chinese parents?—A. I could not tell you; there are perhaps two or three hundred Chinese children in this city now.

Q. Did you present here a printed statement or chart or constitution of these companies?—A. No, sir; I did not present anything printed.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You state that these six companies are volunteer companies?—A. That is my understanding.

Q. Do all persons become members of the companies by going up and giving their names, or is the membership confind to a few persons?—A. I understand that it is desirable for every person who comes from a region represented by a particular company—that it is generally their desire to be connected with that company. An agent from each of the companies meets the immigrants on the steamer, and, either from some person who comes with them who knows them or by interrogatories, they ask, "Where are you from." They say so and so, and the agent says then, "You belong to such a company," and his name is taken down, and he becomes a member of the company in that way.

Q. Do they pay an admission-fee?—A. No, sir; I think no admission-fee is paid by them.

Q. How are the revenues of the company made up?—A. I think nearly all the revenues they have now are simply voluntary subscriptions when they want special money for special purposes, and then the Chinaman asks for a permit. I think he asks for a permit.

Q. A permit for what?—A. A permit for departure according to the arrangement with the steamship companies and our six companies. The steamship companies have an arrangement with the six companies, which I read to you, that they will not sell a Chinaman a ticket to return unless he has a permit from his company.

Q. Do these companies have officers who devote their time exclusively to their company?—A. I think so.

Q. How are they paid?—A. Out of these revenues.

Q. From the sale of permits?—A. From the sale of permits; and they have also collections. If they are in need of money, they will issue their statement of a tax of so much, asking people to pay a certain sum. Some pay more and some less—half a dollar for a man, usually. It is all voluntary. Every man pays or does not pay, as he pleases. There is no system by which the company forces collection.

Q. If they find employment for a Chinaman, do they tax him so much for his wages?—A. I never heard, except here in this investigation, of the Chinese six companies finding employment for anybody. I never heard of the Chinese six companies—the whole or as one—furnishing employment for anybody, so far as my knowledge or connection with the Chinese is concerned, and I never heard of anybody going to the six companies to get employment.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do they import anybody?—A. I never heard of their importing anybody except in these wholesale charges made against them.

Q. Do they import any goods?—A. I have never heard of their importing any goods.

Q. Do they deal in merchandise?—A. I do not understand them to be mercantile firms in any kind of business.

Q. Have you heard of anything in your intercourse with the Chinese which leads you to suppose that these institutions had any other business than that of eleemosynary institutions?—A. I do not think they have any other object. Sometimes, when the officers get fees, they may make a little money out of it, but their ostensible business and practice is of a charitable nature.

Q. Do they relieve the sick?—A. I think they do; in early times, very much. Lately, I think, not so much, because nearly all the Chinamen here have personal friends to help them if they get into trouble.

Q. I see there are no poor Chinamen in the almshouse. Where do their poor go; who takes care of them?—A. Their friends. Most of them have brothers, uncles, or friends. They are a great people to help each other.

Q. Do these companies act as bankers?—A. I never heard of such a thing.

Q. Do you know of their remitting money?—A. I never heard of a thing of the kind. A Chinaman connected with one of these companies, who was president last year—for they elect, I believe, annually—was for some time my personal teacher before he became president and during part of the time while he was president. Previous to that time it was impossible for me to get any satisfactory knowledge of what these companies were, but he was one of the most gentlemanly Chinamen here, and an intelligent, scholarly man. He was president of that company. I visited the hall of the company often, and found him there with his interpreter and clerk and one or two men, and never saw them doing any business except this kind of arbitration and general interest in their people as such, and he constantly and persistently insisted that that is all that they do.

Q. What proportion of the Chinese who are here now have been back to China and are here for the second time?—A. Of course that is only my opinion, but I should judge at least somewhere between a third and a half. I do not know but more. Large numbers of those who are here have come for the second time.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have heard the testimony of Captain King in which he stated that he was engaged in the coast traffic of China on the schooner Wanderer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you tell the commission what was the character of the lorchas, as they call them, engaged in the coasting trade generally?—A. There were a number of lorchas, known as opium-lorchas, all engaged in visiting ports not open according to the treaty, and smuggling goods, opium, and property. About the Wanderer I have not a very distinct recollection. I could not tell, for instance, what company she was owned by or trading for. I remember a schooner or lorcha there by the name of the Wanderer. I may have seen Captain King. I have tried from the time of his testimony until now to call him to my mind. I have no recollection of ever seeing Captain King until I saw him here, although he says I did; and very likely I did. I will not say I did not. I asked my wife about it, and she does not remember him.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I believe he mentioned the circumstances under which he saw you.—A. He mentioned a circumstance of going down on a vessel to the mouth of a river, and that made me think more than ever that he is mistaken. I never went down with any vessel with Captain King, I am very confident. I have not been able to call to mind any circumstance to refresh my memory. I went down the river on a British gunboat, with a number of Chinese officials who were going out to sea. I went down on what we call a house-boat, with a Scotch Captain Dallas of a certain ship. I went down on two or three occasions. I remember a number of gentlemen with whom I went. I do not say it is not so, for many things occurred a great many years ago that I do not remember.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Are not those vessels engaged in the coasting-trade usually engaged in disreputable trade, opium and gathering coolies?—A. Usually. I do not know about gathering coolies so far up north as Takiang province. These coasters are looked upon with suspicion.

Q. What is your experience and knowledge of the prompt redressing by the Chinese government of wrongs perpetrated upon foreigners, missionaries and others, by the natives—stoning them in the streets?—A. Although the Chinese hate to punish their own people for any assaults upon foreigners, so far as my experience went they always did it, and did it quite efficiently when required to do so by our consul.

Q. Do you know the circumstances of the stoning of a missionary there some years ago, in which the United States vessel the Saco, Captain McDougall, was called upon?—A. Yes, sir; there was a riot at Fuhchau, and mission chapels were torn to pieces, and one missionary family was driven out of their house, and the house torn to pieces by the mob. Captain McDougall went with his men up there. I was there at the time. That was the time when I acted for Mr. Clark, our consul, as interpreter and general manager of the consulate for about six months.

Q. What was the result of that affair?—A. The result was that all the indemnity was paid and the men were punished.

Q. In what manner were the men punished?—A. They were imprisoned, I believe, one or two of them, and one or two escaped and were never caught. Those who escaped were not permitted to go home, and could not go home. Two of them were put in prison. The officer who did not act efficiently was disgraced.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. So far as matters came under your observation there, how does the account given by Captain King compare with your own observation?—A. I heard nearly all Mr. King's testimony. Many things that Mr. King said are true, but many things are not true, according to my view of the case. I would say in regard to the settlement of this difficulty that we found it necessary to go to the governor-general with the British consul, the American consul, Captain McDougall, and his men of war, and a large retinue. We had an interview with the governor-general, who was the second man in the empire. After we were all arranged in the room, the old man asked what we had come for. He was told. He said he had heard about that difficulty, and was sorry for it, and then he said: "Gentlemen, what do you want I shall do? Whatever you want, in accordance with law, that shall be done. The Takiang people are a turbulent race, and I have difficulty in governing them, but we propose keeping our treaties and to make the people obey the law," and I think he did, as far as he could.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Speaking of this problem of white-labor competition, &c., what do the wages of the white man who has a family represent. In other words, do they not represent the education of his children, decent household accommodations for them, plain, decent food, and things of that kind, which go to make up a comfortable home for an American laborer? Is not that true?—A. I should think it was, certainly.

Q. He must receive wages sufficient to cover those points and enable him to keep his children at school and in decent clothes?—A. Yes, sir; certainly.

Q. Our American civilization carries that idea?—A. That is the desire.

Q. That is the want of American society and American labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How does the Chinaman live in those regards; does he educate his children and have separate accommodations for the members of his family?—A. The Chinamen in this country do not live in families. They have not brought their families, we all know.

Q. They have no families to educate?—A. Some of them have families in China to educate.

Q. They do not maintain schools here?—A. They pay to support our schools.

Q. I want to know whether there is not a different standard of living required for American laborers from that the Chinese subsist upon?—A. I think there is somewhat.

Q. Then can the American laborer live upon the wages upon which the Chinese do subsist in this town?—A. Yes, sir; he can.

Q. An American laborer can maintain his family, educate his children, find those ordinary comforts necessary to an American laborer's home, upon the wages which a Chinaman can subsist upon in this town?—A. That was not the question, I understand.

(The question was read to the witness.)

The WITNESS. You will allow me, before I answer that question, to say that there is in it a phraseology which requires a little explanation. A Chinaman can exist on very little indeed. If you mean an American family can be supported on the pittance that a Chinaman can possibly bring himself down to, I answer, No; but if you mean to say, "Can an American family be supported on the wages which Chinamen do get, I mean to say, "Yes." That is my answer.

Q. What are the average wages that a Chinese laborer gets?—A. The Chinese, for the most common and unskilled labor, get a dollar and a dollar and a quarter a day; $30 and $35 a month. For skilled labor they get $60 a month.

Q. Do you think that a laborer can maintain his family, with three or four children, clothe them with decency, give them decent food, and perform his other duties to society on those wages?—A. I think that white labor in this State is as well paid as in any State in the Union. That is my answer to that question.

Q. You have fixed your own scale of wages; but I ask you if all these things can be done on a dollar or dollar and a quarter a day?—A. I can only answer what I know, that the laboring people in this city do support their families, and have money in banks, and live in homesteads.

Q. May not that be because this State has large resources to be developed, and there is yet, notwithstanding the competition of Chinamen, a chance for white men to live? Of course they have homes, &c.;

but they have not made them at the wages of a dollar a day.—A. They have made them in spite of all Chinese competition.

Q. The question in future is, whether they can still continue to do that? They cannot do it on a dollar a day and maintain their families.—A. They can live here as cheaply as in any other part of the world.

Q. What are these homes worth; they are worth all the way from $800 to $2,000?—A. Yes.

Q. How long will it take to maintain a family and get a home like that at a dollar a day?—A. I do not know.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Could you support your family on that?—A. I could; but I could not do so satisfactorily. I will not, for I can do better; and so can every one of these men do better. That is another feature about this matter. No man need work at a dollar a day, besides a Chinaman, if he does not want to do so, in this country.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say there are 3,000 Chinese servants in homes in this city. Does not that necessarily exclude so many white people from those homes—from that employment?—A. I do not think so. You cannot get the white ones in. I tried three or four times.

Q. It may be a single instance. You may be very hard on servants.—A. That may be.

Q. Your feelings may be in favor of Chinese, and you may prefer them.—A. That may be.

Q. If there are three thousand Chinese employed as servants here, do they not necessarily occupy the places which white women might occupy, such as they do occupy in eastern homes?—A. I do not think Chinese house-servants take the place of whites at all.

Q. If they employ three thousand Chinese, can they at the same time employ three thousand whites?—A. No, sir; because they cannot get the three thousand whites.

Q. That does not answer the question. I ask you if they exhaust the market upon Chinamen, if the whites are not excluded?—A. Of course, if they fill up with Chinese, they do not want any whites.

Q. If they fill three thousand places, is not that in that direction?—A. Not under the circumstances in which it is done. Take the case of the head of a family with a limited salary, who wants to live in a certain style. He can live in that style and afford to pay $16 a month for a house servant. If he should choose to have a white servant, he would find them demanding $25 a month, and you put your washing out.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you mean to say persons employ Chinamen because they get them at low wages who would not employ white people at a higher price?—A. There are many cases of that kind, and some employ Chinamen, from choice, at the same price they would pay to whites.

Q. Do you mean to say that there is work here enough for all the Chinamen and whites who are here?—A. I think there are very few people here without work, Mr. Chairman. Very few people who want to work are without work.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Can a man with a family of several children get a white girl to do all the work of his family—the work that a Chinaman does?—A. I could not, myself, and I tried. That is my experience.

Q. If you employ a white girl to do the work of a family of a man and his wife and several children, have you not got to put out your washing?—A. You have got to put out your washing, and get somebody to wash the windows and front steps besides.

Q. And if you employ a Chinaman he does the whole of the work?—A. Everything.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Why are the white servants so much inferior in this city to what they are in the city of Boston?—A. I did not say they were inferior; that is not my testimony.

Q. Do you not know the fact that in Boston and Philadelphia the white girls do all these things, and do them faithfully?—A. I suppose they do, in some instances.

Q. Why is the rule so different here?—A. That you must ask the girls here and not me.

Q. Then I ask you for this evidence of inferiority on the part of the girls here; that is that the girls cannot do here what they do in Philadelphia and everywhere else in the world.

Q. It is simply evidence that girls can do so well elsewhere that they do not propose to do that kind of work; they can do better. That is what the girl left me for; she could do better.

Q. Are you not aware of the fact that ladies, unquestionably ladies, and girls testified before this committee the difficulty of getting employment in this city?—A. There may be a few instances of that kind, but it is not general.

Q. They testify that it is general.—A. I testify that it is not general.

Q. How do you know?—A. From my general information.

Q. You think the fact of there being three thousand Chinese house-servants here does not have the tendency to exclude white girls here and make it general?—A. No, sir. May I tell you why?

Q. Certainly.—A. Because the very presence of these Chinese servants in these families makes it possible for those families to be here with all their industries, and those families could not live here if they had not Chinese servants.

Q. Suppose they found the Chinaman also competing in making cigars, slippers, overalls, &c. Does that tend to bring them here?—A. So far, in my opinion, Chinamen have only multiplied labor here.

Q. So that the more Chinamen crowd the different occupations the better chance there is for white people.—A. It might be done to excess as I stated. I do not believe in the rapid influx of any people.

Q. You do not think that three thousand servants and artisans have any tendency to prevent white people from obtaining work?—A. I think a few thousand unskilled laborers in any city will certainly multiply the facilities for skilled labor and higher industries, and everybody who understands political economy understands that to be the case.

Q. Suppose, instead of this work being done by Chinamen, it were done by white men, would that have a tendency to multiply the facilities for labor?—A. If you can get it better.

Q. Would it not be better to have them than not to have them at all?—A. I do not say that.

Q. Take the foundery business, a large interest in this State. It was testified that not a Chinaman was employed in it.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How can business prosper or thrive without Chinamen?—A. I suppose you understand me that the general effect of Chinamen has its effect on the labor of the foundery-men. They come under the general fact of competition of labor.

Q. The prosperity, then, lies in reducing the price of labor?—A. When the labor is so exorbitant that you cannot carry on industries, then prosperity depends on a reduction of labor.

Q. The way, then, to have prosperity in a community is to keep down the price of labor?—A. No, sir.

Q. That is the panacea for all evils?—A. If you please, you do not report me correctly. I did not say anything of the kind.

Q. What do you say?—A. I say that when labor is exorbitant so that industries cannot be carried on, then the reduction of labor down to the prices that the industries can be carried on is a benefit.

Q. On the other hand, might you not admit that decently-paid labor is necessary to American civilization?—A. Yes, sir; and I desire to see it, and we have it.

Q. Is that labor decent which is measured by the necessities of a Chinaman who lives on a few pounds of rice and sleeps with a dozen people in a room that is hardly fit for one person?—A. That is one way of putting it, but when you compare it with the Chinaman who gets his $35 a month and $60 a month in this town, it is none of my business where he sleeps.

Q. Are not those the exceptions?—A. I understand the common laborers get a dollar a day and a dollar and a quarter. I cannot find Chinamen working anywhere for less than a dollar and a quarter a day.

Q. I ask you whether an American laborer can educate his family, his children, attend to his duties in the church, give them decent clothes and meat and other food, such as Americans live on, at a dollar a day? You say you cannot.—A. I cannot. I do not want to. I do not need to; neither does any other man.

Q. Those are the wages of a Chinaman. If that is the competition, does not that necessarily bring down the white labor to that scale?—A. I understand generally for the same wages people will employ white labor if they can get good, industrious men.

Q. For the same price?—A. I think they pay them a little more, as I understand this testimony of whether white labor is better paid than Chinese labor.

Q. Is it not the tendency of an abundance of inferior-paid labor to bring down the price of labor generally below a decent price?—A. The supply and demand of labor, I suppose, will have something to do with the matter.

Q. Then, if there is an enormous supply of underpaid labor, it reduces the whole market, does it not, below a decent price?—A. That is only a plausible case.

Q. Is not that the necessary tendency of it?—A. What was the question?

Q. Whether the tendency of a very large supply of underpaid labor is not to bring down all the labor of all other laborers in the market?—A. I should suppose it might have that tendency.

Q. Then you admit that might possibly be the effect?—A. It is no admission. I suppose it is a statement of fact.

Q. Very well, you state it as a fact.—A. It is an opinion, of course.

Q. Let me ask you another question. Are Chinamen employed as nurses of children in this town, to take care of young children?—A. They may be in some instances; I do not think largely.

Q. I do not mean nurses at the breast; I mean to lead them about; take care of them; see that they do not fall down?—A. I think not to a large extent. You know as well as I do.

Q. You know how inquisitive children are about asking a great many questions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You know that children ask you a great many questions, questions difficult to answer, and do you not know that from their nurses, their parents, and those who take care of them, they acquire a great deal of knowledge?—A. Yes, from their parents; but from their nurses, white or Chinese, I think they never ought to learn.

Q. Suppose the nurses that the parents employ are decent white people and can answer the questions of the children properly, do you think then there is much they ought not to learn?—A. If they have good, intelligent, nurses; but if you will allow me to give the question you really put, your idea is that the white nurse would be a benefit to the children, teaching them, and that the Chinaman will not be a benefit, but teach them vice.

Q. Do you not know that from decent white nurses children do obtain a great deal of information which they have, useful to them in life, and consequently by putting them with a nurse who does not understand our institutions, and cannot answer their questions properly, the children are left in ignorance?—A. No, sir; I do not know any such thing.

Q. You swear to that?—A. I do swear to it. I never heard before that the nurses of the country were the educators of our children.

Q. That those with whom children continually associate are not their educators?—A. I have no idea of it. I suppose they learn some foolish things from servants, but children learn in schools and from their parents.

Q. Do you think they learn only foolish things from decent, well-behaved American girls who have charge of them?—A. I did not say that.

Q. I am referring to that class.—A. You are referring only to the decent intelligent class of American-born servants?

Q. I am.—A. Then, I answer, they learn something.

Q. I ask if that is not the class in New England and other communities in the East and West?—A. Not largely; that is my understanding. I think the house-servants in the East are largely foreigners. I may be mistaken in that.

Q. Is there an objection to their being foreigners?—A. I did not say there was.

Q. Is there?—A. There would be to me.

Q. Is there not the same objection, then, to employing Chinese nurses?—A. Certainly; I would rather have an American.

Q. You admit that that is an objection against the Chinese, even if shared by other foreigners?—A. Just the same.

Q. You say the Chinese as a race are kind to their children?—A. That is the character of the people.

Q. How do you make that consistent with this infanticide which you say prevails all over China and especially in some provinces?—A. I do not know how to reconcile the fact, but I know there are cases of infanticide in some parts of China, and I know furthermore that the Chinese are very fond of children and very kind to children. I know that from a life among them. I do not undertake to reconcile these facts.

Q. Are not the facts inconsistent?—A. They may be; I do not know about that. I know the facts.

Q. Do you not know the fact, also, that the Chinese sell their female children?—A. Yes, sir; some of them do.

Q. Does that show fondness for them?—A. I said some of them do. I did not say it was the general custom.

Q. Does that show fondness for them?—A. Not in the persons who sell them; still sometimes it may. Sometimes they may sell from the fact that they know the children would be better off when sold.

Q. Do you not know these sales are for prostitution often?—A. Sometimes they are.

Q. Does that show that they think they would be better off?—A. That would show something differently, but it is not the rule in China.

Q. Did you testify that Chinese are peaceful among themselves?—A. I did, generally; I testified also that they had riots among themselves.

Q. Do you not know of bloody riots among themselves, as, for instance, that recently at Virginia City?—A. I read about that.

Q. And another at San José?—A. I read about that.

Q. From what did those feuds arise?—A. I do not know the particular cause; sometimes about a woman; sometimes about money.

Q. Are not these feuds rivalries between Chinamen coming from different parts of China so that it is neighborhood against neighborhood?—A. Feuds often occur in China between villages. I do not know about these two you mention. I do not know whether it was that sectional animosity or not. It is not my understanding of them in either case.

Q. Those feuds do arise in China between villages?—A. Yes, sir; at times.

Q. Would the inhabitants of those villages, coming here and meeting together, have the same locality?—A. I presume they would.

Q. May not that account for it?—A. I presume it would in a measure. I do not know that it was the immediate cause of those two riots. I never heard it was.

Q. You say that all consular officers, if I understood you, report that there is no such thing as slavery on the part of the coolies who come to this country?—A. There is no slavery in China as to the male sex. There are no slaves among the Chinese in America.

Q. You say that all consular officers say that?—A. I say all missionaries and all consular officers who have studied the Chinese language, and have therefore better opportunities and facilities for knowing the bottom of the question, say that. There may be consuls in China who know nothing about the language and very little about the people.

Q. Do you know Mr. Bailey, the consul at Hong-Kong?—A. Not personally.

Q. Would you exclude him from the category of those who say that there are no labor-contracts?—A. I do not think he understands the language at all.

Q. Is it necessary to understand the language absolutely to know whether they have contracts for slavery for a certain number of years?—A. Perhaps not absolutely. Perhaps it might be found out some other way.

Q. He is consul at Hong-Kong, from whence most of these coolies are shipped?—A. I believe he is.

Q. Are you not aware that he has reported that many of the Chinese get to this country by giving onerous obligations, which are secured by their certificates, and that in frequent cases where there is a failure to return the money the relatives themselves are sold in order to make good the contract?—A. I have read that somewhere, but whether it was Mr. Bailey or not, I cannot testify. It may be that it was him.

Q. You did not have that in your mind when you were speaking of labor contracts?—A. No, sir. I should like to say right here that my mind would at once say that Mr. Bailey was mistaken about the families being sold. It is not the custom in China to sell a family.

Q. I do not know that he says a family, but members of the family.—A. Boys and men are not sold. Girls are sometimes sold and sometimes wives, but those are exceptions and not the rule.

Q. You say there is no temptation for a person to profess to be a Christian in China, but the inducements are the other way entirely.—A. I should think so, always.

Q. Do you think it is the same rule here?—A. I do, indeed.

Q. You also stated that persons represented themselves as belonging to the mission school, &c.?—A. Yes; sometimes, in families where they want to get credit.

Q. They make this representation in order to get confidence?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then is there not an inducement for a Chinaman to profess to be a Christian whether he is one or not, in order to get employment among the whites?—A. You may make an inducement out of that, but the idea of becoming an actual, open, avowed Christain, except in a family where he serves, that is to be known a Christian in Chinatown, would be met with so much ignominy that it would be very much against him.

Q. Of that I have no doubt, but would it not be an inducement for a person to give out so that it would be known to the whites that he was a Christian, while he told his Chinese friends this is mere pretense; I am not a Christian?—A. That is what I intimated in my testimony.

Q. Would there not be an inducement, then, for the Chinese to profess to be Christians while really they were not?—A. They might profess to the families where they live, but to go to the mission and to receive baptism and become Christian men, I think there is no inducement except a clear love of truth and nothing else.

Q. Suppose they could get lucrative employment from the whites by making this profession, and explain to their Chinese friends that it was simply for that reason and everything was fair against the outside world, would not that be an inducement?—A. That is hardly a supposable case.

Q. I have supposed the case?—A. It might be an inducement, but I think the inducement would be more than counterbalanced in the minds of the unchristian Chinamen, who would oppose and persecute. I know a young man who is the president of the Young Men's Christian Chinese Association, who told me some time last year that he had to give up his brothers, uncles, and everything he had got here, or else give up his Christian religion, and he had been thinking it over and made up his mind to keep up the truth.

Q. I think they would be probably sincere where there are Christians among them, but I merely ask you whether there might not be a profession of that kind understood by these Chinese themselves to be assumed on account of the more confidence they would get among the whites?—A. I do not profess to be very expert in the knowledge of character, but I have traveled some and seen something of the world, and I am not disposed to believe Chinamen more than you would be, senator, but I do not think the Chinamen here would be professed Christians except from sincere sentiments. There may be instances, such as you suppose.

Q. Have you examined the Chinese hospital which they maintain themselves here?—A. I looked in that hospital three or four years ago when I first came here, and I have not been in it since.

Q. It has been testified to here that it is in a very squalid condition and that persons there under treatment, as we would say, are starved;

that is, they beg when persons go in; they eat ravenously even cold rice given to them. Do you know whether that is true?—A. I do not know. I have not been there for years. As I said before, it is the universal practice here, as a general rule, to which there may be a few exceptions, that the personal friends, the relatives, or the persons from the same neighborhood and the same little village, take care of the sick.

Q. Independent of the hospital?—A. Independent of it. They do more of that than almost any people in this city.

Q. Do you not know of their turning out persons to die?—A. I only know that from what I have heard here, and from the newspaper accounts. I have never seen anything of that kind. Here I want to say that in the testimony before the State senate committee I am made to say that I knew such cases. I never said that. The answer I gave, "No, sir," was reported "Yes, sir."

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you consider yourself an entirely disinterested witness in this matter?—A. In what respect do you mean disinterested?

Q. I want to know whether you are not making a living out of the Chinese, and if there were no Chinese here whether your avocation would not be gone?—A. Perhaps it would. I can only give my opinion that I would be able to support myself if there were no Chinamen here. Mr. Chairman, with regard to this matter of being interested, I beg to say that I have no interest in Chinamen coming here or going away more than any other man, except as a citizen of the State and community.

Q. Your employment, I understand, is in preaching and teaching and in keeping a missionary home?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is it supported?—A. By the missionary society of the Methodist Church.

Q. In the East?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is a matter of compensation to you, is it?—A. I have my salary from that.

Q. Are you a property-owner in the town?—A. I am.

Q. Whereabouts?—A. On Twentieth street.

Q. Have you any property in the Chinese quarter?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you a lessee of any property there?—A. I am.

Q. Occupied by Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are getting a portion of your living from Chinese tenants?—A. Living! We get rents and expend the rents on the building. There has been a good deal said about that building, and efforts have been made to make capital in the newspapers, and I think it would be justice to me to be permitted to make a statement in regard to that building, and I should like, Mr. Chairman, to have it go into my testimony under oath. I understand the drift of the question and what the effort is. I rented in Chinatown a store of a Chinaman who had the lease of a large Chinese building. The building was inhabited by Chinese tenants. It was, if not the worst, one of the most filthy and degraded places in Chinatown. The stores on the street were four. I rented one of the Chinaman for a chapel and was to have it as long as he held the lease. We fitted it up at a missionary expense of some hundred dollars, put more seats in, and put our man in, and he preached as well as he could, and I also. We occupied the building about two years, and Chinatown began to work down below it, and rents came up, and I paid a higher rent. They found out then that it was a good place to open a gambling office, and the Chinamen who wanted it for a gambling office determined

they would get it from me. I tried to find some other place. Dr. Loomis, of the Presbyterian mission, has been here twenty years and has not been able to get a place here yet in Chinatown for a chapel. As we were just beginning to get known as a station all over the country, as a preaching place, I felt it a matter of importance, as you understand, that we should remain there. They came with a lawyer and told me I must go out; that they would not allow me to have it any longer, no matter what rents I would pay. I said, "Let me stay until October and I will make some other arrangement." It was agreed. I then went and found the owner of the property. He told me their lease ran out in October, which I did not know, and I leased the whole property in order to save my chapel. For the property I gave $450 in gold a month in advance. I run great risks of losing money, having to keep it in repair, furnish a sexton, water, and everything else. The first month I lost money. Some other months our expenses have been two or three hundred dollars more than the proceeds. On the whole we have just about got along. I think we have expended a little more in making repairs than what we have received. That is all personal with me; still I am paraded over town with making a capital of three per cent. It was a filthy place; no light, except a transom over the door; dark, nasty rooms. I found them full of Chinese. I do not know what they do. I have let the people stay, and they pay me their rents. The stories above we have cleaned out—shoveled out—and they are now washed down every week. The carpenter who helped me when I first went in came there and went through it the other day after two years and said he hardly knew the place; that is, the house. I shall hold it as long as I can.

By Mr. KING:

Q. Do you not know that it is one of the lowest opium dens in that house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not know that they smoke opium there?—A. I know that they smoke opium there. I have seen them smoking opium there. It is not an opium den, as I understand it, where they receive people who come in and pay so much for smoking opium; but the people who room there are opium-smokers. In some other rooms that I have rented I have seen people smoking tobacco, cigars, and drinking whisky.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Does the use of opium make men mad, wild, violent?—A. No, sir; I do not understand it so; it stupefies them, rather—puts them to sleep, makes them languid.

Q. How does the effect of smoking opium compare with the effect of smoking tobacco?—A. The smoking of opium is very much more injurious, I think, than the smoking of tobacco. It debilitates the system from protracted use.

Q. It does not make men violent?—A. O, no, no more than smoking tobacco.

Q. How does the effect of smoking opium compare with the effect of drinking whisky?—A. They are very different. The smoking of opium stupefies, quiets, puts to sleep, puts out of the way. My observation of whisky is that it stirs the people up, makes them rampant, and fight sometimes; but Chinamen never fight when under the influence of opium.

Q. I understand you to say that you rented the building in the Chinese quarter simply for the purpose of securing a chapel?—A.

Simply for that purpose. I have no other and never had any other purpose.

Q. You had no motive of profit in it?—A. No, sir; I had no motive of profit in renting the building at all.

Q. And this opium-smoking is simply carried on by the occupants?—A. By the occupants only.

Q. Not as an opium den, where others are invited to come and smoke for profit?—A. No, sir; I do not understand so at all. I would shut the rooms up before I would have anything of the kind there. Neither is there any prostitution going on there. There are no professional prostitutes in the building at all.

Q. Do I understand you that the Chinese take care of their own sick, then?—A. Largely. Their friends take care of them. Nearly all the Chinamen here have personal friends.

Q. Do they take care of their own paupers, or do their paupers go to the poor-house?—A. The list of the inmates of the poor-house will show. I think at the alms-house, if I remember, there were none.

Q. There were none?—A. I think there were none. I had the statistics.

Q. If they do not go to the alms-house, and they do not take care of their paupers themselves, who does take care of them?—A. There are but very few of them who do not manage to get a little something one way or the other. They are a great people in their own country to live on their friends. A Chinaman may have employment now for a few months, and then he will be out of employment. When he is out of employment he goes and turns in with his friends who have a place somewhere and waits until he gets employment.

Q. What are their habits of industry? Take the Chinese of San Francisco; are they industrious ordinarily, or are they idle?—A. They are industrious, almost always, if you exclude the women who are prostitutes and the class who are gamblers. There is a class who run the gambling and prostitution business, but I think there are hardly any idle persons among the Chinese.

Q. How do they compare for industry with the same number of white people in their condition?—A. I think there are quite as few idlers among the Chinese as among any other class of working-people in this country, and the same holds in China all through the country. They are the most industrious people in the world at home, and the same characteristic holds here.

Q. Something was said about their being quarrelsome. Are they quarrelsome or peaceable, as a general thing?—A. As a general thing they are peaceful, and their quarrels generally end in words only.

Q. As compared with a low order of whites, how are they?—A. There are fewer fights among Chinamen that come to blows and assaults, it is my opinion, than among the lower whites.

Q. You said something about the schools. Do I understand you to say that Chinese children are not admitted into the public schools here?—A. I make that statement. I had a Chinaman come to my school who had been to some other schools and could read very well; had studied geography, arithmetic, history, &c., and he took a notion that he wanted to go to the public schools. I told him I did not think it would be pleasant to admit him; that he had better not try; that there was prejudice against the Chinese; but he insisted. I wrote a letter to the school board, stating that this man wanted to go to school; that he was cleanly in his person, well behaved, and had such and such scholarship. They said personally they would not object, but they did

not think the public sentiment would allow it, and they did not dare admit him.

Q. Are they excluded on account of their color or race?—A. It was a race prejudice in this case.

Q. Is there any law by which they can exclude a Chinese child from school?—A. I think not; I think the Chinese childhas a right to go to the schools.

Q. Do you know of any instance in which Chinese children do attend a white school?—A. In Sacramento there is a Chinese girl who attends school.

Q. Are there any in this city?—A. I never heard of one here.

Q. You know of but a single instance?—A. I know of but one instance; there may be others in some country school-districts, but I don't know of it.

Q. In this case you made application?—A. I made application by letter; it was refused by a formal written answer.

Q. Do you know of other applications having been made?—A. No, sir; I do not know of any others.

Q. If they would admit Chinese to the schools here, do you believe they would be sent to our schools in a considerable number?—A. In the night-schools you would have a large number of them, if they were admitted; they have a system of night-schools here.

Q. Is there any desire among the Chinese here to learn—to be educated?—A. I think so; the mission-schools are quite full all the time.

Q. How many are in attendance on those schools?—A. I hardly can tell exactly, there are so many different schools, with classes here and there. There are about 80 or 90 in my school, and, I think, 120 in Mr. Loomis's school. I do not know how many are in the Baptist and Episcopal schools. I give the average attendance.

Q. You are acting here under the direction of the Methodist Church?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are a Methodist clergyman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are now under the authority of the missionary society of the Methodist Church?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you get a fixed salary?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Paid by the church itself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It does not depend upon the number of pupils you have?—A. No, sir; it does not depend upon anything of the kind.

Q. You, then, have no interest in this matter beyond doing your duty as a missionary?—A. Simply as a missionary.

Q. How long have you been devoted to this work?—A. In this city, eight years; in China, ten years.

Q. Were you there as a missionary?—A. Yes, sir; under the same society. I went there in 1855.

Q. Under the direction of the Methodist Church North, I suppose?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has the Baptist Church a missionary society here also?—A. They have had. I think the missionary is away, and that the man who has it in charge lives in Oakland.

Q. Have the Presbyterians a missionary society here?—A. O, yes; the largest one here.

Q. The Catholics also?—A. They did have, but not now, I think.

Q. Have any other branches of the Christian Church societies here?—A. The Congregationalists also have schools, and the Episcopalians. The different branches of Protestants have schools for the Chinese here.

Q. Taking all these churches together, these Protestant establish-

ments, how many children do you think attend their schools?—A. I suppose regularly in the schools every night there are three or four hundred. Perhaps there are twelve or fifteen hundred different Chinese who attend altogether. They cannot go regularly; every one of them works.

Q. Do they pay for this teaching?—A. In regard to my school they are expected to pay a dollar a month, each scholar.

Q. It is a secular school?—A. It is a secular school.

Q. What do you teach in your school?—A. We teach reading, writing, geography, and grammar, the same as any other school, and employ teachers.

Q. You employ teachers?—A. Four or five teachers. I am employing now five teachers every night.

Q. How do you regard the effort at christianizing the Chinese? Do you regard it as an incipient success?—A. As I stated in my testimony, the character of those who have become Christians will compare favorably with other Christians and in numbers of additions. For instance, I take my own mission for one, and with the amount of labor bestowed and the money spent, it is about the same as any other Methodist church if you take the number who were not church members before. We have no additions by transfers of membership; it is all out of new timber, out of heathenism.

Q. I understand that the missionaries in China are making marked progress of late years?—A. Very great.

Q. Are the churches encouraged to persevere in those efforts?—A. No Christian work in all the world is moreencouraging than the work in China.

Q. What churches have missionaries in China?—A. The Presbyterians, what they call the American Board, the Episcopalians, the Baptists, the Methodists North and South, and in fact all Protestant denominations in this country are represented there, and many in Europe. All missionary associations in this country have associations in China.

Q. Are the Catholics also engaged in mission-work there?—A. The Catholics are not there now.

Q. The Protestants are going ahead in this work?—A. Very largely; the influence is by the Protestants. The Catholics are not influencing the civilization there now.

Q. What effect had opening trade there in protecting missionaries?—A. Probably more than any other one thing in the world. The port of Fou-Chow, the greatest tea-port in China, would never have been opened had it not been for Dr. McClary of our mission, and the same thing holds good of other places.

Q. In regard to the effect of Chinese labor here upon white labor, do you believe from what you know that there has been too much labor here, more than could receive adequate employment and payment?—A. Hardly at any time. There may have been a few months once or twice when that may have been the case.

Q. Is there a plethora of labor now?—A. I do not so consider it. There may be individual cases that cannot adjust themselves to labor, but I understand that at the present time the demand is equal to the supply.

Q. Do you understand that the presence of Chinese labor interferes with white labor on this coast at this time?—A. I do not understand so now. If they should come in in hordes, if millions should come, it might.

Q. I am speaking of this time.—A. I do not think it interferes with it. I think it has stimulated labor and helped hundreds of white people to honorable employment who would not have come here without it at all.

Q. You think it has been the means of creating employment for white labor?—A. I do, most certainly. When you consider that among the Chinese there are no workers on the public buildings, no house-carpenters, or bricklayers, or painters, or any of those principal pursuits that go to build up a city, and that the Chinese are doing the low and unskilled labor, I think it is evidence at once to any man who understands political economy that the Chinaman has made an opportunity for other people to come.

Q. When you say there are no Chinamen on public works you do not include railroads?—A. I mean State works and city works under municipal authorities and State authorities. All buildings that are constructed by the State generally provide in the contract that no Chinese labor shall be employed.

Q. Are there any Chinese carpenters here?—A. Very few; there is a little jobbing among themselves.

Q. Are there any mechanics?—A. Very few.

Q. Any carriage-makers?—A. I never heard of such a thing.

Q. Workers in wood?—A. Very few; a little carving among themselves. There are some workers in the mills, sawing, but not workers on buildings and houses that I know of. I do not know of any furniture-makers. They make boxes.

Q. What effect do you believe Chinese labor has had on the prosperity of this coast, from what you know about it?—A. I believe it has been a large element in the prosperity of this country so far, up to the present time. I should like to state before my examination closes that I should be very glad if there could be a limitation of Chinese immigration.

Q. I should like to hear your views upon that question.—A. I believe there are two objections which exist with regard to Chinese immigration that hardly exist in the same proportion in regard to any other foreign immigration. One is that they assimilate to our civilization more slowly in adopting our forms, learning our language, and learning to live as we do, more expensively, and all that. They do assimilate, but they assimilate more slowly than any other people who come here. That I think makes them a less desirable people so far as that one element is concerned. The other point is the possibility of a large and sudden influx of Chinese. I believe the matter of supply and demand will hold a good check upon Chinese immigration, but there is a possibility, though I do not believe there is a probability, that through some wars and intestine strife in China there might be a large influx of these people. I should like to see them limited to a couple of hundred on a ship, for instance.

Q. If our laws permitted them to be naturalized and to become citizens of the United States, what would the effect be upon them; in the first place, how many would embrace it?—A. At first I think it would be slow. I think only those who knew the language would care about it, and only those who were learning the language and getting accustomed to our country would desire it. I think many already desire to become citizens, and would make very good citizens. I think it would be slow, but, as I said just now, they do assimilate. I think it would be unhappy and unfortunate if the Chinamen should all at once have the right of suffrage.

Q. You think that would be unfortunate?—A. Yes, sir, exceedingly unfortunate, but not more unfortunate than many other things of the same kind that have been done.

Q. You think they should be allowed to be naturalized?—A. I do most certainly, on the same conditions as other people.

Q. What effect would it have upon immigration from Europe, say if the immigrants were not allowed to become American citizens, but compelled to remain aliens for all time?—A. I doubt if they would come in such large numbers as they do from Europe. I think it would tend to lessen the immigration.

Q. Would that have the tendency to segregate them, to keep them a separate body from the American people?—A. I should think so.

Q. Would it have a tendency to degrade them?—A. It seems to me it would most certainly. I might say in regard to this matter that many of these Chinamen who learn to speak our language and learn to talk about the history of our Government and their rights in this country often express a desire to become citizens. I read in the newspaper that Chinamen are all opposed to becoming citizens, but I have heard Chinamen say, "We want to become citizens, and they will not let us; how can we become citizens when the laws will not allow us?" I have heard that hundreds of times from different Chinamen. They are not to blame for not becoming citizens now, because they are not allowed to naturalize in this city and State.

Q. If European immigrants, for example, were not allowed to become citizens, would that, in your judgment, have the tendency to make them an inferior social class?—A. I think it would certainly.

Q. And it would keep them separate from the American people?—A. Always.

Q. And prevent them from assimilating with Americans?—A. I think it would have that tendency—a constant tendency in that way.

GEORGE D. ROBERT sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are the president, manager, or main officer of the Tide-Land Reclamation Company?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been a resident of this State?—A. I arrived here in 1850.

Q. You have been engaged in business enterprises since that time to develop the interests of this coast, I believe?—A. Always.

Q. How much tule-land has your company reclaimed?—A. The Tide-Land Company proper started in with 120,000 acres. They have been reclaiming portions of it, but not on a large scale, until recently. I suppose we have partially reclaimed 30,000 or 40,000 acres.

Q. Will you explain to the commission what you mean by tule-lands?—A. We call the overflowed lands forming a delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin River tule-lands, and also lands on the margin of the river farther up.

Q. What do you mean by the reclamation of those lands? What kind of work is it?—A. Building dikes, gates, and ditches, preventing the overflow.

Q. What species of labor have you been employing?—A. Generally Chinamen.

Q. How do you employ those Chinamen; by contract? Explain how you do it.—A. Generally by contract. In building the docks we contract by the yard, so much a yard. We go to some of the Chinese merchants or business men, and tell them we want to give a contract for a certain nuumber of miles of levee. They will contract, then, sometimes in large and sometimes in small bodies of land. Sometimes the contracts are for five, six, seven, or eight hundred or a thousand yards, and

sometimes less, with one individual, as the case may be. We pay so much a yard and measure the work after the work is done, and they receive their pay.

Q. Do they generally perform their part of the contract faithfully?—A. We have had very little difficulty with them. The work is generally very satisfactory.

Q. How do you look upon them as day-laborers as to their promptness and trustworthiness?—A. For many kinds of work we prefer them; for some work we prefer white men. There are certain classes of work that Chinamen will perform better and more faithfully than white men generally; that is, work which does not require any great skill. Anything like field-work, where you can explain to a Chinaman simply what you want done, he will do it just as you explain it to him, and he will do that kind of work more faithfully than a white man would; but generally in the higher classes of work we employ white men.

Q. Could you reclaim these lands with white labor?—A. Not successfully at this time. I do not think we could get the white men to do the work. It is a class of work that white men do not like. We have tried them to a certain extent. The special advantage in Chinese labor in work of that kind is owing to the contract system. They form little communities among themselves, forty, or fifty, or a hundred, and they are jointly interested in the contract. We could not get white men to do that. They would not be harmonious and agree among themselves, but the Chinese form little families of their own, do their own cooking, live in little camps together, and the work is staked off for them separately. We first gave a large contract to one or two Chinamen, probably, and they sublet it in smaller contracts to the Chinamen; that is the general system. White labor could not be worked in that way at all.

Q. In your experience in making contracts with Chinese, have they ever broken their contracts with you—when they made a losing contract, for instance?—A. As a rule, they are probably about as honorable in that matter as white men. If they could take advantage of you, probably they would do it; but we have never had any difficulty in that line. We generally had the contract well explained and written, and when they failed to comply with it we would inform the boss Chinaman, and he would have it done, and there would seldon be any touble at all.

Q. It has been given in evidence that these six companies or headmen hire out the labor of the Chinese and receive their pay. Do you know, in your experience, anything of that kind?—A. No, sir; I do not. We never hire of them.

Q. How do you pay the laborers when the contract is carried out?—A. We pay the contractor, after measurement. We general pay them as the work progresses. We now have three or four thousand employed, mostly under contract.

Q. About what do you give them a cubic yard?—A. We pay from ten to fifteen cents.

Q. How much a day do they make at that rate?—A. They expect to make about a dollar a day. When we hire by the month, (I hired two hundred men yesterday,) we pay $27 a month, and they find themselves, houses, camps, and everything.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you tally the actual days' labor when you hire them by the month?—A. We tally the actual days' labor when we pay them by the month.

Q. Their cooking is extra?—A. We have nothing to do with that.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Does this class of labor conflict with white labor?—A. I cannot see that it does. We could not do the work at all with white labor in this State at present.

Q. These lands have lain vacant for 25 years?—A. Yes, sir; they have been of no value at all.

Q. Some of those lands have been reclaimed and crops are now raised upon them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What will an acre of this land produce?—A. We consider fifty bushels of wheat to the acre about an average crop. I have raised as high as ninety-two bushels of wheat, by actual measurement.

Q. That land would have lain idle until you could have got it reclaimed by labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You cannot plow that land, I believe?—A. Yes, sir; we plow it.

Q. Do you believe that the tendency of the Chinese laboring classes of this country is detrimental to white labor?—A. Possibly, to a certain class of white labor; but, to the general prosperity of the country, I think they are a great advantage. I think they fill the places that white labor would fill very reluctantly, and it would be a long time before we could get white labor to do it. I think the wealth they produce stimulates prosperity to such an extent that it gives white men higher positions. I do not think the presence of the Chinese here affects the price of intelligent labor. It is possible there may be a class of labor that is affected by it, but to sustain that class of labor alone, we would have to hold back the enterprise of the country.

Q. They have added materially, then, to the wealth of California, in your opinion?—A. In my opinion, the aggregate product of the wealth produced by Chinamen in this State is equal to our mines, including the mines of Nevada and Dakota. Probably they produce sixty, eighty, or ninety millions a year in wealth.

Q. You have had a good deal to do with mining interests?—A. More or less.

Q. You are a good judge on that point?—A. I have been more or less engaged in mining.

Q. How do you find the Chinese as to fair dealing and honesty?—A. The standard of morality on that score will compare favorably with the lower classes of white men generally. I have never had much difficulty in that respect. I do not pretend to say that Chinamen are models for our higher civilization at all; but I do say that they are a great auxiliary to our prosperity and wealth at the present time.

Q. Do you employ them in preference to white men, or can you not get the white labor?—A. I do not give them the preference; I generally give white men the preference.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. At the same prices?—A. At the same prices, and sometimes pay a little higher for white labor. After the land is reclaimed, then, of course, we employ white men generally. We employ white men where there is any machinery required—where there is an easy position—any work requiring a higher class of intelligence; for instance in running plows, thrashing-machines, headers—in any work that requires a higher class of intelligence we generally employ white men.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Then the reclamation of these lands is open to the labor of a great many white men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose the Chinese were all taken away from this country now,

would you have to abandon this land-reclamation?—A. At present we would have to give the business up. We have tried white labor in the country, and have found that it would not do at all. In the first place, irrespective of wages, very high wages, the white man would not do that class of work; you could not get white men to contract to do it with white labor at all.

Q. What class of men are generally employed in the cultivation of these reclaimed lands?—A. Generally white men. That is, white men are generally the farmers who buy or lease, but, as a rule, the farmers employ more or less Chinamen. I have furnished poor white men horses, and tools, agricultural implements, who did not have money to buy a plow, and I have leased them the land on a crop-lease, and started them to work.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are Chinamen employed as foremen laborers?—A. Yes, sir; to some extent.

Q. Do they plow?—A. To some extent. I have leased lands to poor white men who did not have money to buy teams, and we furnished them teams, furnished them seed, furnished them a house, and everything necessary to do the work, and started them in. They would have nothing but their labor as capital to start on, but it would be but a very short time until they would have Chinamen doing their work for them and they would be bossing the job. It is the general tendency of the Americans to boss their job. They want somebody else to do the work, and they are in favor of the Chinaman doing the work that white men will not do.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You lease this land as fast as you reclaim it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There are a great many farmers around there, are there not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever tried Chinamen to work in mines?—A. Yes, sir; in gravel-mines; and in one or two instances in quartz-mining, but in surface mining more particularly; we never worked them in deep mining, except as carmen. They do work that does not require much skill, running cars, and everything of that sort. I will state one instance where we gave white labor a very fair test here a few years ago. We had a very large wheat-field. It was harvest-time, and the superintendent wrote down to send him up a couple hundred of white men. I went to all the labor institutions here and employed men of all kinds, of all nations. We gave them the usual country wages whatever it was, $35 or $40 a month, I think. We had to abandon it after trying a couple of weeks, and losing a great deal of wheat by the experiment. Those men would not work more than two or three days, or a week, and then they would quit. I kept the steamer here almost loaded sending up white men, but they would leave as fast as I sent them. I then went to a Chinaman and told him that I wanted to contract for binding and shocking wheat. We did the reaping by machines. I made the contract at so much per acre. The weather was warm. They went up there. Several hundred of them came. We had one or two hundred acres that had been reaped, and needed putting up very badly; and the next morning it was all in shock. The Chinamen did the work that night. They did the work well and faithfully, and of course we abandoned white labor. Since then we have done all machine-work with white men, but field-work of that kind we would contract with Chinamen to do.

Q. Do the Chinese purchase lands or rent lands, to your knowledge?—A. Yes, sir; occasionally; not to any very great extent, but more so recently than formerly. There is a disposition among them now to turn their attention to farming. They think it is a more quiet life; they get out of the excitement of the city. Many of them have rented patches, and are paying $25 and $30 a year per acre for lands.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Twenty-five dollars and $30 a year?

A. Yes, sir; pretty near all the sweet potatoes you get here are raised by Chinamen, on Grand Island, and in that neighborhood.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know who eat all those sweet potatoes?—A. I suppose we all have a hand in that. They are the best field-men that we have.

Q. Better than the negro?—A. Better then the Swede, and the Swede is the best worker we have had. They are better field-hands than the Swede. You can depend upon them longer; that is, if you can get them this year you can get them next year and the year after, if you treat them well and pay them. They become attached to your place and they stay with you. So far as the labor question is concerned there is no doubt but that the Chinaman is the best human labor-machine we have in this country for certain classes of work, and he does a class of work generally that the white men scorn to do, and which the white man will not do if he can possibly avoid it. We employ a great many white men. We have two or three hundred white men employed all the time. Immigrants, men coming to the country, will hire by the month and stay with us, it may be, two months or three months at the outside. They are not satisfied with $30 or $35 a month. They did not come to this country, they say, to work, for that they came to make money, and they are not satisfied. As soon as they get a few months' wages they go to the mines or want to rent a piece of land of you, themselves, and hire Chinamen to do the work. They want to speculate. A very intelligent class of white men generally come to this country, and very few of them come here to do cheap labor, and we have cheap labor that must be done, or it will stop the progress of the country. We could not afford to pay three or four dollars a day to white men to do our work. We could not get them to do it, scarcely; and the labor that the Chinaman does is producing wealth to the country and producing labor for the white laborer.

Q. Do you not believe that the Chinese puts more labor into the hands of the white people here than if they had not any Chinese here?—A. In our special case I know it does. For instance, we are employing several hundred white men. If we had no Chinamen we could not employ white men.

Q. In what occupation are the largest number of Chinamen engaged, in the State?—A. Generally their labor is employed as farm-hands in vineyards, building railroads, draining tule-lands, in certain class of manufacturing, as house-servants, and in washing.

Q. Have you any further information for the commission that I have not thought of? You have the liberty to make any statement you desire bearing on the question.—A. I can only say as far as the practical working of Chinamen is concerned, and as far as my experience goes, that they are a great advantage to every man of intelligence and of enterprise in this country. As to the future effect, their enlightenment, and things of that kind, I do not profess to know anything. I do not think that they are a class of laborers who care about interfering

in the politics or government of our country in any way. I do not think they care much about becoming citizens.

Q. As laborers do you not think that they compare favorably with certain portions of our immigration from Europe?—A. I think they do with certain portions of it.

Q. What is your politics?—A. I have been a democrat, fortunately.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are those lands entirely waste?—A. Entirely waste; worth nothing at all; overflowed by high tides, and grown up with weeds, and useless; entirely useless.

Q. What did these lands cost you in that condition?—A. Originally they cost very little; that is, to the original locators they cost nothing. The State gave them to the settlers or people who wished to locate them, which is about the same thing. We paid nominally a dollar an acre to the State, and when it is reclaimed that dollar is credited to us and we get it back. Of course the lands changed hands before they came into the hands of the parties who reclaimed them.

Q. Before you did anything toward reclaiming them, what did they probably cost your company?—A. I bought a large amount of those lands myself. I, at one time, owned a quarter of a million of acres, and then formed a tide-land company, or association. I paid all the way from two to three dollars an acre, although in some cases I got it for half a dollar an acre. I had to pay a dollar to the State besides.

Q. What is the average cost of reclamation per acre?—A. We are reclaiming about forty thousand acres at six or seven dollars an acre, it being a large tract; but we have some on Grand Island that I suppose we have spent $25 an acre on. It depends on the size of the piece and the advantages or disadvantages to be overcome.

Q. What is the land worth per acre after its reclamation?—A. That depends on the locality. There is a difference in value. It is worth from $20 an acre up to a hundred dollars, probably. We paid for four or five thousand acres, a day or two ago, $25 an acre.

Q. Then perhaps there is an average of $75 an acre?—A. After it is thoroughly reclaimed. There have been a great many failures in reclamation from the fact that the levees were not properly constructed; that they were too small.

Q. Then the lands are worth from five or six dollars to twenty dollars an acre, on the outside before they are reclaimed, and average seventy-five dollars an acre afterward. Could you not afford with a big profit like that to pay white men's wages?—A. As I told you, we could not get white men to do the work.

Q. Could you if you paid them decent wages?—A. In some cases it might be done; but white men will not do that work as a general thing.

Q. You speak of employing Chinamen in hydraulic mines. Is there any trouble about getting white men to do that work?—A. I did not put it on that ground at all. As a general proposition, when I buy a thing I buy it as cheap as I can.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You encounter great risks in reclaiming these lands, do you not, from floods?—A. Yes, sir; it was an experiment when we started in. Very few capitalists would touch it at all. It is looked upon now as very hazardous. Very few would touch it, but still it has been done.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is this work generally in water?—A. It is generally in water.

The tide covers the land every day, and the excavations are made by damming off the water, and sometimes the men are in the water.

Q. It is disagreeable work?—A. It is disagreeable work; work that white men will not risk their health for at all.

Q. Hardly for any price?—A. Of course at some price you can hire a man, but nothing that we would be willing to pay, because there is great risk in the enterprise; it has always been so considered at least.

Q. Is it an unhealthy kind of work?—A. Not so much so as it would appear. Most people think it would be unhealthy, but it is not. It is an unpleasant business for a man to be in the water, and have his feet wet all the time. That is the general rule. Of course in some places we have high banks and scrapers, and are employing white men now after reclamation. They always give white men the intelligent positions to fill. They prefer to employ them even at a larger expense.

Q. Would they do more work than a Chinaman at the same thing?—A. In some particulars they will; but the white men are more trustworthy handling horses and machinery. We can explain things to them, and they are better than Chinamen.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. What effect would the naturalization of the Chinamen have upon our institutions?—A. I am very much opposed to extending the franchise, and have been opposed to it for some time.

Q. Do you think they would amalgamate with our race?—A. I have no doubt the more intelligent of them would make good citizens.

Q. Do you think if the Chinaman was a voter you could employ him in this work?—A. I do not think the Chinaman being a voter would particularly interfere in that matter. The objection to Chinamen voting would be that they would probably be controlled by men who employed them, because they do not understand the language, and are not familiar with the institutions of the country. Of course a great many of them are quite intelligent men, and quite as intelligent on political matters as some of our white men who vote; but they are not so as a class. They did not come here to be politicians; they came here to do our work.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you think the subjection which they are under, as the slaves were, is favorable to their efficiency as workmen?—A. I think they are much better than slaves or negroes were. In the first place, they are more reliable. They are not politicians in any sense of the word. They do not care anything about our parades or excitements.

Q. The slaves were not politicians before they were free?—A. But they soon became politicians.

Q. It is alleged that these men came under contract of service—voluntary contracts, but a species of slavery. The question I desire to ask is whether, because they do come like that, and that they work in droves, and contract through one man, does not account for the efficiency of their labor?—A. I think that is a mistake; that there is nothing of that kind at all. I find my Chinamen entirely independent of the bosses. When the bosses do not pay them they come to me. If the boss does not pay them any wages, they tie him up and call on us. That has been the case in several instances. I find that each man has his account, and he holds the boss responsible.

Q. Are these bosses Chinese?—A. They are Chinese. I have noticed one or two of them here in the room. I will go to a house and tell them

that I want five hundred or a thousand Chinamen. They will take the contract at so much a yard, but they will let it out in a great many subcontracts to small numbers, to families. The per cent. they make is simply the profit on selling rice. It is very seldom that they make anything at all on the contract per acre; but they always stipulate that they shall have the privilege of supplying the Chinamen, and they make the profit in their stores. It is the storekeepers who do the contracting. The Chinamen all know that the boss is getting so much. The boss says "I get 12 cents a yard; here is my contract; you go and work at 12 cents;" and they let it out in small contracts in that way.

Q. You say these bosses sometimes try to defraud the Chinese?—A. In a few instances the bosses have used the money. We do not pay the individual Chinamen. We pay it all to one man, and he has to pay it out to his own men.

Q. How many instances of that kind do you remember where the boss has attempted to defraud the Chinese?—A. I only remember two or three instances where a boss Chinaman has been dishonest to the Chinamen under him and has not paid them the money.

Q. The previous witness has testified that they were never dishonest?—A. I do not think they are models as to honesty, but they are about as reliable as the common run of men who fill such positions. If you take the intelligent educated Chinamen, the merchants, I find them very reliable, very trustworthy, and we seldom have the disagreement of a cent in our accounts. Their measurements hold out with those of our engineers. They make their own measurements. Our engineer measures the work, the Chinamen measure it, and we seldom have any disagreement. They are very accurate in their measurements.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. They know how to calculate?—A. Yes, sir; perfectly well. I know of one instance where our engineer made a mistake of two or three thousand yards in a large contract. They told him it was a mistake. I told him to get a white engineer from some other company. They came down here and employed a white engineer, and he found out that my engineer had made a mistake, and I paid the difference. I do not believe in importing Chinamen to any great extent; but I believe they are of great benefit to us.

Rev. DAVID DEAL sworn and examined.

The WITNESS. I am a representative of the preachers' meeting of the Methodist ministerial association.

We, the members of the preachers' meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of San Francisco, would respectfully submit the following statement of facts and belief:

We would respectfully represent that a number of us have been for years residents of this coast, and we also have among us those who have been engaged in missionary work in China, and are not now thus engaged; and hence we have had fair opportunities for becoming acquainted with the Chinese people.

We have carefully noted their habits of industry and quietness of demeanor, and have rarely known them to solicit alms.

In many of our churches we have Sabbath-schools, as well as night-schools, in which they receive instruction, and find them eager to learn our language, and they take an interest in reading the Scriptures, and manifest anxiety to understand lessons of truth.

We have given personal attention to the missionary efforts of the different churches on the coast, and have been personally acquainted with a number of the converts, in whose piety and purity of intention in embracing Christianity we have entire confidence.

We utterly fail to discover any motive in this country or in China for a hypocritical pro-

fession, when persecution and a loss of standing among their own race is in every case the result of their embracing Christianity. The Chinese Christian ministers seem to impress the thoughtful mind by their earnestness and accuracy of statement and life.

We are impressed with a firm conviction that faithful Christian effort will bring the Chinese to an appreciation of our Christian civilization. And we are impressed with a belief that it is a favorable moment to exhibit that kindly spirit that will teach these strangers that there is something in our civilization that is superior to the systems under which it has been their misfortune to be reared.

We are well convinced that a false impression has gone out in regard to the success of missionary effort among the Chinese. And for your information we would remind you that at present we have in China: 17 missionaries from our parent society, 11 from Women's Foreign Society, 13 assistants, 95 native preachers, 1,277 Chinese members, and 700 probationers; and let us assure you that in China to-day is exhibited the heroic age of the Christian church.

The Chinese native preachers are called to endure the persecution of the early Christian church, and we have in our number those who have personally witnessed their heroic devotion to the truth, and a number of them from among the best-disciplined minds of the Chinese empire.

And now, in conclusion, while we would not express an opinion in regard to congressional action, we would ask that the Christian sentiment of our land be not wholly ignored, for it is not confined to the unthinking multitude who for the time can be ruled by passion. And we really fear it would require a more potent effort to convert some of them to Christianity or to a correct appreciation of a genuine Christian civilization than it would the Chinese.

C. H. AFFLERBACH,
President.
DAVID DEAL,
Secretary Preachers' Meeting.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Could you tell how many members you have in your church of these Chinese converts?—Answer. In our mission-church here?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I do not know the exact number of members we have. I am not acquainted with the precise number of converts in the Chinese chapel.

Q. Have you anything further to say?—A. Nothing further.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The statement you read you desire to go as a part of your testimony?—A. Yes, sir; it is the statement made by our preachers' meeting. We have a preachers' meeting every Monday morning in this city, in which we discuss such matters as are of interest to our people and the church; and in the preachers' meeting this paper was ordered to be presented to the commission, if they desired it.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Are these converts adults?—A. A number of them are.

Q. Do they speak English?—A. Some of them.

Q. How do you reach those who do not speak English?—A. We use Chinese missionaries. In our Sunday-schools we teach them English; but we have our Chinese missionaries here who preach to them. Two members of the preachers' meeting have been a number of years missionaries in China, and they are now here engaged in other work on this coast.

Q. Do you know anything about the Catholic mission here?—A. I do not know anything about it.

Rev. AUGUSTUS W. LOOMIS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Have you a prepared statement, Mr. Loomis?—Answer. I have a prepared statement according to the questions which were propounded by the committee.

Q. You have been a missionary in China, I believe?—A. I was a missionary in China from 1844 to 1850. I have been on this coast since September, 1859, over 17 years, engaged in the Chinese missionary work.

Q. What society did you represent in China?—A. The Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, and I represent the same here.

Where do the Chinese come from? They come from the southeastern portion of the province of Canton, from the cities of Canton and Macao, and from the towns and country around about to the number of twenty-five, and scattering around over different portions of the province. I put in my pocket a rude map of the country, as found in a Chinese geography, prepared by my associate. [Producing a map.] That is a map of 18 provinces; that is Canton [pointing] down there, and this is a map of the province of Canton, prepared by the missionaries as a missionary map, designed especially to give the missionary stations. I have marked in blue pencil several of the places from which the Chinese come. They are not all down; some from there and there, [pointing on the map,] from places around about. This is the Canton province. I have the names of the towns as represented in the six companies, but there are scattering Chinese from many townships which are not mentioned here. They all embark at Hong-Kong, which is a city and colony of the British government. These people speak mainly four or five dialects quite distinct, and some so distinct as not to be understood by the people when they first come. They become more familiar with each other, and understand each other better after a while.

What class of the Chinese people visit California? They represent nearly all classes. There are merchants, a few scholars, artisans of nearly every description in their own country, farmers and gardeners, and common laborers. Far the largest portion are from the rural districts, accustomed to labor at home and expecting to labor while here. A large proportion of them are young men, with many mere boys. They are people who have been bred to industry, with economical habits. Not very many gentlemen of large means come to this country, but there are branches of large mercantile firms established here. No priests or teachers of religion or any of their religious sects have come to California as teachers.

How do they get here? Those who are able to pay their passage do so and come as other people come, and others are assisted by relatives; and many who propose to come to California, being poor, have not sufficient means of their own, or means at command to procure an outfit and pay their passage, therefore they resort to various ways to raise the needful funds. Some mortgage their portion of the paternal estate, such as a corner of the house, a room, or a share of the small farm, hoping to redeem the same when they return after a few years from California. Many borrow money, giving only their note, but with a heavy interest. In early times some poor but reliable and healthy men had their wages and outfit advanced by friends, capitalists, with an agreement to share equally in the profits and losses of their mining ventures for a specified term of years, and after that period had expired, and the terms of the contract had been fulfilled, the immigrant was freed from obligation to refund, even if his mining or trading adventures had been all unfortunate. Of late years many have come to California under labor-contracts: as, for example, a railroad contractor or manufacturer goes to some Chinese mercantile house or to some labor-broker or intelligence-office and engages a certain number of men at a stipulated price. The contractor deals only with the Chi-

nese firm or broker. He will make him responsible for good men and will pay the wages to him. The broker then looks out for the men. If he can engage them here, so as to save a fair percentage he does so; if not he telegraphs or writes to China, promising a specified rate of wages for a given time, perhaps two years, together with passage-money and an advance of wages sufficient to purchase outfit and to leave a small amount in the hands of the family from which the emigrant comes; this requiring so large an outlay on the part of the broker, together with all the risk in regard to sickness or death of the emigrant, that the broker feels justified in expecting a pretty large percentage on the wages. After the specified time, it may be for six months or for two years, the person is at perfect liberty to contract for himself. The employés all acquiesce with entire harmony in these arrangements, and seldom are known to break faith with those who helped them to get here. Of the Chinese coming to this country for the last few years, however, a large proportion are returning Californians, or brothers or cousins of those who have been here, and therefore are supplied with funds by these relatives. There are no coolies brought to California, nor do the six companies import their countrymen at all. All Chinese male emigrants to California are free, but a large proportion of the women that have come to California in earlier years have been brought here for vile purposes, some being decoyed or kidnapped and others bought, the price advancing very much on their arrival in this country. Many of these women have been purchased by the men here, either for wives or secondary wives, and they live with these women with the same domestic regulations as in Chinese families at home. Of late years the Chinese are bringing their wives more than formerly, and many now speak of going home to bring their families back with them.

Do the Chinese purpose to become permanent residents? Generally the Chinese leave their homes at first with the intention of returning; not to return would be regarded a great calamity. The Chinaman's love for home and his regard for the paternal inheritance, the ancestral temples and tombs turning him homeward from whatever portion of the earth he may have wandered to, and the desire that his grave may be visited by the family friends and his spirit receive its share in the ancestral rites and worship, make it a necessity that he be buried in the ancestral tomb, or that his bones, at least, be transported and entombed by the side of his fathers. But those who become christianized renounce these superstitions and prefer not to have their bones removed to China if they should die here, and every year the number increases of those who are in this manner weaned from their superstitions. There are many Chinamen who will not return home because they are not likely to get above a chronic condition of poverty which prevents their return. But nearly every steamer takes home some who are assisted to return by relatives or countrymen. A few confess that America is a better country than China, and that they have abandoned the purpose of returning, and this number is increasing somewhat from year to year.

The six companies. These are commercial guilds. The people from different sections belong to their several companies, analogous to the Hibernia, Saint Andrew's, Sclavonia, Italian, German, or New England societies. These societies have their by-laws, their presidents, secretaries, treasurers, interpreter, &c. These officers are chosen by ballot every year, and receive their salaries. They are for mutual aid. For certain benefits which are extended to the members they are willing to pay the dues and taxes imposed. The officers of these companies, together with

prominent men among the merchants and others connected with the company, are called together to deliberate and advise on occasions of important events, such as a murder, a riot in the mines or anywhere, a quarrel between members of different companies, the failure of some Chinese firm, or threatened persecutions or any impending danger, or to make arrangements to receive and do honor to any dignitary. These meetings are simply advisory. They act often as arbitrators in difficulties, so as to prevent their people, if possible, from going to law; or when their countrymen have been robbed or murdered in the mines they take steps to procure, through the Government officers, the apprehension and prosecution of the offenders.

Some of the companies in early California times built and supported hospitals for their countrymen. An old building down on what was called Washerwoman's Bay was built and supported by the Chinese for a hospital in early times. These companies do not import coolies; they are not immigrant associations; they are not civil or criminal courts to try and execute offenders, nor are they secret combinations for the purpose of subverting or interfering with the course of justice in the countries to which their people go to sojourn. Christian Chinamen object to them because in the houses owned and occupied by the several companies there are rooms fitted up as idol temples, and funds of the companies have been expended to fit these up; therefore they have withdrawn from them, declining to pay their dues and taxes, and likewise, of course, forfeiting whatever privileges and benefits connection with these companies might afford them. The Christian Chinamen have a Young Men's Christian Association, which is designed to give the same advantages as similar associations among our own people.

One advantage in remaining connected with the six companies, which has weight with most of the Chinese here, is that their bones, wherever buried, will be gathered up and returned to China, and a portion of the dues to each company is for this purpose. However, less is done each succeeding year in this direction; their burying-grounds here are filling up, and are gradually assuming the appearance, more and more, of permanency, while we hear less of ships chartered to carry home the coffins.

Another of the benefits of these companies (in the minds of Chinamen who are in business) is that they help in the collection of debts, or rather oppose barriers to the absconding of debtors. These companies have an arrangement with the different shipping-houses by which no Chinaman can get his ticket for his passage unless he brings a stamped permit from his company. If a Chinaman is known to be insolvent, or if there are suspicions that he desires to defraud his creditors, or if a telegram comes from any part of the country saying "Stop such a man," he will be hindered from going until the case has been investigated and satisfactory arrangements have been made.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. How do they hinder them?—A. Simply by declining to give this ticket.

Q. Then you say these men are free?—A. I state the facts, and you may draw your inference.

Q. You said previous to that statement that these men were free to go?—A. My design in making the statement was to tell all I knew.

Q. The two propositions do not cohere?—A. Very well, you have them as I give them. Difficulties have sometimes arisen in the companies owing to real or suspected malfeasance, misuse of funds, but probably no more than is the case with similar associations among

Christian people. Each of the six companies owns its house and lot, and some of these company houses have large rooms, to which the immigrants from the ship are permitted to come and lodge until they find employment, or until they can make arrangements to get to their work on the railroads or in the mines. Also, Chinamen coming from the country to embark for China are permitted to take their baskets and blankets to the company houses and lodge while waiting for a ship. These buildings are, in fact, like the caravanseries of the East, and this feature connected with them has led to the presumption (on the part of people who do not speak their language) that these six companies are the importers of coolies, and that the company houses are cooly-baracoons. I give here the fees paid by the different companies, respectively, from each member:

The Yen Wo Company initiation-fee or entrance-fee, or whatever you call it, $8, and bone-money, for carrying home the bones, $5.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is that the initiation-fee?—A. They have what they call the initiation-fee; I do not know how much that may be. When they first come they are expected to put down their names. In most cases I think it is $2. They are not required to pay that, but it is remembered, and when they go home they are expected to pay that, and there some other charges.

Yeang Wo, $8 to the company fees; bone-money, $5	$13
Kong Chow, $5 to the company; bone-money, $8	13
Hop Wo, $5 to the company fees; bone-money, $5	10
Sam Yop, $5 to the company fees; bone-money, $2	7
Ling Yeang, $5 to the company; bone-money, $3	8

But there are other fees. They are assessed. It often occurs that there may be some difficulty where the company is requested by friends of the people who have been murdered to prosecute the case and employ lawyers, and then they make a special assessment.

Q. Is there anything like monthly dues?—A. I think not.

Q. And nothing like a percentage on the wages?—A. No, sir.

How do the Chinese find employment on landing in this country? Most who come have friends here to receive and direct them. Those who have been engaged in China by the labor-brokers are conducted at once to the places where their labor is needed. It is sometimes the case that a ship will come in and there will be a small steamboat waiting to receive them, to save the annoyance of landing and running the gauntlet of these hoodlums. They will go up alongside with a small steamer and take them off to the work. Many during the present season have been sent directly to work on the railroads in the southern part of the State, on the Southern Pacific, and the railroads out from Los Angeles, and extending on into Arizona. Others are sent to work on wagon-roads, to build embankments for redeeming the overflowed lands. In the seasons of strawberry cultivation, strawberry-picking, fruit-gathering, hop-picking, potato-digging, harvesting, the demand for labor is greater than the supply, and the immigrants have no time to linger in the city. There is always a demand for house-servants in San Francisco, in inland towns and villages, on the ranches, at the mills, and factories, and hotels all over the State and in the Territories. Chinese are employed as operatives in various manufacturing establishments to do the work of expert fingers and patient, plodding, tireless minds—a species of labor that no other source but China has

been able hitherto to supply to California, at least at such a rate as has warranted the capitalist to venture in manufacturing enterprises. Very many Chinese now arriving are those who come to take the places of brothers, cousins, or friends who will return to China as soon as they have taught the new-comer his business as servant, laborer, or factory-hand; and thus it is that the increase of the Chinese portion of the population is not to be judged of by the arrivals, for the number returning is likewise very great. The populace, especially that class of people opposed to the Chinese, make emphatic note of the arrivals, but say nothing at all of the departures.

Returning Chinese. Every ship to China carries back more or less Chinese; but in the autumn and early part of winter is the season in which they return in crowds, so that the outward-bound steamers and ships in the fall are as much crowded as the inward-bound steamers in the spring, the spring being the season for the largest immigration, and the autumn and early winter the season for the greatest rush in returning.

There are two principal reasons for the fall being chosen for the return by the greater number of the Chinese, viz: Because in the winter the call for farm and garden hands is less, and the work on roads, railroads, and embankments and canals has slacked off; also mining in the mountains is, in many places, discontinued during the stormy months of winter. The other reason is that they may come in season for the New-year's festivities.

The flow of Chinese back and forth is an ebbing and flowing tide. They come and go, come and go; and such has been the history of the Chinese immigration from the first. While it is true that the ebbing tide is lighter than the flowing tide because many die here, many never succeed in business so as to go back with a competency, as they had hoped; some also become discouraged or reckless, or their friends at home have died since they came to California, so that the attractions at home to this class are every year becoming less; while a few, having learned our language, and become familiar with our constitution and laws, and our religion in the mission schools and Churches, choose to remain here rather than return to a heathen country.

Does the population in California, on the whole, increase? The population on the entire coast has increased somewhat during the past years, but in the State of California there are probably less than there were twenty years ago. There were then in the placer and gulch mining districts multitudes of Chinese miners; but those mines were, for the most part, long ago "worked out" and abandoned, and the mining settlements deserted. More Chinese are employed on ranches now, and as servants in families all over the country, and this as a natural consequence of the increase of our rural and agricultural population, and the proportionate increase of the demand for laborers and servants in this direction. The same cause has increased this element of the population in San Francisco and in other town and villages; also, the inauguration of new manufacturing enterprises has drawn Chinese to some of the cities and towns, while they have opened new avenues of commerce and furnished demand for the consumption of home products.

The character for morals of the Chinese immigrants. The Chinese immigrants come mostly from the rural and farming districts. A large proportion are vigorous and enterprising young men, and very many are mere boys—young men and boys that have been reared

in the country, trained to habits of industry and economy and frugality, and accustomed to hear the proverbs of the sages quoted constantly. These proverbs and mottoes are inscribed on the door-posts and lintels of their houses, every house, every shop, on the walls of their dwellings, and shops, and school-houses, and in all public places, by the hearth-side; thus they are warned and exhorted and taught to be honest, industrious, obedient to parents, to elders, to superiors, and magistrates; to be kind to the sick and poor, and to fear the gods, and be respectful to the mandates of Heaven; but being of the same stuff that our own human nature is made of, they do not all practice as well as they know. Many depart from the instructions received in youth; but as a body of immigrants they are remarkably quiet, law-abiding, respectful; as servants and laborers, they are remarkable for docility, honesty, and desire to please. Of course there are exceptions. There are those who show ingratitude; some pilfer; and there is in every city and town a horde of gamblers and idlers who live on the earnings of others. All the respectable and industrious Chinamen would be glad to have the gamblers and prostitutes, and all who aid or who are in any way connected with these immoral sources, expelled from the country; and the merchants of San Francisco and the six companies have endeavored at different times both to have the bad women sent home and to prevent the landing of new arrivals, but they have failed through the action of our own courts and the efforts of some lawyers to defeat their purpose. For a heathen nation, the Chinese at home, in their own country, are outwardly the most correct, the most thrifty, and unexceptional, in their domestic and commercial life, of any of the nations who have not enjoyed the advantages of a Christian civilization. As a body, in this country, they are a quiet, inoffensive, docile people. There are none among them like the hoodlum element among our lawless boys and young men. There are none who correspond to the low, profane, debauched, drunken crowds that infest certain portions of most American and European cities.

There are Chinese gamblers, opium-smokers, pimps, and idlers, and thieves; and very likely this class will wax worse and worse unless restrained and punished by law, for such is the tendency of human nature. But these classes are now far more numerous than they would have been had they all the time been properly dealt with. It has been commonly reported, and there is no doubt of the fact, that gambling-houses and brothels have bought immunity in their illegal practices by regular weekly or monthly payments to certain officials. When any special outcry is made against them, and a demand on the part of the public to have them closed, the thing is done at once, showing that it might be done all the time.

There are Chinese in the county jails and State prison. While the truth also should be stated that judges and juries have found it easier to decide against these people than against those of our own race, and many times heavier judgments have been decreed against them than against our own people for the same crimes; and, furthermore, there is no doubt that they have in very many cases failed in getting a proper hearing because of the want of adequate interpreters and proper counsel, and because of the prejudice against them which very many of the public officers do not attempt to conceal.

Advantages or disadvantages to California of this immigration. There are many advantages. Many manufacturing enterprises would not have been started here but for the possibility of obtaining Chinese labor, which is cheaper than could have been ob-

tained in any other quarter on this coast, but still not so cheap as the manufacturers at the East are able to secure. The Chinese, moreover, are more desirable as factory operatives because of their skillfulness and patience, and quiet, prompt, and persevering attention to business.

All our public works, such as railroads, wagon-roads, and dikes for redeeming overflowed lands, are in a more advanced stage than they would have been but for Chinese labor.

There are more houses built and many more families residing in California to-day than would have been but for Chinese labor; because very many eastern families have moved to this country, in part, at least, to rid themselves from the tyranny of another kind of foreign domestics, and to find here the luxury of Chinese domestics, who perform a greater variety and amount of labor than other foreign servants, and in a quiet and faithful manner.

Without these Chinese laborers the grain crops, hop crops, grape crops, small-fruit and large-fruit crops could not be saved in season, as we have the testimony of employers; and, therefore, in this particular they are of incalculable benefit to the country, an important source of wealth to the State and to the nation.

The moving of the merchandise which is imported by them to this country, and again reshipped to all parts of the interior and to points up and down the coast, and to South America, employs many draymen, gives business to expresses, and to shipping, boating, and wagoning interests everywhere. They pay a large proportion of the customs duties; they insure extensively; they patronize the gas and water companies; they pay city, county, State, and poll taxes, internal revenue, and licenses. I have statistics on these heads if they are called for.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have you the statistics in regard to customs, as to how much they pay?—A. I have; I will present them at the close of my statement. They handle much money; and every time a dollar is moved, no matter who handled it, some new impulse is given to business, there is a stir all along the line, a quickening of trade. True, they send home money; but much of the specie sent to China is for the purpose of buying goods for this market, and of course all that thus comes back helps to enrich our people; and whatever private individuals carry or send home helps the people there to become better customers. And such may be seen to have been the working of this immigration, viz, the Chinese by coming here have acquired a taste for our modes of living to some extent, have learned the use of some of our luxuries, and on returning home have found it inconvenient to do without them; and if they have saved money by their visit here, they are therefore prepared to indulge their desire, and at the same time to help our commerce, our manufacturers, our farmers, and our merchants. Thus this immigration is a benefit to us.

Political economists know that the increase of labor is a benefit to any land; every fresh acre or fresh foot of land brought under cultivation is a benefit to the country and to the world. "He that makes two spires of grass to grow where but one grew before is a benefactor of his race." And no people on the face of the earth know how to do that thing so well as the Chinese. Every ounce of gold or silver dug from the earth and put in circulation, either for a circulating medium or for the arts, is a blessing to the world. It is better for the world that people everywhere be profitably employed than that they be idle,

and the Chinese have afforded the facilities for the improvement of large portions of this State which would, but for them, be still lying unimproved. There are, however, apparent disadvantages attending their residence among us.

It is a calamity that any town, city, or village should be disfigured and its morals damaged by Chinese prostitutes; but it has been demonstrated that proper police regulations may rid any town of such a nuisance, or correct it to a great extent, and it may, if it will, close similar establishments kept by men or women of other nations than Chinese.

Chinese have been allowed to live in too close quarters in the cities and towns, and the impure air is offensive, but there are possible ways by which they may be put in the way of getting more roomy and convenient quarters.

The Chinese pay taxes like all other people. We have statistics to show something that they pay.

Do they also reap the benefits of the public funds like all other people? The Chinese pay all manner of taxes, the same as any citizen or stranger; and moreover, on many occasions, and for long periods of time together, they have been made to pay especial and discriminating taxes such as no other people have paid, and yet their children are all and always excluded from the public schools. One thousand one hundred and fifteen Chinese children in San Francisco, under 17 years of age, all drawing public money, but not one of them in the common schools. Their sick are not received into the hospitals without payment of a specified rate per week, $3 per week it used to be. I do not know what it is now, except cases of contagious diseases which the health-officers are bound to notice and provide for.

They everywhere pay road-taxes without much use of them, and poll-taxes without the privilege of voting, or very many of the privileges of citizenship. A Chinaman came to me a few days ago from Kern County with his three tax-receipts—his name Ah Gong 99, showing that he had been *viséd* by the officers here. There was a poll-tax of $2, a hospital poll-tax of $1, and a road poll-tax of $4 on one man in Kern County, and I suppose it is the same in other counties.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do they not use the roads very largely?—A. I think very largely.

Q. Are they not always traveling about?—A. They are always traveling about. They do not travel in their own vehicles very much. That will be my explanation. They benefit our people by riding in the stages. They go in stages and in wagons. In the hills they pack their baskets on their backs and travel over the mountain roads.

What are the effects of this immigration upon the Chinese themselves? There is no doubt that many have been injured by it. Some who have come to this country poor and grown comparatively rich have contracted extravagant or prodigal habits, and become poor again and gone to ruin financially and morally, just like many of other nationalities. Many lads also and young men have found themselves here with their wages in their pockets, and free from the restraints to which they were subjected at home, (in that land where family government is much better enforced than in the United States.) They have been enticed into gambling-houses, theaters, and brothels, and opium-shops, and so have contracted dissolute and idle habits and gone rapidly to ruin; very much as boys of other nations have done. Also a few—a very few—by contact with low and dissolute people have learned to swear, chew tobacco, and to swagger like rowdies of our own color, but

this class is very small, comparatively. On the other hand, the general effects of this immigration are good.

The mingling of so many young and enterprising people from China with a wide-awake nation like ours must and in fact has produced a powerful and very marked result. They have been stimulated. They have learned our modes of doing things. Wherever they travel and wherever they reside they keep their eyes wide open. They contrast our speedy ways of travel and communication with the slow and clumsy methods of their own country, and begin to inquire whether the same cannot be introduced into China, and by and by, when they have returned to their own country, they will feel the need of all our improved machinery and modes of travel more than ever, and will call for these improvements; and when the cry reaches the men in power in China (as it has already) these very men, who have been the wide-awake "lookers on" in this Venice, will be the persons whom the government can make good use of to build their railroads and operate them, with telegraphs and all manner of machinery, and then we will supply the material for those railroads, we will then reap the fruit of this immigration; that is, if we treat them properly and do not forfeit their good will. It has been ordained, and of necessity it must be, that by the running to and fro of the people, by the mingling of the nations, knowledge shall be increased. Thus China will be revolutionized, and every advance that China makes in any respect, in religion, in the arts, in social life, will benefit all the rest of the world; but especially will it benefit the nation which is its nearest neighbor, and which possesses so much greater natural advantages over European nations for commerce with China; especially if we treat as we ought to treat the representatives of that nation while they remain with us; and we have representatives of that nation who are men of great influence at home, and those who will be of influence by and by more than now.

Have many been influenced religiously by contact with us? Bad treatment, oppression, unjust and partial laws, and persecuting measures, as well as all exhibitions of wickedness, of drunkenness, prostitution, profanity, and Sabbath-breaking, have prejudiced many against the religion of the Bible, because they have supposed that Americans generally should afford examples of the good effects of the teachings of the Bible. But, on the other hand, many have learned to discriminate between true Christians and merely nominal Christians, and between these again and open infidels and scoffers; and these also have learned that the true Christians are not those who beat them, pelt them with stones in the street, and set their dogs on them. Moreover, the missions which have been established here—the preaching by missionaries and their native assistants, together with their schools and Sabbath-services and Sabbath-schools, and the Sabbath-schools in very many of the churches, have been exerting a steady but powerful influence upon the susceptible minds of these multitudes of young Chinamen, so that thousands who came here idolaters are no longer so. Nearly all Chinese in California become, to some extent, weaned from their idolatry and superstitions. Most of the young men who attend the mission evening and day schools and the Sabbath-schools learn something about Christianity. Many thousands during these years of coming and going to and fro have become christianized to some extent, so far, at least, as to lose reverence for their gods. Three hundred or more have professed Christianity; some of these, we know, have boldly witnessed for the truth, and steadfastly endured persecution after returning to their own country. The Chinese Young Men's Christian Associations number a thou-

sand or more members, and all these have formally renounced idolatry and adopted the Christian faith. And more and more each year the Christian people of California are awakening to a sense of the privilege and honor conferred upon them, as well as the obligation devolved upon them by God's providence to do all in their power to evangelize these Chinese, that they may be prepared to disseminate the truth when they return to China, and so become the leaven which shall eventually and, we hope, speedily leaven that whole nation. If it is God's purpose by this immigration to America to prepare the way for christianizing China, and if we ought all to be co-workers with God by falling in with his plans of working, then it is best, probably, not to quarrel with God's arrangements. I have here a list of the members of the churches, those enrolled in the different churches—not an extravagant list, but quite a number. [Producing a paper.]

Q. It is not sufficiently full.—A. It is not full. I have here a list numbering 246.

Q. Give us what information you have. The reference to that is of no value unless it goes into the record.—A. I intended to make it out fuller. I would rather not give it.

Senator SARGENT. Supply it afterward, and put it in the testimony. [See Appendix H.]

The WITNESS. Is there a probability that the immigration from China to this country will increase from year to year?—This immigration is regulated entirely by the demand for laborers and the openings for business. So long as the railroads prefer them, whether because they work better or cheaper, so long railroad-laborers will come, and they will also return again when there is no more work for them, providing they have saved enough to take them home; and the same in regard to other departments of work, and the farmers and road-contractors, and railroad-contractors, and manufacturers, will continue to send for Chinese laborers, just so long as, on the whole, they see it will be for their pecuniary interest to send for them; therefore the very fact of the Chinese continuing to come at any time is an evidence that their presence is desired by the class of men who employ them, and by the larger interests which they represent, notwithstanding the outcry that may be raised against them in certain quarters. Should the country fill up with laboring men and women of other nationalities, and that labor be cheap enough to warrant the employing it, then the Chinese laborers will cease to come. It is the necessary consequence. Now, however, people are coming here with money to invest, and others with a little money to buy a home for themselves, and with the hope to find Chinese domestics, while those with no capital have come hoping to get rich speedily; they demand higher wages than employers can afford to give and compete with eastern or foreign manufacturers, and therefore in consequence the cheaper labor will be required, and the cheaper labor will continue to come unless the rabble rise and drive them out; and when that is done the factories will be closed, and the ranches and gardens and vineyards will go to waste, because these men and women who cry out against the Chinese will then demand whatever wages they please, and more than capitalists can afford to pay—more than business can live at and compete with those who at the East or elsewhere have their work done with cheaper labor.

Do the Chinese buy real estate?—To only a very limited extent hitherto. There has always been so much opposition to them here, so many threats to drive them away, that they have been afraid to buy. They rent almost universally, and pay much heavier rates than any

other people, and for this reason their landlords would be sorry to have them driven from the country. The six companies own the houses occupied by them severally, and a few other pieces of property are owned by the Chinese, but they are beginning more to lease property for several years.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are those six companies incorporated?—A. I think the Kong Chau company is incorporated. I do not know about the others.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Incorporated under the laws of this State?—A. I think the Kong Chau Company is incorporated. They had some law business. They are beginning to lease, for a term of years, usually 20 or 25 years, and at the expiration of that term the property goes back into the hands of the owner of the lands, he paying the price for improvements according to some stipulation. One ranch of 875 acres above Rio Vista was purchased a year or so ago at $30 per acre, stocked and improved by a joint-stock company, part tule and part upland; another of 1,100 acres on Grisley Island, another of 750 acres on Grand Island, that on Grisley Island for $27 per acre, stocked and improved, and also some other smaller pieces.

Q. Are those purchases or leases?—A. Purchases, I understood. They may have been long leases, but I understood them to be purchases. In other cases where Chinese engage in gardening, strawberry or peanut culture, or hop raising, they rent the land, and in most cases the landlords do the marketing, and of course handle the money, and pay themselves out of it first. The landlords receive the fruits as these men bring them to the heap or to the wagon. These men take out the potatoes, receive the money for them, pay themselves out of it first, and pay the balance to the Chinaman.

Do Chinese desire to become American citizens? Not in the present state of feeling toward them. Only a very few men, so far as we are aware, have applied for such a privilege. They do not now take very much interest in our political affairs, further than to learn which party is most opposed to their people, and which of these parties is likely to come into power, and then they watch the papers to see what new laws are proposed or enacted against them.

Are they so bound by allegiance to their own emperor or to their religious teachers that they dare not become American citizens? Not by any means. Although the laws of China, until recently, forbade the emigration of any people from China, nevertheless the Chinese have been accustomed to go where they pleased, to stay as long as they pleased, return when they pleased, make as much money as possible, and keep as much of it as possible, their emperor never interfering with them. And, unlike some others who come to America, as we have been told, (and who manage to get to the ballot-boxes very soon,) they are not sworn to support any foreign hierarchy and foreign ecclesiastical magnate who claims the whole earth as his dominion. They are not sworn to any such government.

Mr. PIPER. That is foreign to the question entirely.

The WITNESS. The Chinese, even at home, are not zealous propagandists; they are, on the other hand, so tolerant that they have allowed the Tauist sect to spring up; then the Buddhist to come in; then the Mohammedan, and now the Christian religion is tolerated, and by the provisions of the treaty any Chinaman is at liberty to profess whatever faith he chooses.

What might be the effect of the modification of the treaty with China? The Chinese are not likely to stop with the modification of one or two articles which we may designate, but they will probably insist, likewise, on some which have always been more obnoxious to them than any articles in the treaty have ever been to us. The treaty has always been regarded on both sides as granting more privileges to Americans in China than to Chinese in America. Americans in China have their own courts, are tried by their peers of their own countrymen, and may claim the aid of the Chinese government to secure the accomplishment even of this.

If the Chinese should come to America, desiring to remain, bring their families, and become naturalized, would they be desirable citizens? We would not favor a proposition for any foreigners becoming citizens until they had fully learned our laws, and become familiar with and heartily in sympathy with our republican institutions; therefore, we believe that in all cases there should be certain educational tests applied to all voters, as well as a reasonable time of residence in this country, before admitting persons of any nationality to citizenship, and then each man should be examined carefully as to his qualifications and intentions before admitting him to the privileges and responsibilities of an American citizen.

With such precautions there need not be a fear in admitting Chinese who meet the qualifications to the privileges of citizenship, and we know many educated and christianized Chinamen who would make good citizens of this republic. As the case now stands, however, by the provisions of our revised constitution, there are many boys growing up here who will very soon come to manhood, who must of necessity be allowed to vote; but they are not here in California allowed to attend the public schools; they are shut up with their own people, and cannot receive the education and preparation which ought to be bestowed upon them in order to prepare them to assume their place as fellow-citizens with us in this republic. The schools are doing that work, supported by Christian people, and we have a great many of these boys under instruction, religious and secular.

About Chinese women. Most of the Chinese women in California, in former years, were brought here for bad purposes. In the early days of California they were brought for the accommodation of the white population, and so still, to a great extent we are told, their houses are visited by low white men both in the city and country towns, and mining camps.

These women have not generally or to any considerable extent come to California of their own choice, nor did they commence, nor do they generally continue a life of prostitution of choice. A large proportion of them were quite young girls when first brought here. They were obtained in various ways: some are stolen from their homes; some are decoyed away on promise of marriage; some are disposed of by their parents, who are poor, for a small money consideration, to persons who promise to train them up as daughters, not for sale, not for brothels, but with this pretense, that they are to be trained up as daughters, and others dispose of their girls to persons who profess to be seeking for one to become a secondary wife or concubine of some man, and many of them are orphans, who without protectors or support have been decoyed away and deceived, and at length found themselves wholly in the power of the procuress. They are sold from one to another in Hong-Kong, then sent here and made to serve their owners, or sold to men, and kept by them as their mistresses. But very many of this class of

young women, after having been brought to California, have been bought or otherwise obtained by the Chinamen for secondary wives, who are living with them in a respectable way, according to Chinese domestic customs, and many too have been regularly married, according to our laws, and are living happily with their husbands. It is believed that very many of these unfortunate women would abandon the places where they are kept if opportunity was afforded them. Some have done so. The missionaries have aided in rescuing many. Some of these have been sent back to their friends in China, and some have been married and are living respectably, and there are at present in the homes for these women, which are sustained and managed by the missions, between thirty and forty women; they are happy and cheerful; they are receiving religious instruction, and are taught various kinds of needle-work and domestic duties. Many more of the merchants and others are now bringing their wives from China than formerly. We hope that the importation of the bad class of Chinese women may ere long cease.

I have a letter here from Mr. Bailey, our consul at Canton. This is written in answer to a communication to him when sending home a woman to the country, whom he received, and took proper care of her. He says:

> The subject of Chinese emigration to the United States is a very difficult question, and especially as regards female emigration. I am endeavoring, in every possible way, to stop women going to the United States for lewd and immoral purposes, and shall at all times be pleased to hear from and co-operate with those who are opposed to this great evil.

Do the Chinese show a disposition to intermarry with our people? There have been no more than four or five instances of Chinamen with white wives in San Francisco, to my knowledge, and in every case they have brought these wives with them from other places. Two or three married Irish women in New York and brought them here. One brought a white wife from the West Indies; one married in Australia; and we remember an instance of a Chinaman taking a half-Mexican woman and living with her at San José, and another who brought a half-breed woman from Peru. There has been no disposition to intermarry here in California.

Much has been said of the offensive character of the Chinese houses of prostitution. How do they compare with the quarters occupied by white women? The quarters occupied by the Chinese prostitutes are not commendable to the city, and ought to be suppressed, and they are shut up when the authorities set themselves about it in earnest; but the solicitation and indecent exposure of the fallen women of other nationalities is far more disgusting than anything to be seen in the Chinese quarter.

How many Chinese in California have become Christians, and what is their character as compared with other professing Christians? There are probably about three hundred who have been baptized and received into Christian churches. They compare well with other Christians. At first their knowledge is limited and their faith weak, but they grow in knowledge and Christian activity, and show an interest in the affairs of the church and a desire that their friends and countrymen should be brought to the knowledge of the truth. They hold prayer meetings by themselves; they give for the spread of the gospel among the heathen; they watch over one another; they pray for their enemies; they are patient, long-suffering, and forgiving; they make sacrifices in order to prepare to preach the gospel; they love the Bible, the church, and the Sabbath; they witness a good confession in this world, and die rejoicing in the hope of the forgiveness of all their sins and of

admission into heaven. They are well reported of by all who know them; they are, moreover, the leaven by which all China is to be leavened, to be Christianized, so that those eighteen provinces will be growing more and more, year by year, a country that we will take pleasure in and receive profit from as our near neighbors across the seas. There have been a few cases of apostacy, but not so many as might have been expected, considering all the temptations to which they are exposed. There are many hundreds, and thousands probably, who have been so influenced by the teachings they have received that they will never go back wholly to idolatry, but will give their influence on the side of reform when they return to their own land.

I would like to state that, in regard to their Christian character, I have received letters from several clergymen who have Chinese in their sabbath-schools and churches. They have sent them to me to be given here as evidence, if the committee desire them. They are sent for that purpose, and I will present them to the committee if they desire me to do so.

Senator SARGENT. They can hardly go into the record unless testified to, though you might publish them in the appendix.

[See Appendix I.]

The WITNESS. What would probably be the effect should the purpose of those opposed to the Chinese be carried out, and the Chinese be dismissed from all the places where they are now employed? Great disturbance in all branches of business would be the result. As soon as the Chinese were fairly driven away, the artisans, employés, and servants would undoubtedly demand whatever wages they might think best, as they were accustomed to do before there was this competition of Chinese labor. It was because of the strikes of mechanics and laborers demanding higher wages or less working hours, that employers were forced to employ the Chinese at first in some of the skilled trades, as shoe and boot makers, for example. Let the Chinese be driven away and the laborers, mechanics, and servant-girls will, in all probability, pursue the same course as before. Let the Chinese be driven away and all the manufacturing interests would be seriously affected, if not stopped. They are now only able to sustain themselves in the face of the Eastern and foreign competition by means of the operatives they now find in the Chinese.

The cultivation of all the small fruits, grapes, hop-picking, potatoe-digging, would have to cease or be greatly diminished; for these fruits could not be raised at present prices.

The immigration, or a very important element in the immigration to this State from the East, would cease if cheap labor and good servants and provisions at reasonable prices cease to be an attraction.

Many thousands of families have been drawn here, not only by the climate, but because good servants at reasonable prices could be obtained, and because, by means of Chinese labor, many kinds of vegetables and provisions could be found in abundance, and at moderate prices; and this addition of people of means to our population has stimulated every branch of business; it created the demand for houses, and raised the price of real estate. Let the Chinese be driven away, and this class of people will remain in their comfortable homes at the East, and many here will return to those old homes.

The men who are now demanding the expulsion of the Chinese are largely the very mechanics who have been drawn here by the demand for houses, and other necessary articles of consumption, which the presence of Chinese has occasioned, and let those people go away, or cease to come, and these very men will soon have to go also.

I have here a list of the arrivals and departures, beginning with 1855, compiled from the custom-house records. [See Appendix K.] These people are scattered all over the Pacific coast. Not half of them are in California; most of these now hope to return to China. I have given the number here as probably 110,000. They are here now serving our people in ten thousand ways. The people are enriched—the whole country is enriched by them, not impoverished. The resources of the country are developed by their labor—commerce is improved everywhere over the world. Individuals may be crowded out of places they had occupied, but other and better places are soon opened to them. The world is made richer by every new foot of land that is brought under cultivation, and by every fresh ounce of the precious metals that is dug from the earth. The range of science, political economy, civil liberty, philanthropy, and religion is improved and extended by increased intercourse with neighboring States, and with distant nations; and all these considerations are of importance in these investigations, because as no man liveth to himself merely, but has responsibilities in regard to others, so is it with nations. There is a brotherhood of nations—there are missions for nations to perform in regard to other nations. Whatever discoveries we may make in science, whatever improvements in government we may have made, or revelations in religion, we are bound to communicate to less favored people.

What is the feeling among the clergy and the churches of different denominations in regard to evangelizing efforts among the Chinese in California? Nearly all denominations, except the Roman Catholic, are doing something towards educating and trying to Christianize the Chinese. The Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Congregational, and Episcopal churches support mission-work. Many churches in the cities and towns have Chinese Sabbath-schools. Many of the churches have Chinese members of whom the pastors speak in the highest terms. In testimony of which I refer to the letters I have received. Nearly all ecclesiastical bodies have annually passed strong resolutions urging the Chinese mission-work upon the attention of their churches. Nearly all our presbyteries at their last session in October gave much time to this subject, and the synod gave to it two entire evenings, with the greatest cheerfulness and most intense interest. I intended to submit some documents from the presbyteries and synods. I submit the annual report of the mission of the board of missions of the Presbyterian Church to the Chinese in California, for 1874.

[See appendix L.]

Have you lived in China? State what you know of the sanitary and social condition of the people. Having lived in China for six years, and in different parts of the empire, visiting all classes, and speaking the language, I learned much about the people.

As to cleanliness or otherwise, there is not by any means such a condition of extreme and universal filthiness as some have labored to represent. There are beggars in China and many very poor people, but their cities, though crowded and the streets narrow, are kept remarkably free from filth; the streets are paved with broad flat stones; the garbage is gathered up and carried off every night or early in the morning, to enrich the neighboring fields; the cleanliness of the people bathing after the day's work is over, with change of apparel, the tidiness of their small apartments, their fondness for flowers, ornaments, pictures, and singing-birds, and their refined tastes and courtly manners, their polite expressions, have always been and are still the subject

of remark and delightful surprise by all impartial and intelligent travelers who have capacities and tastes to appreciate such things.

The little floating habitations of the boat-people are as white and as clean as the tables in this room.

In their social relations and manners the Chinese are superior to any other heathen people. They live in families, the wives are faithful to their husbands, and the penalty for unfaithfulness may be death. In no part of the world is there such filial obedience and reverence for age and respect for superiors and deference to rulers, such love of country and affection for home and all its associations. There is no drunkenness, no rioting in the streets; the cities are still and quiet during all the night. There is no such shameless exposure by lewd women as on the streets of San Francisco by white prostitutes.

What is the system of education in China and how general is it? There are some schools of a high grade supported by the government, many supported by gifts and by endowment of the rich, but most are private schools supported by tuition.

There is a religious feeling in China which prompts them to give for the support of benevolent institutions. They expect merit from it; and the same thing prompts them in the saving of life. They will risk their own lives to save the lives of those who fall into the river or are drowning. I have seen that myself. They expect merit from it.

The degree of knowledge is universal; to be a scholar is the highest honor, and opens the way to office and to advancement in every respect.

The classics are taught in the schools, also books of proverbs. These proverbs are committed to memory, and become perfectly familiar to all the people, high and low. Mottoes, proverbs, and moral maxims are posted up in every house and shop, and in every room in every house; the children become familiar with them, and these maxims and speeches of their sages, and rules for an upright and virtuous life, go with them wherever they wander over the face of the earth. They are repeated in their daily conversation, and these influences, this early education, cannot fail to make them industrious, frugal as servants or citizens, submissive to law, and to have respect for integrity to a greater extent, certainly, than if they had not been so educated.

How is it that we get so many branches of business among the Chinese here carried on by very young men? A large portion of these young men came here poor, went to work as house-servants, gardeners, or whatever they could find to do, saved their wages, put it out at interest, and when an opportunity occurred for going into business borrowed from their young friends, and they can do it because they trust one another, and then from month to month they pay back principal and interest in installments.

There are innumerable little savings and loan societies among them, companies from five to twenty members; also many servants in families and boys in our schools are silent partners in some of the large stores. Many who were waited upon at home by servants are servants in families here; they are ready to do anything that may procure an honest profit. Thus, while great numbers of our own youth, with better opportunities for saving and for accumulating, are waiting for large profits, or to get rich easily and suddenly, these industrious and careful boys from China are laying foundations for solid fortunes, and they will be solid men by and by. I can point you out a great many such boys who are growing up in business.

Is there any reason to think or to fear that the ill treatment of the Chinese here may interrupt our friendly relations with China? We

can say only this, that there is a deep feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of the Chinese on account of the abuse which many of their countrymen have suffered. The queue ordinance is regarded as a studied affront and injury, and as a national insult. Very many of the Chinese trading here are men of influence at home, having wealthy and influential business and family relations in China, and some of the young men who are now here will be advanced to places of influence in future years in their own country, as has already occurred in several cases; and, moreover, all the one hundred and twenty youth at present in our eastern colleges and others who may join them or succeed them are preparing for government offices, and all of them pass through San Francisco going and returning. They see and they hear how their countrymen are treated. They go about among them and hear these things, and they read our daily papers now. They may be made friends or foes even by such things as they see, and they are all to be mandarins, every one of them. Furthermore, we find this little sentence in a letter from a man who has been reported as appointed a minister to represent his government at Washington. We mean the honorable Yung Wing, L. L. D., made L. L. D. by the New Haven College at their last commencement. He was a graduate some years ago. He says, after speaking of other matters:

But rights have been violated, and we shall demand justice for it.

That is what Yung Wing says, and he is reputed to have been ap pointed a minister from China to this country.

Senator SARGENT. Will you read the whole letter, the part that refers to that more fully?

The WITNESS. I have but a part of the letter here. I will read the extract.

The excitement against the Chinese seems to have died an ephemeral death after the presidential nominations were made. The whole thing was got up for a political purpose, and when that is served all is over. But rights have been violated, and we shall demand justice for it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Has he written that since he became minister?—A. I understood he was minister before that. This is dated September 4th.

Senator SARGENT. I think it might be well for the Senate to know what his feelings are when he comes to this country.

The WITNESS. He is at the East now. You will hear from him. They will hear from him in Washington on this very subject. He has been gathering up facts all this summer. He is posted probably as well as any gentleman here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Has he been gathering them here?—A. He has been gathering them through his friends and by the papers. He intends to bring the matter before the President.

Mr. PIXLEY. We will cut off his queue.

The WITNESS He is an American citizen.

Mr. PIXLEY. Then he will not want a queue.

The WITNESS. He is an American citizen, and has his wife living in New Haven.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know what rights he refers to?—A. I do not. He does not make any specification.

Have you any evidence that parties opposed to Chinese immigration intend to resort to violent measures to accomplish their ends if legislation fails?

Senator SARGENT. Who asks these questions?

Mr. BEE. It is a series of questions that we prepared and requested the witness to answer, to save time, as we thought.

The WITNESS. We hear of their frequent threats as reported in the papers, of acts of violence already committed, as the destruction of the entire Chinese quarter at Antioch, at Truckee, and deeds of violence committed in many cases in this and other cities, as well as in their threatening letters, a specimen of which I am willing to submit to the committee.

Mr. BEE. Read it.

The WITNESS. I do not care to read the whole of it:

In p'ain words, you had better leave this State, or apologize to the people whom you have so grossly insulted, &c.

That was in reference to some testimony I gave before the senatorial committee.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is it an anonymous communication?—A. It is anonymous.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How do you know that it is authentic?—A. I do not know that it is authentic.

Q. You do not know whether this came from a person opposed to the Chinese or some one who thought it was a good way to get up an argument in their favor. You do not know who it came from?—A. I do not know who it came from. I simply submit it as the kind of communication the friends of the Chinese are accustomed to receive.

[See appendix M.]

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Have you received any other except that?—A. I have received only that. I have heard of those that have been received by others.

What have you to say of the intellectual capacities of the Chinese generally? The history of China; the permanency of the government; the fact of its continued existence through all the ages since the dispersion from Babylon, and to-day a stronger nation than ever before, answers that question; the career of such men as Yung Wing, once a poor boy in the streets of Macao, now honored with his double L. D. from New Haven College, where he graduated with honors; the rapid progress and high standing of the Chinese students in our eastern institutions; the essay of one of the Lai Sun family, which took the prize in such an institution as Philips Academy, (and those students are taken from all classes of society, but largely from the Canton province;) the progress made by the scholars in all our mission-schools—their enterprise, skill, and success in all branches of business which they undertake—all these facts are sufficient answer to the question, have the Chinese intellectual capacity?

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. By the essay which you have read I infer that you think the presence of Chinese is a benefit, on the whole, rather than an injury. Do you think, on the whole, they are a benefit?—A. I think they have been a benefit to the country.

Q. Do you think it would be a benefit to have double the number here that there are now?—A. If they were needed as they have been needed, if the advance of the country in improvements should require their use, I should think they would be of service; and I have en-

deavored to state my opinion, on that point. If they are needed, they will be called for by our manufacturers and men engaged on public works. When they cease to need them, I think the Chinese will cease to come.

Q. Is not the condition of the Chinaman here employed about gardens and in all the industries you speak of easier and his wages greater than he can earn in China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is not the difference sufficiently better in his favor here to induce him to come on his own accord without being sent for by contractors?—A. There are many coming just in that way now.

Q. Then that is an inducement aside from his being sent for?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think it would be to the interest of the country if, instead of having 110,000, as you estimate, we should have 220,000 coming on those terms?—A. So fast as we can utilize them, I think they are a good thing.

Q. They are not coming for us to utilize them, but coming to make themselves more comfortable; to take possession of the country.—A. Those who come to make themselves more comfortable also help to benefit our country. They pay taxes. If they put land under cultivation, that land will pay taxes. Their products will pass through the same processes as our own products. When people come from Ireland, or Germany, or any other place, and make money for themselves, our Government gets its proportion and every branch of commerce feels it. They put money in circulation; they create money; they create wealth, thus benefiting us. If they did nothing more than to benefit themselves and to benefit China, they would benefit us, because they become more elevated, they become capable of trading with us. Let China become elevated, let it have more money, let the tastes of the people be advanced, and they will demand our products.

Q. You are speaking of the benefit to China; I am speaking of the benefit to our own people.—A. Whatever benefits China benefits us.

Q. Do you think if we should double the population of Chinese here it would be a benefit to the State?—A. I think so.

Q. Suppose you quadruple the number of Chinese, would that be a benefit to the State?—A. I think so.

Q. Suppose we could have all Chinese here, enough to cultivate all the lands, to make this a province of Asia, do you think that would be a benefit to the State?—A. We can suppose a great many things. I do not apprehend anything like that. If they should come in such crowds as you suppose, it might be time to make some demonstration on the subject. I do not think they are beginning to come in that way.

Q. Why should we make such a demonstration if they are such a benefit to China, a benefit to themselves, and a benefit to the State?—A. The fact is they are not coming so much now as they came in 1852.

Q. My question is not whether this is going to happen this year or next year, but I ask you if they were going to come in such great number as I have suggested, do you still think it would be a benefit to the State?—A. I think there are many millions of acres that they might be employed in cultivating that no one else would cultivate; and it would be a benefit to the State, to the world, if they should take them up and make them productive; and I think Chinese labor is just the thing that will do it. I think if you would put Chinese out on those plains between Ogden and Omaha, they would make them gardens; they would irrigate them, they would bring the water down from the mountains; they would make a garden over of that plain.

Q. Do you think that we can have too many Chinamen here? That is the point I want to get at.—A. I think too much of a good thing is too much.

Q. You think, then, there might be too many Chinamen here?—A. There might be; but I do not think there will be.

Q. You think that there might be such a thing as too many Chinamen, after all? Is not the difference between yourself and those who think otherwise as to the number of Chinamen which makes too many? If you admit that there is such a thing as too many, is not the question really whether 110,000 are too many, or whether 220,000 are too many? Is there any difference in principle; is it not only in degree?—A. My feeling has always been in sympathy with those who say America for Americans. I was a native American in principle, and I believe that America should belong to Americans. I do not believe in giving up the country to any class of foreigners; I think we ought to look out for our liberties in every respect, and I feel that way.

Q. You say that they are beginning to buy ranches here, paying $25 an acre; that is, good land. If they go into that extensively and buy up good land worth from twenty to fifty dollars an acre and make their settlement upon it, does not that necessarily exclude, so far as they do that, our own small farmers and white persons who would utilize that land?—A. The Chinamen who do that are men who will make good citizens. The young man who has charge of that ranch above Rio Vista is one of the scholars in our schools. He comes there now to school as often as he can get away from his business. He is the managing man there. Another one who is a stockholder and put in his $500 is a boy who was in Bowen Brothers'. He is a member of our school, and is over in China now. Those boys are studying with us the Constitution and laws of the United States, and they can talk with us about America and about our election matters as well as some other people.

Q. Then, supposing that the managing men of that concern are as intelligent as you say, do you think, taken as a whole, it is better that other large portionsof the State should be settled up by the kind of Chinamen there are there, even including that better class, or that it should be settled up by men like those farmers who go into Minnesota, and have churches and schools, and have families, and do not have polygamy? Which do you think is better for the State?—A. I think these men will become just as good citizens as any other citizens.

Q. You think it just as well to have a community of Chinese there as to have a community like a village in Iowa?—A. I do not know but that it would be just as well. Many questions have been asked here as to the Chinese being capable of becoming citizens. I think they are capable of becoming citizens. When a Chinaman becomes christianized, when he understands the nature of our laws, our constitution, I think he has capacities equal to any people I ever knew; and I think, when he becomes a Christian, he is as conscientious, and would be as decent a citizen as people of another nation. I like my own people; I like Americans. My parents were New England people. I rejoice in the blood, and I have always had a little feeling against the colored people. I would not feel like taking a colored man right alongside of me, but still he is a man. I would go as a missionary among the negroes. I have been a missionary among the Indians. Some of them are nice fellows, and there are some negroes who are nice fellows, but I do not think the negroes are capable of becoming grand men like the Chinese. There is not a grander man on the face of this earth than this same Yung Wing. He is a noble fellow. I want you to get acquainted with him. He has

a grand head—a Daniel Webster head. He is an American citizen now. He has married a lady of high standing in New England.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Was he born in the United States?—A. No, sir. He was born in Macao. He was a poor boy when S. R. Brown took him into his school of eight boys.

Q. How did he become an American citizen?—A. I think he became an American citizen in China. At any rate, he put himself under the protection of our Government. I do not know the process.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. There is no power to naturalize in China.—A. I do not know what the process was, but he put himself under the protection of our Government.

Q. Although there may be here and there, and unquestionably are, very intelligent and able Chinamen, very virtuous ones—I do not deny it—I was drawing your attention to the great difference between a village of Chinese, such as those who inhabit that ranch, living in their hovels, with their peculiar manners, their polygamy, and their second wives, and a village of Presbyterians and Methodists, with their churches and schools and their well-dressed children and their American morality—Bible morality. I ask you which of these two is the more desirable to be dotted all over this State?—A. You are putting things together that I would not put together. If they become American citizens, if they become christianized, in the first place, they would not be allowed to have their polygamy and their second wives. If they become American citizens, our laws will prevent that practice. We are not proposing to turn any part of California into a Salt Lake.

Q. If, before you brought these Chinamen into the State to acquire this property and make these efforts, you christianized them and gave them American morality, &c., that would make a difference; but these men go on and buy up this valuable land. It is valuable land, because they pay high prices, and from the location it is evidently valuable. The question is, would you then have a struggle with their habits after they get possession of the land and fail?—A. I do not know about that. I have never felt myself competent to solve all these questions.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. If the proposition be true, as laid down by many, that it is impossible to civilize and christianize the Chinese as a man, and if it is impossible for them to assimilate with us and become citizens of the character that you describe good Christian converts would become, how could you christianize them then, assuming that you can christianize them?—A. I do not allow anybody to suppose that I would assume any such thing. The effect of the missions in China is equal to those anywhere.

Q. I put a hypothetical case. If they should come and bring their own peculiar customs and morality here, would you consider them desirable immigrants to this coast?—A. I would not allow myself to be put in such a position as assuming that.

Q. You have been a missionary and engaged in mission-work for many years, and you regard the opportunity to christianize the Chinese as the highest essential?—A. I think it is the grandest thing a man can be engaged in.

Q. The controlling principle, then, that governs you in your opinion is to afford that opportunity to christianize them?—A. That is a very strong feeling; but I am an American citizen. I glory in my country.

I stood an hour and a half the other day in the ranks to put in my vote to help save my country.

Q. On the democratic side?—A. On the right side, I hope.

Q. I ask you which it was?—A. I vote the straight republican ticket every time, always, for I was born that way.

Q. Then your whole argument in favor of the unrestricted immigration of Chinese, if I understand you, is predicated upon the belief that they can be christianized and their civilization changed?—A. I think they can.

Q. I ask you if your opinions are predicated on that belief?—A. Not that only. O, no, sir. I hope I take a broader view. I hope that I have some political economy in my mind and some notions of government and statesmanship.

Q. Do you regard the Chinese as having the same inherent, natural, God-gifted right to come to California as everybody has?—A. I think so.

Q. And that there ought not to be any inhibition because of their peculiar character or their civilization?—A. When our statesmen have been considering these matters, I have not given my opinions one way or the other. If it seemed best to restrict their coming in any way that can be done without violating our treaty stipulations and without violence to our constitution, let it be done. I do not quarrel for that. I came here not to enter into any political discussions, for I never have engaged in them. My whole interest has been in trying to serve the church and the missionary society that sent me here, and to do good to these people. I have not taken any part in political discussions whatever.

Q. I understand you are in favor really of the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese to this coast?—A. I have not given an opinion upon that subject at all.

Q. Are you in favor of an unrestrained immigration of the Chinese to this coast?—A. If the Government sees best to restrict their coming I am satisfied.

Q. But the Government is now endeavoring to educate itself from the opinions of intelligent persons as to whether they should limit, by legal and constitutional restrictions, of course, the immigration of these people, representing as they do 400,000,000 on the other side, and we having 40,000,000. Are you in favor of the unrestricted immigration of Chinese to this coast?—A. I want to answer that by saying that I have such confidence in the judgment of the committee and our legislators that I am willing to submit the whole case to them, after hearing such evidence as they can elicit. I have simply given my views about the Chinamen here as to their capacities and as to the benefit that our country is receiving and may receive from them. I am willing that the committee should take these and all other facts that they can gather as a basis to make up their minds and report to our national Congress.

Q. You have given your opinion, as I understand, in reference to business affairs and the general interests of the temporal affairs of the State and nation, politically and otherwise?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you consider yourself as good a judge of that matter as men engaged in different avocations from your own?—A. I would yield to Mr. Pixley and to all the members of the committee.

Q. Do you not think in your own mind that your desire to Christianize and to elevate the Chinese, the good you think you can do them, is biasing your mind a good deal in reference to the propriety of their being

permitted to come in unrestricted numbers to the State?—A. No, sir; I do not. I studied politics when I was a boy; I was then among politicians; and I have always studied the laws, the regulations, and the politics of the country. I have been accustomed to look on things outside of my profession. I have not confined myself in my reading to my profession. I have not confined my associations to my profession. When I vote I try to vote intelligently.

Q. The population of what we call the Pacific States is about 1,200,000 people, including Nevada, Washington Territory, Oregon, &c. Do you think it would be desirable to admit 1,200,000 Chinamen here? Setting aside the benefit that it might have upon the Chinese immigration and the reflected benefit upon China, would it be desirable for this State and this commonwealth of States, the United States, to introduce to this coast as many Chinese as we have here, that is 1,200,000 Chinese?—A. If they can be profitably employed. I would not have them introduced to become voters at once.

Q. I did not ask you that question.—A. You will allow me to explain, I hope.

Q. I ask you if you think it desirable to introduce 1,200,000 Chinese here. Of course you will take the whole range of pros and cons.—A. If they could be profitably employed and would help to develop our country and enrich our people, enriching the whole United States, making China itself a better customer of this country, I think it would be advisable, with these provisions.

Q. Then, provided such a thing should happen, what in your opinion would be the effect of the conflict of the two civilizations?—A. I do not think that there would be a conflict.

Q. Do you think theirs would give way? One must prevail, must it not?—A. I think our own people would prevail. I think Americans would prevail one to a dozen. I have faith in such men as Mr. Pixley and our statesmen and prominent Congressmen.

Q. Then you think that really we are so superior that if we could stand in the relation of one to twelve we would still be the dominant and controlling race?—A. I think so.

Q. Does not that statement admit the inferiority in many respects of the Chinese?—A. I think not. I think as they came here and as they became enlightened they would see the beauty of our institutions.

Q. You would regard it as no risk to our institutions to introduce them with their established opinions?—A. We hold the ballot; we are the officers.

Q. You would restrict them from the ballot? You would not allow them to become citizens?—A. Certainly. I would restrict them in that respect.

Q. Is it desirable to introduce into a free republic a class of people to that extent who are not citizens and who cannot become citizens of the commonwealth?—A. I think we have gone too fast in admitting so many foreigners without proper qualifications. That is my feeling.

Q. That would hardly justify you in admitting another class?—A. I do not know; if we could admit something that would counterbalance that.

Q. But you do not propose to let them vote?—A. I would not let them vote, and I am sorry so many other foreigners have been allowed to vote before proper qualification.

Q. If I understand you, you are contrasting the Chinese with we will say the Germans and Irish?—A. With any foreigners.

Q. And to the prejudice of the Germans and Irish?—A. I am contrasting them with ignorant people.

Q. You think, then, that ignorant Chinese are superior to ignorant Irish?—A. O, no; you did not gather anything from what I have said like that. At first, they do not understand our language. Some of these foreigners who come learn our language probably faster than the Chinese. Some of them speak our language at once. The Chinese are therefore under that disadvantage. They would require to be under longer tutelage.

Q. If they should come in the numbers that I have suggested would they be apt to learn our language?—A. Possibly they might not.

Q. Then as an ethnological question, I believe that is the correct word, as a race question, do you think they can assimilate with our people by intermarriage?—A. I think they can.

Q. And that it would produce a race that will be equal to the American?—A. Stock-breeders think stock is improved by mixing.

Q. Do you think the breed is improved by mixing the American Indian with the American?—A. A good deal is owing to education. I believe there is a good deal in the people.

Q. Do you think the white race is improved by mixing with the Indian?—A. I think the Chinese are immensely above the Indian. They are intelligent; they are men of strong mind.

Q. As to the African and the Aryan or our race, is either improved by mixing?—A. I think the comparson is not good. I think the Chinese are very far above the African.

Q. Do you not think they are as distinct a type from the European race as the African, or American Indian?—A. I think there is not so much difference.

Q. Then you think they might assimilate and produce a superior race?—A. I should like very much if you could see some of their mandarins. Some of their mandarins are grand, noble men.

Q. I do not doubt that, but they have never been mixed with Yankee women, and we do not know what the experiment will be. We are trying that on a small scale now. Mr. Gibson is trying that experiment. If you could separate the question of religion entirely, and if it was hopeless to Christianize the Chinese, then would you not consider the question lost?—A. Putting that question out of view, I think as statesmen and as philanthropists we must take a broader view than has been taken by many of the anti-Chinese faction. I think we have a mission to perform as Americans. We hear a great deal about the mission of our grand republic, as a sample of what the world may become; and placed here so near China, I think we have a grand mission to perform as statesmen.

Q. That mission is in the Christianization of the Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. And in the civilization of the Chinese?—A. It would be civilization leaving out the Christianization. I think we would do a grand thing in raising up these young men and preparing them to go back to civilize their country.

Q. Is there any danger in bringing these two civilizations together that ours would deteriorate?—A. I think not. I think we would bring them into our civilization and all the time be elevating them.

Q. How about ourselves?—A. About ourselves? You remember how the Athenians used to do when they wished to teach their boys to be temperate; they would bring in a drunken man to show how ludicrous he would perform; therefore, I think if we saw examples of degradation it would elevate us and make us more men than we have been. I think any contrast of that kind would help us.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you think exhibiting a prostitute to our daughters would improve the morals of our daughters?—A. I think so, decidedly.

Q. The best Sunday-school for children, then, would be to take them into a drinking-saloon and let them see vice close by? If their fathers do their duty they would keep them away from contact with vice either by sight or sound?—A. I think you will agree with me that a pure woman is more disgusted with obscenity by the example, and she strives the harder to keep clear of it.

Q. But is her mind improved by hearing it, although her purity rejects it? You are speaking about bringing vice and virtue into contact for the benefit of virtue?—A. I do not propose to come down to that; I do not propose to mingle with it. I do not myself go into those lanes, and I endeavor to draw the people away. All those exhibitions are disgusting to me and I think disgusting to every pure man, and every exhibition of it will make him better if he has proper impulses and a proper education, and has training parents to look after him.

Q. You think the pure waters of national morality would be improved by letting muddy streams into them?—A. I do not think we would allow them to mingle; I have so much faith in my blood, in Anglo-Saxon blood.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. But you have no faith in Irish blood, in German blood, or in the foreign element, and that is a very large proportion of our American citizens, as we stand to-day?—A. I say I do not believe in giving the ballot to men who are not prepared for it by education and acquaintance with our institutions.

Q. If I understand Mr. Gibson and this gentleman, they both have contrasted Chinese immigration most favorably with foreign immigration, and make the Chinese to be the superior class of people?—A. You did not hear that from me; you certainly did not hear it from me.

Mr. PIXLEY. Well, Mr. Gibson, then.

Mr. GIBSON. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. PIXLEY. (To Mr. Gibson.) You are a little touchy for a priest.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You think giving the foreigners the ballot would not be safe?—A. I do not think it is safe.

Q. Suppose the negroes all voted the republican ticket, it would be safe then?—A. If they must vote, I would have them vote right.

Q. You would think it safe so long as they voted the republican ticket?—A. I would prefer in regard to the negro to have had a certain time allowed, and certain educational qualifications required. That was my feeling.

Q. But if they vote the republican ticket that is safe?—A. I say this, and I repeat it, that if they are to vote at all I want them to vote right. I believe the republican ticket is right.

Q. You spoke about these Irish or people coming here who have sworn allegiance to some foreign potentate. To whom have you reference?—A. I have reference to the Roman Catholics.

Q. Do you think that Chinese immigration is less dangerous to our institutions than Roman Catholics?—A. I think so; decidedly less. I do not think there is any danger at all in regard to the Chinese. They do not purpose to intermeddle with our religious rights; they have no hierarchy; they are not sworn to support any religious system; they

are mixed up at home; they have no one religion; they may be Mohammedans. There are Mohammedans all through the country; there are Buddhists; there are Tauists; there are men who are simply Confucianists, who worship the spirits of their ancestors and their tombs; and there are Christians.

Q. You think they are less dangerous than European Christians of a certain persuasion?—A. I answer the question you put before. I think that they are less dangerous than Roman Catholics.

Q. Are they less dangerous than Europeans?—A. Whether they be Europeans or any other nationality, if they are Romanists.

Q. Suppose these Chinese would become Catholics, then they would be dangerous?—A. I think so.

Q. I think this is all religious prejudice?—A. I beg your pardon; I think that the feeling is general, and you will find it everywhere among our people. It is not confined to religious bodies or Christian people.

Q. The Roman Catholics are not Christians, then?—A. They are Christians, but they are not Protestant Christians; they are Roman Catholic Christians.

Q. But they are Christians, are they?—A. They are Roman Catholic Christians; they are not Protestants. I make a wide distinction between Protestants and Roman Catholics. You, yourself, have read of the history of the Reformation, and you should understand why there is a distinction.

Q. Have you read the history of the Calvinists?—A. Yes; I have read the history of the Calvinists.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did you hear the testimony of Captain King?—A. I read part of it. I did not hear the whole of it.

Q. Did you, at my request, look over a stenographic report of his testimony?—A. I did.

Q. Will you look at these notes that you prepared, and state in regard to the matters he testified to?—A. I marked on page 10 what he said about coolies and cooly traffic. I would say that they are not coolies; they are free, and they use their wages as they please; they go and come as they please; they choose to make contracts through interpreters, and intelligence offices, or mercantile firms, but they will not comply with the conditions unless they are suited with them, and they leave the employment, one or all of them, if the other party fails to keep his part of the agreement. Some of the Chinese in the factories have told us about the agreements under which they come to this country, and to work on the railroads. Merchants or labor-brokers here send for a certain number of men, pledging a certain rate of wages for a given time, generally two years. After that time is up they make bargains for themselves. In early times nearly all came to work in the mines; they worked for themselves, but had borrowed money, many of them, in the same way that many of our own people come here. Again, on page 7, he says nearly all who come to California, come from two districts close to Canton, Sinong and Sin-Wai. They are largely from the southeastern portion of the Canton province, but from many districts, the principal of which are Kow-Lung, Yen-Ping, Kais-Yeen-Shan, Chin-Chan, Shen-On, Nam-hoi, Piin-Yii, Shen-Tse, King-Un, Tan-Yun, Samshoi, Chung-fah, Koii, Ko-ming, Sz-way, Shen-Ning, Hoi-Ping, Sheng-Ning, Yen-Ping, Heang-San, Tung-Kiin, Kung-Shing, Pok-low, Shen-Wui, Hok-Shan, twenty-five and more townships; while there are a few representatives from many other districts of the province. He testifies

of their speaking two dialects. They speak more than that—some four or five. He says they are of the lowest classes, and that those who go to Australia are like them. But it is known that those who go to Australia are all free; all enterprising. He says that they are caught and forcibly brought; but that is only his assertion, and contrary to the facts. They all come voluntarily; they do not run away when they get here. He talks of contracts, and contractors for coolies. He repeats that over and over again. Any papers which pass between parties are simply agreements. He says they are contracts. We say they are agreements, which all civilized people, ourselves among the rest, are in the habit of giving and receiving every day. The Chinese receive the same agreements for work, and that very thing shows their intelligence. The very fact of their having these agreements proves that they are free to engage and to make bargains. He charges on page 9, and in many other places, that the six companies are cooly-brokers. They are not cooly-brokers; they are simply companies organized for mutual aid. On pages 11 and 12 he expatiates about the high-binders, hired assassins, kept by the six companies to intimidate the coolies. These are simply assertions without proof. He talks of the oppression of the Chinese companies; but how happens it that in all these years since 1849, no other ship-captains, or ship-agents, or citizens have had such experience as he relates?

Q. Have you met any of these high-binders?—A. I have not.

Q. Have you heard of any high-binders?—A. I have heard the papers speak of them. I do not know of any such people. I have heard of such an organization as the Hip-ye-tung, but I do not know what their arrangements are.

Q. In your intercourse with these people have you ever seen anything which led you to believe that there were any such Chinese in the em-employ of the six companies?—A. Not in the employ of the six companies.

Q. Or that they make use of any means to control the Chinese?—A. No; I believe that is a false statement. He says the Chinese are inveigled here, but he does not prove it. If that is the case why do they not break away when they get here? He says their condition is immeasurably better here than in China, but yet they come unwillingly, and try to get away and escape from the six companies.

Q. Did you hear anything of that kind in China?—A. I never heard anything of the kind in China, and never here. It is a fact that in later years a very large proportion of those coming to California are men who have been here before, showing that their former experiences here have not been very horrifying.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If their experiences have not been horrifying, and they have returned here so freely, would not that be evidence that their treatment in this city has not been so bad as represented?—A. I have explained before that they are willing to come in order to better their condition, and the fact that they do come and take the work, such as they do in those tule swamps, that they are willing to submit to hardships in order to make the money.

Q. You yourself testified something in your essay in reference to their being stoned on the streets and other outrages, and you referred to this gentleman with the Napoleonic head going to Washington to state that they were wronged. Is not the fact that so many go back to China and return here evidence that they have not been badly treated?—A.

It is evidence that they are willing to undergo very great hardship. There are Chinamen who will peddle around the streets with baskets. They will go home at night with their heads battered up and blood running down their garments; but they will start the next morning and go over the same track.

Q. So you think it does not tend in any degree to show the humanity of the people of this city toward the Chinese that more than one-half of the number return here again? You think you cannot draw a shade in favor of the general humanity of this city from that circumstance?—A. I think the papers give us the evidence.

Q. And you draw no such inference at all from the fact that these men come back to make homes here?—A. I have stated and state again that these men, in the face of all these abuses, will come back.

Q. You still insist that our people are inhuman and cruel toward them; that these are not exceptional cases to which you refer, and that the tendency is not to exaggerate them, but that our people are malicious, mean, and savage in their treatment of the Chinese?—A. I do not make that sweeping statement.

Q. But you deny that there is the slightest inference in favor of the humanity of our people toward the Chinese from the fact that so many having returned to China have come back here again?—A. I say that they come back to this country, notwithstanding they have been abused. I do not make the sweeping statement that all our people treat them so badly.

Q. Do our people generally treat them in that manner?—A. I do not make that statement. There are a great many of these cases of abuse of Chinese which the authorities do not notice; but they ought to notice them in order that our civilization might be vindicated, and that our own coast might be vindicated in the face of the heathen.

Q. Do you think it is a vindication of our coast to take a case occurring perhaps every day, but which may necessarily be an exception when we consider that there are thirty thousand Chinese in this city, and from those isolated circumstances to reason that our people here are inhuman, and that public sentiment here approves of an atrocity committed upon anybody? Is that a vindication of our coast?—A. The ships come in, two a month. They land the passengers at the wharf, and these people come up through the city. Every time, these men run the gauntlet from the time they land until they get to their places of lodging.

Q. Is it not often the case that ship-loads of Chinese land, and that large numbers come off of ferries and other public conveyances who are not molested by anybody whatever?—A. I do not say that it is always the case, but I have seen many instances when they would come to their lodgings bleeding, and covered from head to foot with mortar; and I have seen boys on the street lassoing them, while officers would be passing them on the street, without intermeddling.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. How often have you seen this?—A. Hundreds of times.

Q. How long have you lived in this city?—A. Since 1859.

Q. And you have seen this occur hundreds of times?—A. I have. I am safe in saying hundreds of times.

Q. I have lived here since 1849 and never saw it once. Do you pretend to say hundreds of times? Might it have been more than two hundred? Recollect you are on your oath, doctor.—A. Call it a hundred times, if you please.

Q. Do you keep a memorandum of the occurrences?—A. I do not;

but my means of observation are different from yours, perhaps. I have been, in early days, in the habit of visiting these people in their lodging-places. When they come off the ship they go to these caravansaries; they go to rooms prepared for them by the company, vacant rooms. I have passed around among them from one room to another, and have seen dozens of them in one place, and dozens of them in another place. I should like to say, further, that from the fact that this is not interrupted, it is a reflection against our civilization here.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are there not often cases of punishment for injuries inflicted?—A. Very seldom.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Did you ever make any complaint?—A. No, sir; I never did.

Q. Have you been a good citizen, then, to see these people outraged, without interfering?—A. No; I have been faulty in that respect; I acknowledge that.

Q. I never saw but two outrages in this town, and I licked both fellows. On one occasion I knocked the white man down, and the other time I sent for the police and had the offender arrested.—A. I never knocked a man down, but I have interfered in a quiet way.

Q. You ought to belong to the church militant.—A. The church militant is the church fighters. I have not trained in that company. On the 13th, 14th, and 15th pages Captain King talks of oppression by the Chinese six companies; how happens it that in all these years since 1849 no other ship-captains or shipping-agents or citizens have had such experiences as he relates? He says the Chinese are inveigled here. How does he prove it? Why do they not break away when they get here?

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In your intercourse with these people, do you see any evidence of those things that he charges?—A. I do not.

Q. You meet with no evidence that there is any feeling of oppression on the part of the people or fear of the companies?—A. There is no such thing, but they resort to them as their friends to help them, as I have explained, in matters of difficulty, to arbitrate for them, &c. In these 21st and 23d pages he repeats the charge that the Chinese, both men and women, are encouraged to contract gambling debts both in China and on the way here, for which they sell themselves into bondage to the cooly-brokers.

Q. Is it possible under the laws of China for a man to sell himself for a gambling debt?—A. I never heard of any such thing; I do not think it is possible.

Q. Would a gambling debt be legal there or binding upon the debtor?—A. I think not.

Q. Is gambling allowed by the laws of China?—A. No, I never heard of it being allowed; I do not think it is.

Q. Could a person get himself under any bondage by contracting a gambling debt?—A. He could not.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not know that while gambling is prohibited by law, a gambling debt is called a debt of honor, and that a gambler will pay those debts rather than pay his grocery-bill?—A. I have heard such things, and if you wish to make a point of that you would prove that the Chinese are as honorable as we are. I am willing to let that go.

Q. As honorable as we are in gambling. We are trying to get at facts, and you are reasoning from facts that gambling is not legalized and therefore that this charge cannot be true?—A. Captain King speaks of the cooly acts of the United States, which of itself proves that there can be no cooly traffic with this country. We have a consul at Canton and one at Hong-Kong, and I think they are men who try to do their duty, as the chairman this morning substantiated.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know those officers in China?—A. Not personally. I have met Mr. Bailey.

Q. What is their reputation?—A. Their reputation is good. I have known personally some who have been there. The consul in Canton I do not remember now. Captain King speaks of the American as a "small fightee man;" that is, that he fights with the Chinese less and oppresses them less.

Q. What do those words indicate; their feeling toward the American people?—A. They indicate a kindly feeling; that they are not the people who have made trouble with them; and, therefore, from that very fact our country stands in a better position than any other country.

Q. Is that feeling valuable in a commercial point of view?—A. Very valuable. For example, while the war was going on, the war of 1841 and 1842, our people went forward in their trade and took away a great deal of the trade that was then in the hands of the English. The English themselves made out a caricature, representing John Bull holding a cow by the horns while Brother Jonathan was milking; and that shows the position which, as Americans, we have obtained by our good conduct and brotherly relations with them. If we should continue to maintain these relations by our treatment of them here and there we might hold the trade and hold the position that we have acquired. On pages 35 and 36, he says the Chinese know nothing about the immigration to America, never had heard of it; he means, probably, that the Chinese away from Canton know nothing of the emigration of the Cantonese; but how strange. The Chinese have newspapers, their merchants travel extensively, and scholars from all parts of the province assemble at the provincial cities to attend the literary examinations.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. This is an argument on another man's testimony. You are reasoning that his conclusions must be wrong. The committee may do all that reasoning?—A. I have said a great many things here that I would not be called on to state in a court, and I have heard all the rest of the witnesses put through the same sort of process. I say that scholars from all parts of the empire assemble at the appointed place to hear what is going on, and they go home and tell the news that they receive.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is the habit of this people in regard to their cleanliness of person? How is it as to skin diseases?—A. That is not generally as represented. People who wash themselves and change their clothes are known to be free from those diseases.

Q. How do they compare with other immigrants in the same class of life as to vermin and skin diseases?—A. Where they are huddled together on board ship very likely they accumulate vermin, but I do not think they are more so than a good many other people of other countries in the same class of life.

Q. Are they brought here by any brokers in the employ of the companies?—A. I think not.

Q. Did you hear of any such persons in China?—A. I never heard of any such persons there or here.

Q. Do they leave China because of the scarcity of agricultural labor at particular periods, or is there some other motive?—A. The agricultural interest is going on in China all the time. They gather one crop and put in another; sometimes three crops in a year. In the south of China they will have three crops a year, and it is their custom to put in one crop in drills between the other crop as it is growing up, so that the crop shall come in one season as well as another. I think again, too, that they come here because the demand for them is greater in some seasons than in others.

Q. There is no less demand for their labor in winter in China than at any other time?—A. No less.

Q. But their movements are influenced by the demand for labor in this country?—A. By the demand in this country.

Q. Is there any truth in the charge that they smuggle goods for their coolie brokers and contractors?—A. I think not.

Q. Have you ever heard of any instance of that kind here amongst them?—A. Never.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You have heard of their smuggling opium?—A. They smuggle opium.

Q. And cigars?—A. I do not think they smuggle cigars. I have never heard of that. I have known of clothing being taken away from them when a man has more clothing than the inspectors think he can afford to wear; and the inspectors take away from them handkerchiefs, if they find new ones, I think; and they take away all the opium they find; every particle of it. They would do it on their own account. There are a great many men who come in with little adventures, and if they could smuggle it in they would do it, I presume.

Q. Have you not known of seizures of opium from one thousand to five thousand dollars' worth from these immigrants?—A. I have heard statements of large amounts being taken, but those would probably be dealers. They would very likely be smuggling on their own account. I do not think that they come in with any arrangement with the brokers. Every man is his own master, I think.

Q. Would one of these persons, coming over here to better his condition, to labor to reclaim tule-lands, be likely to have one thousand dollars' worth of opium on his person?—A. A great many come as adventurers. Many come as little merchants, expecting to set up in business and make money.

Q. What leads you to testify that they do not smuggle for persons who employ them to do it in many instances?—A. The statement is that they smuggle goods by the brokers. I do not admit that there are brokers; I deny that assertion.

Q. You think there are no Chinese brokers?—A. I think there are no Chinese brokers in the sense Mr. King uses the word; coolie brokers.

Q. I do not mean brokers of coolies, but brokers of merchandise. What leads you to make the statement that there are no brokers of merchandise who get these immigrants to conceal about their persons or baggage these large amounts of opium?—A. That was not the statement of Captain King, but he said that the labor brokers—the coolie brokers—got them to smuggle opium.

Q. Put it in the form that I indicate. In other words, why do you say that these men who cross in this way have these large amounts of property, but that it does not belong to other people?—A. I do not, but

that the men bringing in these ventures would divide up, give some to this man and some to another man, and seek that mode of introducing the goods.

Q. Are you prepared to deny that there may not be men here in San Francisco who send back and buy these articles, and have them divided up and brought by these parties?—A. I am not prepared to deny any such thing, but I am prepared to deny that Chinese coolies would employ other coolies to import goods for them.

Q. Why do you deny that?—A. Because I deny that there are such brokers.

Q. Do you deny that any Chinese come here under labor contracts?—A. They come under labor contracts, as I have explained.

Q. For a term of years?—A. For a term of years; but I do not suppose that any of those men engage these laborers to bring in goods for them.

Q. Why not?—A. I do not undertake to explain everything. I do not suppose that these intelligence-office men and these agents go any further in their business than to engage them as laborers to come. I do not suppose they employ them to smuggle goods for them.

Q. But you do not know but that that may be so?—A. I do not know but that it may be so.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You do not know but what they may have stolen them?—A. They may have stolen them. I do not think they would steal them, however.

Q. The question is whether you are in such a position as to be likely to be informed on this subject as well as Mr. King.—A. I think I would have as good an opportunity of knowing it as Mr. King.

Q. Do you think it would prevail, as a customary or general thing, unless you had heard of it?—A. I do not think it would.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Captain King was the commander of a vessel engaged in bringing over coolies, was he not?—A. I never met the man, and never heard of him until I saw him on the stand here.

Q. If Captain King was, as the record shows, the captain of a regular coolie ship bringing them over and engaged for years in the business, would he not have a better opportunity from observation of those coolies that he brought over than a person not engaged in the business, as to what the coolies did? Would he not have a better opportunity for observation than you would have?—A. If that was his business, yes.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are the wages earned by these people dissipated here in vice; and if so, what becomes of it?—A. If it is dissipated in vice it is used up on the coast. Whatever is used in that way finds circulation again among our people.

Q. What is the fact, so far as your observation goes, in regard to the Chinese dissipating their money?—A. There are some, as I have stated in my testimony, who have become recreant to their principles and education, some have grown lazy, some gamble, and some visit houses of prostitution.

Q. How do they compare, in respect to dissipating their wages, with other immigrant laboring population?—A. I think they compare very favorably. As I have explained in my testimony, the young men, I think, save their money, loan it to the merchants, and loan it to one another, and they by and by get into business and grow up into a little business.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 10, 1876.

Rev. AUGUSTUS W. LOOMIS'S examination continued.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You will state to the commission, in your knowledge, what has been the character of the legislation of the State of California and the municipality of San Francisco known as class legislation in reference to Chinese. Have you a copy of those ordinances?—Answer. I remembered that there were a good many laws that were of the description of class legislation, and I had a lawyer of this city to make a copy of them.

Q. Have you that copy?—A. I have.

Q. Read those laws to the commission.—A. I see that he has not given them in the order of their dates. The first that he has given is what is known as the cubic-air law.

AN ACT concerning lodging-houses, &c.

SEC. 1. Every person who owns, leases, lets, or hires to any person or persons any rooms or apartments, in any building, house, or other structure within the circuit of any incorporated city or county within the State of California for the purpose of a lodging or sleeping apartment, which room or apartment contains less than five hundred cubic feet of space in the clear, for each person so occupying such room or apartment, shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not less than fifty dollars or more than five hundred dollars or by imprisonment in the county jail, or by both such fine or imprisonment.

SEC. 2. Any person or persons found sleeping or lodging or who lives or uses for the purpose of sleeping in or lodging in any room or apartment, which contains less than five hundred cubic feet of space in the clear for each person so occupying such room or apartment, shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor, and shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not less than ten or more than fifty dollars, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the chief of police (or such other person to whom the police powers of a city are delegated) to detail a competent and qualified officer or officers of the regular force to examine into any violation of any of the provisions of this act, and to arrest any person guilty of such violation.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall not be construed to apply to hospitals, jails, prisons, insane asylums, or other public institutions.

SEC. 5. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Approved April 3, 1876.

I will remark that the officers have not visited any houses except Chinese, and none but Chinese have been arrested.

Q. Has it been enforced upon any other class of people other than Chinese?—A. No, none except Chinese, and so acknowledged by the officers.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Is it of your own knowledge that you make the statement that it has not been enforced upon any other class?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Of your own knowledge?—A. Of my own knowledge and the testimony of the officers of the police, and I think the testimony that you have here also establishes it. The next law is as follows:

FOREIGN MINERS' TAX.

No person, unless he is a citizen of the United States, or shall have declared his intention to become such, (California Indians excepted,) shall be allowed to take or extract gold, silver, or other metals from the mines of this State or hold a mining claim therein, unless he shall have a license therefor of $4 per month.

This is the act of May 17th, 1861, and I would remark that this tax varies from $4 and $6 to $20 per month.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. That has been declared unconstitutional?—A. It has been declared unconstitutional.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. It was enforced for a series of years?—A. It was enforced. The Chinese paid that tax until within four or five years.

Q. Was it enforced against any other class except Chinese?—A. Never, I think.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. How do you know that?—A. By common report.

Q. Do you know, of your own knowledge, that it was not enforced against other foreigners than Chinese?—A. I have not traveled over the whole State.

Q. I ask you the question, do you or do you not know that it was enforced against others?—A. I know it was considered a tax distinctly provided against the Chinese and enforced against them. I never heard of its being enforced against any other class.

Q. Now I know of my certain knowledge that it has been enforced against others.—A. Very well. An act was passed by the last legislature to regulate fishing in California waters, of general application, prohibiting the use of nets with meshes less than certain specified dimensions, but it was designed to restrict the Chinese fishermen especially, and they only have been arrested for the violation of such a law. An act of the legislature, approved April 23d, 1855, provides that every Chinese immigrant shall pay a tax of $55. It was, however, declared invalid in the case of The People *vs.* Downer, 7 California Reports, 169. A subsequent act, approved April 26, 1858, prohibited all persons of the Chinese or Mongolian races from entering the State or landing at any port thereof, except they should by storm or distress or unavoidable accident be driven ashore upon the coast, in which case they should be immediately reshipped and returned to the place from whence they came. Afterward an act was passed, approved April 26, 1862, providing that every Mongolian over 18 years of age should pay a monthly capitation tax of $2.50, except those engaged in the production and manufacture of sugar, rice, coffee, and tea. This act was also pronounced invalid by the supreme court, in the case of Lin-Sing *vs.* Washburn, 20 California Reports, 534. March 31, 1866, an act was approved declaring all Chinese houses of ill-fame nuisances, all leases for such purpose invalid, and any landlord accepting rent from them to be mulcted in damages in three times the amount of the rent received, one-half of which went to the informer; and unless the nuisance should be abated by the landlord within thirty days after notice, he should on conviction be punished by a fine of not less than $25, nor exceeding $500, or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

By act of legislature, approved March 18, 1863, it was provided that Chinese and Mongolians should not be witnesses in an action or proceeding wherein a white person was party. It was afterward repealed.

By act of legislature, approved April 3, 1876, the board of supervisors of San Francisco were empowered to appropriate a sum "not to exceed $5,000, to be used in defraying the expenses of a delegation of citizens to proceed to Washington, to solicit such action on the part of the Federal Government as should modify the Burlingame treaty, so as to prevent the immigration of certain classes of Chinese under its provisions, whose arrival in our midst is detrimental to the moral and material interests of our own people."

Here are the city ordinances:

Ordinance No. 1264, approved March 15, 1876, provided that all laundries should pay licenses, as follows: using a one-horse vehicle, $2 per quarter; two horses, $4 per quarter; no vehicle, $15; that was afterward held to be invalid.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Was it a city ordinance?—A. A city ordinance.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Fifteen dollars was the tax?—A. Yes, the footman had to pay $15; with one horse, $2; with two horses, $4.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose any white man was a footman. Of course its practical operation may have been against the Chinamen.—A. It provided that all laundries should pay license as follows: using a one-horse vehicle, $2 per quarter; two horses, $4 per quarter; no vehicle, $15.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. When was that ordinance passed?—A. March 15, 1876.

Senator SARGENT. That was one of the methods this city and State have tried to rid themselves of this great plague before appealing to Congress. It may appear ridiculous, cutting off queues, &c., but they resort to those things before resorting to violence.

The WITNESS. The same thing was done one or two years ago and declared invalid.

City ordinance No. 1294, approved June 14, 1876, provides that every male prisoner imprisoned in the county jail of San Francisco, under a judgment from the police-court, should have the hair cut or clipped to a uniform length of one inch, and acknowledged by the officers to be designed to apply to the Chinese; that is, to be made a means of terror to the Chinese.

The WITNESS. This is the remark of the lawyer:

"There are other ordinances and acts which affect the Chinese more than others, but are general in their application, such as acts for the suppression of gambling, and the act known as the 'cubic-air act,' &c."

The political code of California, sections 2949 to 2968, provided that the commissioners of immigration shall prevent the entry into this State of all persons lunatic, idiotic, deaf, dumb, blind, crippled, or infirm, and not accompanied by any relatives able to support them, or lewd or abandoned women, unless a bond in the sum of $500 be given to the people of the State of California conditioned to indemnify against all costs and expenses incurred resulting from the infirmities referred to, &c., &c. Under this act several Chinese women were detained, and by order of our supreme court ordered to be sent back to China; but on appeal to the United States Supreme Court the act was pronounced unconstitutional and void.

Many bills have been introduced at different legislative sessions. I was requested by the chairman to produce some statistics. I have statistics, but they do not profess to be exhaustive at all. I obtained from the clerk of the revenue department these statements: First. Chinese tobacco-dealers' license for single store, $5, and the number of dealers 200, the total license would be $1,000 under that head; the number of Chinese tobacco-manufactories 70, license per factory, $10, total, $700; the whole amount of stamps sold for cigars manufactured in this district, based on the presumption that nearly all tobacco is made up by Chinese, is $500; number of Chinese dealers in leaf-tobacco 20;

they are licensed per dealer $25, amount $500; number of Chinese who sell liquor, whether large or small quantities, 50; license, $25 per dealer; whole amount from that source, $1,250. The whole amount received in duties at the custom-house for the year ending 1875 was $8,000,000, and the clerk, when appealed to, stated that it would take them a very long time to give the amount paid by the Chinese, but, as near as they could approximate, it would be $2,500,000. I do not give that as absolute. These I have from the assessor.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the aggregate of duties?—A. Eight million, and they consider that $2,500,000 is paid by the Chinese directly in their trade. The property assessed to Chinese in the city and county of San Francisco, as given me by the assessor, Mr. Badlam, is $250,000. All these statistics were obtained about the last of July or the first of August. That is the real estate. Then he makes this statement: "Much property is owned by them, but assessed in other names." Others have given the real estate as being $600,000.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Owned by them and assessed in other names?—A. Owned by them and assessed in other names. The personal-property tax for the current year he gave me as $500,000. Then the poll-tax collected was $30,000 up to July 1.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. $500,000 paid on personal property by the Chinese?—A. Assessed.

Q Or paid on $500,000 of personal property?—A. This gives the personal-property tax. Then the poll-tax collected was $30,000 up to July 1.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—A. This is what was given me by the clerk.

Q. You do not know anything about it of your own knowledge? It might have been $40,000 for aught you know?—A. There are a great many things I do not know of my own knowledge. I got my statistics from the clerk.

Q. You do not know it from your own knowledge?—A. I am not the clerk.

Q. You do not know anything about it of your own knowledge?—A. I know that, without my own knowledge, as well as I know any matter of history that I have not been an actor in. I suppose this committee came here as appointed by the General Government to get a fair statement. I do not suppose that any of the committee are here as lawyers for the Chinese or anti-cooly men. I suppose they are all honorable gentlemen, and I came here with the same expectation of presenting my statement of what I know of the Chinese.

Q. I do not object to your stating anything you know. The point is that you go around to other people and get them to tell you, and come here to repeat it, and that that is not testimony, and would not be received in a court; that Mr. Badlam has been here himself, and testified carefully in regard to all these things. I simply asked you whether you knew, of your own knowledge, that the poll-tax is twenty or forty thousand dollars. That you decline to answer, but go into an argument that would imply that members of the committee, in asking you if you know it of your own knowledge, are acting as attorneys.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Answer the question whether you know of your own knowledge or got this information from the clerk?—A. I got it from the clerk. I will further state that I know, of my own knowledge, that this collection of taxes goes on from the beginning to the end of the year. I know, from my own knowledge, that these tax-collectors are on the corners of the street. I know, from my own knowledge, that these tax-collectors appointed by the department about the city hall are stationed at all the landings of the steamers and at the railroad depots. They meet the Chinese as they go ashore; they meet the Chinese as they go away, and if they have not a receipt when they go away showing that they have paid a poll-tax, they must pay it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Mr. Badlam testified to all that.—A. I wish to state it again.

Q. I shall object.—A. I will state further that these Chinese who have come ashore from steamers hardly have breathed our American air before they are made to pay their poll-tax; they must pay it before they pass from that wharf into the city; and I state now certainly that this clerk has given me those figures up to July first, and that still they are going on receiving poll-tax from the men coming in and going out.

Q. Did you state in your testimony that only the Chinese paid miners' license-tax?—A. I did, according to my knowledge.

Q. You state that your knowledge is that only Chinese have paid the foreign miners' license-tax?—A. As a general proposition that is true. If I did not state it before I will state now, then, and let it go into the evidence, that as a general proposition that is true.

Q. How long have you been in the State?—A. Since September, 1859; but then, I have knowledge of things that I did not see. I have knowledge of things that I get by reading, and a knowledge of things that I get by report. I would not profess to state, from my own knowledge, that what Senator Sargent did in Washington was true, except from the reports that I read.

Q. Would you be called in a court of justice to testify as to what I may have done in Washington when you were not there at all?—A. In such a case as this I would.

Q. Where is the distinction? I want to see the distinction between what a witness states on report and what he saw himself. That is what I wanted to do, and to that you took exception, and implied that I was an attorney.—A. I judge as to what I may say from what witnesses have said all along, and from what your chairman has said.

Senator SARGENT. I shall object to the witness going on and stating what somebody has told him.

The CHAIRMAN. It is right for the witness to state whether he speaks from his own knowledge or from the information of others.

The WITNESS. How do you get statistics, Mr. Sargent, for your speeches?

Senator SARGENT. I do not make my speeches under oath.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You say that they collect this poll-tax from the Chinese immigrants as they come off the steamers when they first arrive here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—A. Yes, sir; I know that.

Q. I want to know whether you know that of your own knowledge, or whether it is hearsay?—A. That is what I understand.

Q. You do not know it of your own knowledge?—A. No.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know of their collecting it as they go off?—A. I know of their collecting it as they go to China; and I know they collect it as they come ashore.

Q. Are there many Chinese beggars in San Francisco?—A. Very few in proportion to the people. Only once and a while you see them.

Q. Who are the hukahs spoken of by Mr. King?—A. The hukahs are a class of people in China who in very ancient times were regarded as having come from another portion of the country; probably from the Fuh Kien province. Hukah means stranger. Now they are scattered about, occupying quite a number of towns there. Some of them are here; and one of the Fuh Kien Company houses belongs to them.

Q. What are they as a class of people for respectability?—A. They are as respectable as others. They are very industrious and economical.

Q. Do the six companies import Chinese here for labor purposes?—A. They do not.

Q. Do they make contracts; hiring their labor out?—A. They do not.

Q. Do they receive the money of the Chinese for the labor which is performed?—A. They do not.

Q. Have you any knowledge of Chinamen being murdered in California to any number?—A. I have.

Q. Do you know of the white man or criminal who committed the murder being hung for it in any one instance?—A. I do not call to mind any instances. I call to mind a fact which occurred not very long ago, the Chinese who were murdered at Truckee, and evidence brought to show very distinctly that they had been shot as they came out of their pens; but the murderers were all cleared.

Q. Are you familiar with the treaty stipulations in what is known as the Burlingame treaty?—A. I read the treaty when it came out and have read it very repeatedly.

Q. Does that treaty give the Chinamen the same protection here under our laws as it gives the American under his laws in China? Is it reciprocal?—A. It is more advantageous to the American.

Q. Is the law reciprocal?—A. It is intended to be reciprocal.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would, perhaps, be more satisfactory on that point to put the treaty itself into the record.

Mr. BEE. Very well.

[See Appendix N.]

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say the foreign miners' license-tax was collected only of Chinese?—A. As a general proposition I say it was. There may have been instances here and there of its being collected from other persons.

Q. Then you speak of your own knowledge?—A. I speak of my own knowledge, so far as I know anything that I have not been a part and party in.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In regard to the collection of this tax, was it a matter of general report at the time that it was collected only from Chinese or that it was collected from all alike?—A. It was a matter of general report that it was collected only from Chinese.

Q. Was that the report at the time?—A. That was the report at the time, and it has never been denied.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. At what time?—A. All along from early times, from 1852.

Q. You were not here until 1859. Can Chinamen emigrate by sea from this State as freely as white people?—A. I have explained——

Q. Say yes or no. Can they emigrate from this State back to China by sea as freely as white people emigrate?—A. I have explained that they pay to the companies and others a fee of $20.

Q. I am not talking about that. I ask you if, in your opinion, a Chinaman can emigrate back to China from this State by sea as freely as white people, without any restraint or hinderance from the Chinese of this city?—A. With that exception, they can.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Can a white man run away from this State in debt?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do not white men abscond from here?—A. They abscond.

Q. They leave the State owing debts?—A. They do.

Q. Can a Chinaman do that?—A. Not well.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You say the Chinese are very badly treated in many instances?—A. I have said so.

Q. Do you think the general mass of your people approve of such conduct?—A. I think there is a large and respectable body of the people who disapprove it. I think there are very many who in their hearts disapprove it, who are restrained at the present time by the strong public sentiment that has been awakened against the Chinese during the last few months.

Q. What is your opinion as to the majority of your citizens approving or disapproving it?—A. I think the majority of the citizens would disapprove of it very strongly.

Q. It is limited, then, to a class?—A. It is limited to a low class, and those connected with the labor institutions.

Q. It would be unfair, then, to hold your community responsible for this bad treatment?—A. I think so, decidedly.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You made a statement in regard to the amount of duties paid by the Chinese upon merchandise. From whom did you get that statement?—A. I got that statement from the clerk in the custom-house; but at the time they gave it to me they said that it was approximate.

Q. You made a statement here that the poll-tax was collected from the Chinese upon their arrival, as they landed from the vessel. From what source did you get that information?—A. From the captains and officers of the steamships.

Q. From the officers of the steamships?—A. From the officers of the steamships.

Q. That these immigrants were required to pay a poll-tax when they landed?—A. Before they got out of the inclosure into the city; before they got off from the docks. If it is necessary, those officers themselves can be brought here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you say they collect the poll-tax from them on their landing here?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Give me the name of some of these officers.—A. Take the name of Captain David S. Austin.

Q. Did you say it was a general rule, or an exception?—A. I say that is done.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is it a rule or is it an exception?—A. It is a general rule that the poll-tax is collected at the steamboat-landing.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. When they come ashore?—A. At the steamboat-landing and at the railroad depots, as they come in and go out.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. When the steamer arrives from China bringing immigrants to this port, do our tax-collectors collect the poll-tax at the wharf?—A. I made that statement and I stand by it.

Q. Is it a rule or is it an exception?—A. I say that it is common.

Q. Do you know it of your own knowledge?—A. I know it from the statements of the officers of the steamers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You can state whether you are informed that it is done.—A. I have been so informed by David S. Austin, now in the city, and by Mr. Daniel Friele, now on the Pekin, who is not in the city.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is Austin's address?—A. Office of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about the amount of property-tax being $500,000; is that the whole amount of Chinese personal property that is taxed?—A. I understood that that is the amount of taxes which they pay.

Q. I want to understand whether it is the amount of taxes paid, or the whole amount of property taxed; whether they pay that amount of taxes, or whether that is the value of all the personal property owned by Chinese that is taxed? There is quite a difference, you know.—A. I am not exactly clear upon that point.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You say there are $500,000 of personal-property tax by the Chinese?—A. In regard to that matter, I have just explained to the chairman that I am not clear on that point.

Q. Then you do not know whether it is the amount of money that is paid into the tax-office, or whether it is the assessed value of property there which is stated?—A. I cannot tell.

Q. So you do not know whether it is $500,000 of tax that they pay, or whether it is, at the rate of $2.30, $10,000—nearly $11,000?—A. No.

Q. Let me ask you if that is a fair gauge by which we may estimate the value of your general testimony on this subject?

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think that is a fair question.

Mr. PIXLEY. I think it is. We differ. I think that point just exactly illustrates his testimony.

Rev. JOHN FRANCIS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You have been in charge of the mission-schools here?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. State to the commission your experience while you have been in charge in educating the Chinese, how long you have been, and what sect you represent.—A. The Baptist. I received an appointment as Chinese missionary by the American Baptist Home Missionary Society

about five years since, and have continued, excepting a short interval of a few months, up to the present time, and am still engaged as a missionary in this city. Our mission has been located on Washington street, and we have had about one hundred pupils and about six teachers in attendance during the time that I have been here. I will simply confine my statement to my experience as regards the religious aspect of the Chinese. My experience has convinced me that in regard to consistency, Christian deportment, and steadfastness they compare very favorably with the converts of other nationalities. I have been with them a good deal in their life; I have been with them at their death. One of our Chinese brethren died in my arms, and it was a source of pleasure and gratification to know that he had continued during the years of his Christian life faithful to his principles. When dying he requested me to unite with another gentleman now in Canton to watch over his little motherless boy and train him in the Christian religion, hoping that he should meet him in heaven. That Christian brother had labored here very faithfully among his countrymen for years. I simply mention this instance as a proof of their steadfastness and consistency in their Christian deportment. I have had a knowledge of others also. A Chinese Baptist church was organized in Sacramento about fifteen years ago. They built a very respectable church-edifice. They had a pastor by the name of Shook, who during the war returned to his home in the Southern States. The church became scattered, a flock without a shepherd, but as far as I have been able to trace the members of that church, not one of them has proved recreant to his principles. One of them went to China, and he was found by our missionaries in the streets of Canton preaching the gospel to his countrymen. They immediately gave him encouragement, and he united with them in the mission and became pastor of the first Baptist church in Canton. He continued a life of usefulness for nearly fifteen years, and died a happy death, leaving his family, a Christian family, to the care of the church; and his own son succeeded him in the ministry. Three deaths have occurred in our mission. One was that of a Chinaman on his return to China; another was out of my reach; I was not able to ascertain the manner of his death; but my experience has been that none of our converts, so far as I know, have returned to heathenism, but they have continued steadfast to their Christian principles.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How many converts have you had?—A. We have baptized about fifteen in connection with this mission here.

Q. What were their ages?—A. Their ages ranged from about 17 to 25. The first Chinaman that I baptized returned to China, and was persecuted very much by his father; but his determination was to make known the truth to his mother. That was his great desire as soon as he was baptized. He said to me, "I now want to go to China and tell my mother about Jesus." He received a Christian education. He escaped to Canton from the persecution of his father; our missionaries aided him; and he returned to this country, and is now an ordained missionary in one of our missions, at Portland, Oregon. It would be wrong to detain the committee long, for your hands are full of important matters, but, so far as my observation has gone, our Chinese converts have been true to their principles; and I experienced sweet Christian fellowship with them, just as I do with other nationalities wherever I am located or placed.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you been engaged in this work?—A. Five years.

Q. From what place did you come?—A. I am originally from Wales, but I have been in California fifteen years.

Q. You are laboring under the auspices of the Baptist Church?—A. The American Baptist Home Mission Society, located in New York, but it has its missionaries through the State.

Q. You have a school here?—A. A mission premises and a school.

Q. Do you have a day-school?—A. Our school is always in the evening, from six to nine o'clock every evening.

Q. How many scholars are in attendance?—A. We have had 100 pupils, and about six teachers.

Q. You have an average of 100 pupils?—A. Yes, sir. We have not so many now. Our place is contracted, and some come and stay awhile and then go out and make room for others.

Q. What do you instruct them in—the English language?—A. In the English language; but more particularly in the doctrines of the Christian religion. We teach them English until they can read the New Testament. We do not go as far as the missions of my respected friend Mr. Gibson and others; but we do all we can to give them a knowledge of the English Scriptures.

Q. What are the ages of those whom you instruct?—A. From ten to twenty-five; very few are less than twelve years of age.

Q. Is your time entirely devoted to this work?—A. Entirely.

Q. Do you mingle a good deal with the Chinese here?—A. Constantly.

Q. You see them in different avocations?—A. Yes, sir; but I thought probably as so much has been said, and so well, it would not be desirable for me to give much experience in regard to other matters than merely the religious part.

Q. You have seen them in their different pursuits and trades?—A. Yes, sir; we visit the factories and wash-houses, and all the places of Chinese resort, and preach to them in Chinese.

Q. Do you speak the language?—A. No, sir; I have a Chinaman who interprets when I speak.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q Will you state, from your intercourse with the Chinese, what is their general character?—A. I find the Chinese to be just like other people. I cannot perceive any difference at all. When we bring religious truths to bear upon them they appreciate and exemplify religious principles just like other people. I have been to some extent connected with almost all nationalities in both hemispheres; I hold the office of a minister, and I am not able to point out any difference between a Chinese and other nationalities, Welsh, Irish, French, Scotch, &c. When I bring the truth to bear upon their intellects and hearts, the effect is alike.

Q. What is their general character as members of society?—A. All our young men with whom we have been connected have proved themselves, with very few exceptions, to be honorable, just, reasonable, and honest in their character and in their dealings with us. A number of them are in different occupations in the city, photograph-galleries and other occupations. I find there is a demand for our young men, and we are not able to supply that demand. I think the same is felt by other missions. Our Christian community, our converts, are in demand. The people want them in their service and in their employ.

Q. Are you assisted at all by the State or Federal or municipal governments?—A. No, sir.

Q. The funds are entirely contributed by the charitable?—A. The funds had been entirely contributed by the American Baptist Home Mission Society up to the 1st of January. On the 1st of January the circumstances of the society did not admit of any further contribution, but the work, in my estimation, has been so important that I have devoted the whole of my time for the last nine months, and paid all the expenses, except, I think, about thirty dollars, to the benefit of the Chinese. From a sense of the importance of the work and my duty to God and humanity I have received no compensation at all. I think thirty dollars has been the only contribution since the 1st of January, but my determination is, if possible, to keep at the work until resources shall come from some quarter to give it still further effect.

Q. Would pecuniary aid extend the sphere of usefulness of these schools?—A. Yes, sir; our society proposed to buy a building here and agreed to contribute twenty thousand dollars to that effect, but unfavorable circumstances arose just at the time and prevented the consummation of it. If we could secure a sufficient amount of funds to have a building equal to the missionary building, the Presbyterian building here, it would very materially assist us. The place that we have at present is so contracted that numbers have to come in and receive instruction for awhile, and go out to make room for others who come in and take their place. Pecuniary benefit would be a great strength to the mission.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do your converts to Christianity ever cut off their queues?—A. I am not aware that they do. I have often had conversation with them in regard to their queues, and, as far as I can understand, it is simply a national badge. There is no religious meaning or signification to it whatever. The reason why numbers of them have not cut off their queues is simply that they think they would lose their influence in bringing Christianity to bear upon their countrymen if they should change their costumes or cut off their queues. Many of them would rather change their dress, and would prefer to part with their queues, were it not for the fact that they would lose influence in bringing Christianity to bear on their countrymen.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say the Chinese Christian converts are sought for in photograph-galleries, &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they preferred by employers?—A. I do not know, any further than that they apply to me for such help. We have a young man now who has been, probably, for six years in one photograph-gallery, and he is the young man I referred to. Another one, an ordained missionary in Portland, was for five years in the same gallery. Other photographic artists came to our mission to secure similar help.

Q. Do the Chinamen understand that they are thus sought for on account of their Christian profession?—A. I think they do. I think the Christian young men have a conviction that they are really in demand in preference to the heathen portion of their race.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Would not your work be facilitated to a great extent if the Chinese were permitted to attend our schools and get an English education?—A. Certainly; it would take away a great deal of labor that we

are now obliged to perform. We could instruct them in the Christian religion at once, if they were to come prepared to read the scriptures, and it would save a great deal of time. I must say that it is amazing to me that in this Christian America (I am a British subject) the privileges of education are not secured to all alike.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are you aware that to Christian Australia, which is a British province, the Chinese are not permitted to go at all?—A. I am not acquainted with Australia, but I am acquainted with the principality of Wales. There they are one and all under the impression that equal privileges should be afforded all mankind everywhere, and that the advantages of education should be secured to every human being in whatever part of the world he may have been born.

Q. Suppose there was a certain limited amount of privilege that would just go around in the population of Wales, would you be willing to divide among an equal population of Chinamen?—A. With Christian Chinamen, educated in the same religion, I would.

Q. The statistics show that you have converted about 125 or 100 Chinamen out of the 120,000 or 175,000 Chinese who are here. Would you like to have 175,000 of these Chinamen turned into Wales?—A. Yes, sir; if Wales had the same extent of territory and we had the noble institutions that you have here; and we would be glad to welcome them.

Q. Do you think our institutions superior to English institutions?—A. I think you are in advance. The only difference is that in the principality of Wales we demand, as far as it is possible, as far as the advantage of the British government will afford it, equal rights for all without any discrimination whatever.

Q. How is it about labor in Wales? Is the supply of labor there equal to the demand?—A. Of course there have been persons who were prejudiced; but we have always welcomed other nationalities who would engage industriously and receive any advantages we might give them in the way of education and Christian benefits. There is no difference that I know of.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you think that any of the Chinese become Christians through mercenary motives?—A. It is possible; but that has not been my experience. I looked over this matter before coming here; I have sworn to the statement I make, and I am not prepared to say that my observation enables me to point out a single instance of any of our young men who have become Christian young men from any other motive than a love of the truth. If I had a different experience I would be ready to state it, because it is the case with all nationalities that there are some who become Christians through such motives.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What proportion of the Chinese population here is under twenty-one years of age?—A. Probably about half, I should think. I would say that we have them from twelve years of age up to twenty-five. I think it would be a fair statement to say that about half of them are under twenty-one.

Q. I am not speaking of your missions; I am speaking of the whole Chinese population here. What proportion of them, taking the whole population as you know it, are under twenty-one?—A. I do not know that I can give an intelligent answer to the question, although I would be very glad to do so. It did not happen to occur to me what propor-

tion there would be less than twenty-one; but there is a very large proportion evidently under twenty-one.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. By a large proportion do you mean more than half or less than half?—A. Less than half, or nearly half, I should think. I can judge better from our schools. I have not exercised my mind in regard to the general population.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. We are speaking of the whole population; those who work on tules, on railroads, and in factories—the whole Chinese adult population?—A. If I am not able to give an intelligent answer to satisfy myself, I cannot satisfy you.

The CHAIRMAN. I should like to ask Dr. Gibson, from his knowledge of the Chinese population, what proportion of the whole number is under twenty-one years of age?

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. My statement would be only an approximation and a judgment. I think perhaps there may be a third of them under twenty-one, and a large proportion of the whole are under thirty. That would be my judgment from my observation among the people in this country. Not far from a third are under twenty-one. A Chinaman, in his reckoning, is always one year older than we would reckon him to be. According to their custom of reckoning, he is a year old the day he is born. If he is born in the last month of the year he is a year old when he is born, and when he comes to the new year, within five days, perhaps, of his birth, he is two years old; and so it goes on in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. Taking the real age, you think about a third are under twenty-one?

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. About a third. Sixteen, seventeen, nineteen, and twenty years of age is a common figure for a large number of the Chinamen in this country; and then from twenty to thirty, I think, there is a very large proportion.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of them are younger than eighteen?

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. That would be a much smaller per cent. There are a great many small boys, fourteen years of age, but in the whole population it would not be a very large percentage.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 11, 1876.

JOSEPH A. COOLIDGE sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Are you the secretary of the Merchants' Exchange?—Answer. I am secretary and manager of the Merchants' Exchange.

Q. How long have you been in that occupation?—A. Since the organization of the association in 1866.

Q. How long have you been in this city?—A. Twenty-seven years nearly.

Q. Please state to the committee what information you have in reference to the Chinese that you come in contact with, whether there are any of them who are members of the Merchants' Exchange. Have you a statement which you could refer to?—A. I have a brief statement which I shall read. We have seven Chinese firms as stockholders and twenty-four as subscribers to the Merchants' Exchange. The subscribers are

to be seen daily in the room and on 'change during the hour; they are intelligent, shrewd, courteous, and gentlemanly, honorable in their business transactions, and compare favorably with people of any other nationality. I have been informed by merchants who have had extensive business transactions with them that the usual contracts in writing were unnecessary, their word being a sufficient guarantee for their fulfillment, and in a term of years, in which business to the extent of millions of dollars was transacted, not one cent has been lost by bad faith on their part. I have never been acquainted with a Chinaman in any station in life who could not read and write in his own language. In cleanliness of person they are remarkable. I have observed them closely in their various occupations, and on the streets, and cannot call to mind an instance of dirty face or hands, or of soiled garments. Their habitations, however, are filthy.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. That is paradoxical.—A. At least those are my observations. I can speak only of what I know. They are industrious and frugal, unassuming in their demeanor. I have never heard of one offering himself as a candidate for a position on the police force or for any other public office.

Q. I did not know that anybody but citizens could occupy that place. —A. I have heard of instances of the kind, and that is the reason why I speak of it. Nor do we hear them about the streets making night hideous with unearthly yells and screaming, as is the case with very many who consider themselves their superiors in everything that constitutes a civilized being and a good citizen. The rule to a great extent has obtained to charge the offenses of individual Chinese to their nation, while crimes of other people would be fixed on the individual alone, without regard to his nationality. I am not convinced that the Chinese are less law-abiding than any other people, though through the prejudice that exists against them many are arrested for crimes which, if committed by what is called a white man, would pass unnoticed, and our court-records show a larger proportion of Chinese arrests than if the laws were impartially executed. It is within my recollection that a prejudice to fully as great an extent existed against Irish immigration, and many similar objections were urged against them as is now against the Chinese. The results of the Irish immigration are before the country; those of the Chinese are to be proved. If, as is claimed, the greater portion of the Chinese now here are of the lowest order of their countrymen, it speaks volumes in favor of Chinese civilization, and a strong inducement to encourage a larger immigration of the better classes. Their example might have the effect to improve the morals of those among us who oppose the influx of Chinese on account of their heathenism.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How are the Chinese treated by the merchants at the Exchange?—A. They are treated just the same as the people of any other nation. There seems to be no distinction at all.

Q. There is no ostracism, or violence, or ill language used toward them?—A. Not a bit. I never heard a word of the kind. They are treated with as much courtesy on 'change as anybody could be.

Q. Then the merchant class of this city are not disposed to countenance any violence toward Chinese?—A. I think not, as far as my observation goes.

Q. Is the merchant class of this city pretty large?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You say that the Chinese can read?—A. My impression is that I have never met one yet who could not read and write in his own language.

Q. You have only met with the mercantile classes, I understand?—A. I have met a great many others.

Q. The Rev. Mr. Gibson states that very few of them can read and write in their own language.—A. I have never met one in my experience who could not.

Q. How many did you ever test of the inferior class outside of the commercial class?—A. That I could not state exactly.

Q. Ten?—A. More than that.

Q. Twenty?—A. Probably.

Q. Then your experience has not been very extensive.—A. That is true.

Q. Will you be kind enough to tell me why it was that you stated in your essay that the Chinese never asked for office or to go on the police? I want to get at the motive that prompted that suggestion.—A. I wished to compare the Chinese, as a class, with those of other nationalities.

Q. With the Irish as a class?—A. I did not mention Irish.

Q. Whom do you mention?—A. I mean the people of any other nationality in their position of life, whatever it may be, if they are laborers. I have known people of other nationalities, who really have not been citizens, who wanted positions, but I have never known the Chinese to want them. That was the object of that expression.

Q. To what class did you refer when you spoke of the nightly yells that disturbed you?—A. That is general. You will find as many Yankee hoodlums as hoodlums of other nations. I do not think that is confined to any particular nation, with the exception of the Chinese.

Q. Is it your opinion that the unrestricted immigration of Chinese to this State is desirable? Mark the language of my question—the unrestricted immigration of Chinese.—A. I would consider it as desirable as that from any other nation.

Q. Would you consider that a large immigration from New England would be desirable?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. An unrestricted immigration from New England you would regard as desirable?—A. That might need some qualification. We might have too many people here.

Q. Would you consider the unrestricted immigration of Chinese as desirable as an unrestricted immigration from New England?—A. No, I do not think I should.

Q. Or old England?—A. O, no. I do not think that I should prefer immigration from China to immigration from old England.

Q. Why not?—A. Of course my sympathies are with those who were brought up the same as I am. I of course give my sympathies to those who are brought up as I was brought up myself.

Q. Then if, in your opinion, there should come a conflict of interests between Chinese and European immigration, you would favor the European?—A. I think I should.

Q. Why; because they are your own people?—A. Because their civilization is mine. The Chinese civilization is different.

Q. Do you think the Chinese civilization is superior or inferior to that of Western Europe or America?—A. I think, so far as I am informed, it is a debatable question whether their civilization is not as good as ours.

Q. Then why do you prefer your own?—A. I do not know enough about theirs to adopt it yet.

Q. Then you give our own the benefit of the doubt?—A. I give it the benefit of the doubt.

Q. But from your observation and reading and general intelligence you do not know which is the superior civilization?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you think their people can assimilate with us as citizens, and that it would be wise to invest them with the elective privilege?—A. So far as investing them with our elective privilege, I think it could be conferred upon them as well as a great many that it is conferred upon.

Q. To whom do you refer?—A. I refer to all ignorant foreign populations.

Q. Do you also refer to the ignorant American population?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you will say, perhaps, that it might be as well conferred upon them as upon the freedmen of the South?—A. Just as well.

Q. Do you think it would tend to elevate our country and strengthen our institutions?—A. I might be willing to deny giving the elective franchise to ignorant men under any circumstances.

Q. If I understand you, you put the Chinese in all respects, in their morals and civilization, and in the desirableness of their immigration, upon the same plane as other foreigners of the same degree?—A. That is precisely the idea.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Nearly twenty-seven years.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the number of European immigrants in this city, taking Germans, Irish, English, and all?—A. I have no data upon which to base an opinion.

Q. Is the entire European immigration equal to the number of Chinese?—A. I think not.

Q. How do the Chinamen engaged in mercantile business and in manufactures compare with the European immigrants who are engaged in the like business, who are merchants, manufacturers, and so on?—A. I think the Chinese compare favorably in every respect.

Q. Are there as many Chinese merchants and manufacturers in proportion to the whole number of Chinese residents as there are Germans, Irish, and Englishmen, and other foreigners engaged in the same business?—A. I think not. As I said before, I have no data upon which to form an opinion; I speak merely from casual observation. I do not think there are so many of them engaged in business as Europeans. There seems to be a greater proportion of laborers at ordinary work, housework, and such things, among the Chinese.

Q. What is the general mercantile character of the Chinese for capacity and integrity?—A. I think they have no superior.

Q. Are some of them engaged in large business?—A. Yes, sir; very large business.

Q. As merchants or manufacturers, or both?—A. I speak of merchants. They have some manufactures here, but there are not so many engaged in manufacturing. It is more recently that they have turned their attention to manufacturing.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I understand you to say that you think the whole body of Chinese are superior to the whole body of other foreign people who come here?—A. My statement, I think, was that they compare favorably with them.

Q. You mean by comparing favorably that the Chinese are superior, or equal, or somewhat inferior?—A. I think they are equal if not a little superior to them.

Q. Suppose we segregate the classes. Do you think that the average of the Chinese is equal to the average of the Germans, taking merchants and all classes?—A. I do not think they are.

Q. Then you exclude the Germans from that computation?—A. I would not exclude the Germans. I would include them among the whole to make the average.

Q. I want to see class by class. You think the Germans, then, are superior to the Chinese as a whole?—A. In very many respects they are.

Q. As a whole?—A. I may have a little prejudice in favor of some nationalities.

Q. Are you testifying here from prejudice or from candid opinions?—A. Not from prejudice but from candid opinions.

Q. Lay aside your prejudices and let us get at the facts. Answer the question, whether you think the Germans are superior as immigrants and as useful citizens to the State as the Chinese are?—A. My opinion is that the Germans are superior to any immigrants that come here, Chinese or any others.

Q. I should like to ask you about the Frenchmen who come here. We have a great many French merchants and business-men here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Workers, artisans, &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think the Chinese are superior to them as a whole?—A. The Chinese are their equals.

Q. Everything considered, morals and everything else?—A. Morals and everything else.

Q. We have a large class of Italians here who are fishermen, industrious workers. Do you think the Chinese are superior to them?—A. I do.

Q. And you think they are superior to the Irish?—A. I do.

Q. Do you think they are superior to every class except the Germans?—A. Yes; I think they are superior to every class of European immigrants except the Germans.

Q. Do you know the Scandinavians and the Welsh?—A. I am not familiar with any of them here, and I would not say anything about them.

Q. Do you not know that they are industrious, peaceable, quiet citizens, who do not make night hideous? Do you not know that is true about the Welsh, Cornish, and Scandinavians?—A. I do not know it, but I presume it is a fact.

Q. You presume against them without knowing it?—A. I presume in their favor without knowing it.

Q. Then if these disagreeable characteristics do not exist in regard to those, are they not superior to the Chinese as a whole?—A. In that regard they may be.

Q. The Chinese occupy very small and filthy quarters. Is that true of the Germans, the Irish, the French, the Scandinavians, or other foreign citizens here?—A. I do not think it is.

Q. With regard to such decencies and comforts, are there not other nationalities superior to the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; in such decencies.

Q. The foreign nationalities believe, as a rule, I think, altogether in the God of the Bible and in Christian doctrines, with the exception of the Jews?—A. I think they do. Jews believe in the Bible also.

Q. Is not that an element of superiority as against those who believe in paganism?—A. That is a question in my mind.

Q. Do you think that is a doubtful question?—A. In my mind; yes, sir.

Q. You think there is no advantage in believing in the Bible and having church memberships and religious associations according to the Protestant and Catholic idea. You think that paganism is equal to that, do you?—A. My idea is just this, and I may have singular notions of religion. My idea of a good citizen is, I do not question what his belief is; he may be pagan or whatever he pleases, but if he lives a good, honest square life he is as good a man as the greatest professor of religion or church-member. In regard to the Chinese, I do not know precisely what their belief is, only I have been told by some of them that they believe in a God and their worship is similar to that of the Catholic worship.

Q. Are you aware that Confucius, their great writer, never mentions a God or a future state?—A. I am not speaking of what Confucius says. I am speaking of what I am informed by intelligent Chinese here, that they believe in a God.

Q. Have you ever visited the joss-houses here?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are not aware of the fact that they have painted and horrible devils there depicted?—A. I have heard that they have images there of one kind and another; but I never visited them.

Q. You think it desirable in this community that a large population should worship devils and have their beliefs of paganism as to the worship of God believed in by American and European civilization?—A. I do not care what their belief is; if it makes them better citizens it is better for them.

Q. There you must come to individuals, and I am speaking of them as a class.—A. I am speaking of them as a class.

Q. Then I ask you the effect of men as a class believing in devils and having a superstitious fetish worship, and believing in the God of the Bible?—A. If the Chinese believe in these things I do not see that they are much different from what we call white men, for they all believe in them in some shape or manner.

Q. Then you see no advantage in the religion of the Bible?—A. There might be for me, and there might not for somebody else.

Q. Do you think it is better to have a class among us who believe in polygamy and practice it, and have second wives, or to have the American and European system of one wife and a family?—A. I was brought up in that way, and, of course, I believe that to be the best.

Q. Then is not that an element of superiority over the Chinese as a desirable population?—A. That may be.

Q. Is not that the belief of American and European nationalities?—A. I do not know that the Chinese have more than one wife.

Q. You do not know that they have polygamy?—A. Not here.

Q. You do not know anything about their having second wives?—A. No, sir.

Q. And not knowing those things, you think you are competent to decide upon their morals and speak of their superiority?—A. I judge of them as I see of them. My observations are confined to what I have seen of the people.

Q. You say you think the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese would not be a good thing?—A. No more, I think, than the unrestricted immigration of any other nationality. We may have too many here.

Q. What would you consider too many people for this coast?—A. Perhaps four or five millions would be too many.

Q. You think any limit up to four or five millions of Chinese would be an advantage?—A. I do not say that. I do not know where I should limit it myself.

Q. And your objection to the number of them would not be because they are Chinese, but because the State and coast might be overcrowded?—A. That is it.

Q. You think that five millions of white population, even such a population as that of New England or Illinois, would be undesirable here?—A. I do not know that I understand you clearly.

Q. I understand you to say that five million people would crowd this State and would be too many?—A. I think it would be too many of any class.

Q. Then you think even if we could have five millions of such population as Iowa or Illinois or New England it would be a disadvantage to the State?—A. I did not say so.

Q. You say it would be too many people?—A. I misunderstood you. I think a population of five millions would be a little too many for this State.

Q. And you are the secretary of the Merchants' Exchange of this city?—A. I am.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Is there, in your view, any advantage in restricting the immigration of the Chinese?—A. I cannot see that there is.

Q. Do you see the need of any legislation additional to that which we have now, if properly enforced, in regard to Chinese immigration?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think it would be proper or advantageous to discriminate in regard to any class of immigration on account of religious motive or belief?—A. I do not.

Q. Did I understand you to say that the hoodlums of this city are of no particular nationality?—A. I think they are not, except that they are not Chinese.

Q. With the exception of the Chinese, you do not see that any particular nationality predominates?—A. I am not familiar with them, but judge from general observation that they are not confined to any particular nationality.

Q. To what cause do you attribute the existence of the hoodlum class in this city?—A. I think it is want of government by the parents of the young men. They are allowed a greater latitude here than in any place I ever saw in my life before. At night you can see children of six or seven years of age around this city until two o'clock in the morning. I have seen them frequently myself in little squads of four and five, evidently showing a lack of care on the part of parents as to the habits of their children.

Q. Have you had occasion to notice what kind of employment the young men of this city seek?—A. They seek some light employment, clerkships or employment in stores, and things of that sort.

Q. Do you know whether or not there is a disposition in the young men of this city to take employment in trades and pursuits which require steady application and diligence and labor?—A. I am of the opinion that they dislike anything of that sort.

Q. You think that the positions they seek are clerical in their nature usually?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is not one cause of the hoodlumism the fact that there are not sufficient clerkships to go around, and that consequently a great many

of them are unemployed, because they are unwilling to take positions as artisans or laborers?—A. That is it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know whether the Chinese are largely engaged in the manufacture of different articles in this city?—A. I think they are. To what extent I am not able to state.

Q. Do you not know that they are employed because their labor is cheaper than white labor?—A. Yes, sir; their labor is cheaper than white labor.

Q. If the preference is given on account of the cheapness of their labor, does not that, therefore, close an opening for young men to get employment?—A. That is true.

Q. Then are the young men compelled to seek clerical and other positions which Chinese do not fill on account of the scarcity of other kinds of labor?—A. I think that is true.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What is the superficial area of this State in square miles?—A. I cannot state that with correctness. I have a very poor memory for statistics or anything that is a matter of record. I was brought up in a counting-house and was never allowed to exercise my memory.

Q. How does it compare with the State of New York?—A. I cannot state.

The CHAIRMAN. How many square miles are there in the State, Colonel Brooks?

Mr. BROOKS. I do not remember the square miles. There are 101,000,000 acres.

Senator SARGENT. It is very well known that this State will hold fifteen million people.

Rev. OTIS GIBSON recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. I understood you to say day before yesterday that you are in favor of restricted Chinese immigration. Did I understand you correctly?—Answer. Yes, sir; I made the statement that I would be in favor of restricted immigration from any foreign country, limiting the arrival to 200 on any ship from any foreign land under the heaven. I would not make any distinction between the Chinese and any other people.

Q. We are now considering Chinese immigration. You would be in favor of restricted Chinese immigration, say to 200 on a ship?—A. I think it would be very well to do so.

Q. How many sometimes arrive on one vessel?—A. During the times of increased immigration here there are sometimes 1,000 and 1,200; but for the last two months, and ordinarily, they will not average more than six or seven or eight hundred on a vessel, coming, and three or four hundred on a vessel returning. I have no recollection of 1,400 having arrived on one ship. It may be true, but I do not remember it. Then, as I stated before, I think, Mr. Chairman, that there are only two objections that can be made, that reach my mind at all, against Chinese immigration, which do not prevail with equal force against other immigrations generally from foreign lands. They assimilate a little more slowly; I do not say that they do not assimilate at all, because they do; and as time advances the assimilation will be in an increased ratio. They readily acquire our habits of living, and wish to have more respect-

able forms of living as fast as they can arrive to it, and they spend money very freely. That is one point, the slowness of their assimilation; but they would assimilate faster if they had the privileges other immigrants have. The second objection is, that in case of intestine wars in China, and rebellions, and the devastation of great regions of their country, there is a simple possibility that there might come over a large influx of Chinamen to this country, that could not be handled very well with the interests of the country.

Q. You think, therefore, that there ought to be a limit placed on the number permitted to come in a ship?—A. I think that would be a very good way to arrange it. That would make the passage a little higher. The passage now is about $55, and the condition of Chinamen is not so much better as to make them go through very much to come if they have to pay largely to get here. Chinamen like their own country the best of any country; and the fact that we have so small an immigration from there, with all the inciting causes, ships going all the time, placards put up all over the country offering every inducement to the Chinese in China to come, yet we do not have, I think, a very great immigration. The leading influential Chinamen here are as much opposed to a large increase of Chinese immigration as the Irishmen are, and for the same cause. Something has been said in regard to treaties and the abrogation of the treaties. It is my opinion that any change of the treaty, any agitation of the treaty question at all, would very likely be at our expense. The treaties that are made between our country and China are for our benefit, not for the benefit of the Chinamen. If I understand it, the Chinamen to-day have not a single right or advantage in this country that they would not have if there was no treaty at all with that nation. As I understand it, we have many rights in China which the general system of government in China would not give us without the treaties. If we should call for an abrogation of the treaty or a modification of the treaty we should be met at once by the increased intelligence that the Chinese diplomats who have had these years of experience with our people and have come to learn their rights a little better than they knew before, and they would demand to be put on an equality, which they are not on now. In China I could go anywhere in the rural parts of the country, anywhere in the interior, with a passport, and if I should become vicious and kill a man viciously in the interior of China, all that the mandarin could do with me would simply be to take me very carefully and hand me over to the American consul, who would hear the testimony and decide, punishing me or freeing me as he chose. No Chinese authority could touch me.

Q. For any crime?—A. For no crime under Heaven can a Chinese authority touch an American in China.

Q. From your knowledge of the spirit and purpose of the Chinese government, do you believe it would resent any restriction of Chinese immigration?—A. They might do so, but if they did it would be more as a political movement than through any real feeling. I do not think the Chinese government desire their people to come here, but the Chinese diplomats and statesmen understand their rights well enough, and if you should make a distinction between their people and any other people, I think they would make a point of diplomacy upon it.

Q. Simply as a question of self-respect?—A. Yes, sir; they feel this matter distinctly, and they are agitating it in that way. The Chinese diplomats are not the novices that some people suppose them to be. They have never been beaten in diplomacy yet by any foreign nation.

Q. You think they do not desire their people to come here?—A. No,

they do not; and I think it will be patent to you when you consider that they have never sent any representative in all these years to look after their people here.

Q. Have the Chinese here ever desired that to be done?—A. There have been movements made by the friends of the Chinese and the friends of their civilization here to ask them to do it. Mr. Williams, the secretary of our legation at Pekin for many years, had an audience with Prince Kung, and the Prince made answer that out of self-respect they could not well appoint a foreigner a consul to represent their government over their people in this country, and they had no educated Chinaman that they could trust who could now be spared, but that they hoped out of those they were educating in America (who would also be educated in the Chinese language, customs, and literature, and educated also in the American language and literature,) to raise up a corps of men who could be trusted as their foreign representatives; and then they hoped to be able to do it.

Q. From your acquaintance with the Chinese both in China and here, state what comprehension they have of the character of our institutions. What is their general notion about it?—A. Do you mean the people here?

Q. I speak first of the mass of the Chinese here. What notion or comprehension have they of the character of our institutions?—A. The masses that first arrive have little or no knowledge or idea of our institutions whatever, except that it is a free country, and that they have nothing to do but obey the laws and go on. They do not remain here long, however, without getting more or less of an idea that this is a representative government; and about the time of elections they are made very sensibly aware of the fact that there is something going on with regard to our Government. The Chinese merchants, Mr. Sun Fuin and many others, and even the common boys in school, when they are stoned going to school at night, about election time, say in a kind of pigeon-English, "Well, after election all be right." Those things necessarily call to mind an idea of suffrage, and lead them to investigate and talk about it.

Q. Do they acquire readily after being here a general knowledge of our institutions, and comprehend that this is a free government, a government of the people?—A. I think they do as much as any foreign people of the same class.

Q. Who cannot read our language?—A. Yes, sir; as much as any foreign people who still retain their native language and have not learned ours. As diplomats, I think, they are considered to be equal to any in the world. Their system of politics is different from ours. That is evident to any one who knows anything at all about it.

Q. Do you suppose that the restriction upon immigration by fixing the number that might come upon any ship, or a restriction of that kind, would be offensive to the Chinese government?—A. I do not think so, unless the number would be made so small as to be really offensive. I do not think the matter of restricting them to two or three hundred on a vessel would be objectionable at all. Still, that is only an opinion.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. During the time this committee has been here have you noticed in the papers any accounts of outrages upon Chinamen?—A. I have been so busy that I have not read the papers hardly at all during this investigation. I have looked at the election-returns, and that is about all.

Q. I speak of the last month, since the committee was first in session.

Is it not a fact that the committee themselves may easily recognize that during this time the Chinamen have been unmolested?—A. There have been one or two instances, but I do not think there have been so many as usual. I mentioned the fact in my testimony the other day, that the same thing occurred when Mr. Burlingame was here. I took the trouble to look over the files of newspapers kept in the city hall, and months before his arrival it was almost a constant thing for assaults to be committed upon Chinamen in the streets of this city. During the week or two that Mr. Burlingame was here I failed to find anything of the kind in any of the newspapers. Within two weeks after his departure I found plenty of cases. I stated in my testimony that perhaps the same would be the case now.

Q. Are you not aware that, during the session of this committee, we have been through one of the most exciting political contests that ever agitated this State, and especially in this city?—A. I am aware of that certainly.

Q. You spoke of these assaults occurring at election times. I should like to make one request of you. If, during the next month after the committee leaves here, the newspapers contain accounts of outrages perpetrated upon Chinamen will you be kind enough to forward them to me and to the commission at Washington?—A. Yes, sir; certainly.

Q. The previous witness seemed to have an idea that the religion of the Chinese was as good as the religion or civilization of the Christian God. What is your opinion about that?—A. I do not think it is. I stated at least twice distinctly in my testimony the other day that the religion of China is a lower religion, and that their standard of morals is lower than that of those who follow the teachings of Christ; but I stated also that the standard of morals among the Chinese people is higher than the standard among any heathen people in all the world.

Q. The previous witness compared the Chinese with the people of America and the people of Western Europe where the teachings of the Bible have permeated the mass, and where although perhaps there are not so many individual professors, and some of them may be Catholic, yet, notwithstanding, they have the same precepts of Christian morality?—A. I have no prejudice against Catholics.

Q. The previous witness in expressing doubt whether the Bible was superior in its influence upon the people was in error?—A. I think the Christianity of the Bible is superior to the teachings of the Chinese or any heathen religion. Of course I think so, but the general tone of morals in the Chinese civilization, for instance, permeating the masses of the Chinese industrial classes, and they are all industrious as a general statement, I think is equal to the morality of the serfs in Russia, and that of the common people in Ireland, and very likely to that of the peasantry in France or Germany.

Q. Taking France, for instance—and I am more familiar with it than the others—are you not aware that the peasantry of France have their families and their single wives who care for their children?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you not think that is superior to the system of polygamy?—A. I think the system is superior, but I speak of the general honesty and morality of the Chinese. The plurality of wives is lawful in China, but it is not usual, nor is it generally practiced if a family has a son. If a man has no son and is able, he will take another wife in order to get a son. It is very important to have male descendants, in their estimation. I should say that this one point in their civilization is not so desirable as the system of monogamy, of course; but still, as a general thing, I

think the general morality of the Chinese may be compared favorably with the peasantry of Europe. I take the whole of Europe.

Q. Then does it not follow that the Christian religion has not such a vital effect upon the populations where it is taught as the doctrines of Confucius and Mencius?—A. There are other causes besides the teaching of religion which effect civilization. The Chinese are not without religion, and worship has its effect upon any people. Almost any worship is better than a contemptible infidelity of all things such as we sometimes find in our own country.

Q. Does not your logic necessarily show that this idolatry which is taught and practiced in China has a superior effect upon the people who receive it to the Christianity which is taught in Europe?—A. No, sir; because the idolatry taught in China is not taught as a system. There is no teaching of idolatry as a system; it is simply the habits and customs of the people. There are no churches or priests to preach idolatry nor books written advocating idolatry. It is simply a system which has grown up among the people. The teachings of Confucius, of which I gave a synopsis the other day, and perhaps need not repeat again, is a system of political economy as relates to the relative duties of man and man, the rulers and the people, the people and the rulers, the parent and the child, the child and its parent, the brother and the sister. It is a system of obedience to rule and law. As long as the parent is alive, the child obeys the parent; if the parent dies, he obeys the elder brother.

Q. Are not those teachings temporal in their character relating to this world?—A. Nearly all. There is, however, reference to a future world. I think I heard you say a moment ago that it was in testimony that Confucius did not recognize a God or a future state. I understand him to recognize both, something like Ben. Franklin, who I presume recognized both also. Confucius at one time, when pressed to go into a detailed and exhaustive discussion of the future world and of God, made answer to his scholars, as is a matter of history: "We do not yet fully understand this present system in which we live; we had better exhaust that, and afterward direct our thoughts to the future."

Q. Speaking of the industrial classes of France, the peasantry, &c., you are aware of the immense indemnity which they paid to Germany, subscribed for through all the different departments, and taken by the people?—A. I am not ignorant of that fact.

Q. Are you not aware that that enormous amount was raised by loans by the people all through the departments, taking it in small sums, and that it was paid in cash to Germany in a few years?—A. The details of raising the indemnity I am not acquainted with. I know that France has undoubtedly raised a large indemnity.

Q. Would not that imply a large prosperity among its people?—A. I am not speaking of the industry of the people.

Q. You are speaking about the industrious habits of the Chinese, that they excel those of the peasantry of France?—A. No, sir; you misunderstood me. What I say I would stand by, but I would rather not be misrepresented.

Q. I am not trying to misrepresent you; I am candidly representing you.—A. When I stated three or four distinct times that I thought the Chinese people might be compared for industry, morals, honesty, and good behavior generally with the peasantry of Europe, I do not think anybody should say that I said the Chinese are superior to the French, for I did not say so.

Q. I asked you if you carried the comparison to France. You men-

tioned the serfs, the Germans, then the Irish, and then French.—A. The whole of Europe.

Q. I told you I would question you about France, because I was more familiar with that country than with the serfs. Do you say the Chinese people are equal to the French?—A. I say they might be favorably compared.

Q. What do you mean by being favorably compared?—A. From my understanding of the English language, that they would not lose anything by comparison.

Q. You think the fact that the common people of France were able to raise this immense loan, with which the French government paid off at once in cash the indemnity to Germany, would not show a peculiar and striking degree of industry and thrift on their part that would make them superior to almost any other peasantry?—A. It is very commendable indeed. I do not know but that the Chinese peasantry would have paid an equal amount.

Q. Do not the Chinese peasantry live on a very small sum of money a day?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would they be able, on their scanty resources, to raise such an amount?—A. Yes; the Chinese people are able to raise almost any sum you may lay on them.

Q. There you compare thirty millions of people in France with three hundred or four hundred millions in China?—A. I am not to blame because they have no more Frenchmen.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You spoke about the Chinese being stoned at election times by the people.—A. It has frequently occurred; nearly every year; so much so, that they make these remarks themselves.

Q. Have not other men been stoned about election times?—A. I presume so.

Q. Americans?—A. I have heard of such things; but not so often as the Chinese.

Q. It is not confined to the stoning of Chinese at all?—A. It is only more general.

Q. Others are stoned?—A. I have heard so. I do not remember any particular instance.

Q. You have only heard about the Chinese being stoned?—A. I have heard it; and stones have been thrown through the windows of the school-room, and hit Chinese while they were sitting at their desk and studying. That is a little more direct knowledge, Mr. Piper, than the other.

Q. Have you not heard of stones being thrown into public political processions here?—A. O, yes; and I presume it is true.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you somewhat familiar with the Chinese code of morals, as taught by Confucius, Mencius, with their doctors?—A. I am somewhat familiar with it.

Q. Do they teach the doctrines of right and wrong substantially as we are taught?—A. Very much so.

Q. Do they teach the doctrine of the golden rule?—A. The doctrine of the golden rule is found in the writings of Confucius almost exactly as in the teachings of Jesus, except that Confucius puts it in the negative form. It is the same idea in the negative form.

Q. How does Confucius state it?—A. Confucius says that what you would not like men to do to you, you should not do that to them.

Ours is that you should do unto others what you would have others do unto you.

Q. Reference has been made to their images. Do they regard these images as being in themselves gods, or are they the representatives of some ideal deity?—A. It is a system of demigods—heroic worship. It is within the province of the Emperor to issue a proclamation and to establish the worship of a new god, as we call them. Some person has been of great value to the community somewhere, a great statesman, a great benefactor; and after his death the people petition that he shall be enrolled among the class of persons who may receive divine honor.

Q. Is that similar to the doctrine of the saints?—A. Very similar. I do not know whether it is exactly the same. Their idols are supposed to receive divine honor.

Q. Take one of their joss-houses here, in which there is an image; do they regard that image as possessing vitality and power, or is it the representative of some person?—A. Until it goes through with a certain installment or ceremony, which consecrates it, the image itself is nothing. In the shops where an image is made it is nothing until it is taken to a temple or some appointed place and a ceremonial is performed over it, when the spirit of this person who is dead and gone is supposed to come and take possession of the image. Then the image is worshiped, with the idea that the spirit of that person is present in the image.

Q. In their teaching of duties to each other as parent and child, brother and sister, is there anything that is obnoxious to the Christian faith?—A. No, sir; not that I know of, so far as the relative duties of parents and children are concerned, except this point, perhaps, which I ought to make an exception of, from my stand-point. They have what we call in Chinese a *sinchepur*, a family tablet, a square piece of work, longer or shorter, (illustrating,) with an upright piece, which slides up. On the inside of this tablet are written the names of their ancestors, the father and grandfather, and all the ancestors of the family, and it is kept in the family of the eldest son. These tablets represent something like our gravestones, or memorials, or photographs, or whatever you please; it is the family record, and there are stated times when these tablets receive worship. The family will gather, and some one burns incense, makes prostrations, and offers devotion to the ancestors in that way. The Christian teachers generally discourage that practice.

Q. Do the Chinese believe in the immortality of the soul?—A. Yes, sir; certainly.

Q. Do they belive that the spirits of deceased parents are present in these tablets or in any of their symbols?—A. They are supposed to be present; they have that belief.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is there in our institutions which is so different from the Chinese institutions that a Chinaman would not understand it when he was able to read our language?—A. As I stated the other day, I do not think there is anything that we know that the Chinamen are incapable of learning.

Q. What is there inherently different in the systems of government?—A. Ours is a representative government, issuing from the people; theirs is a central government. It has a constitution, however, which regulates and controls the conduct of the Emperor.

Q. It is as different from ours, then, as a monarchy is different from a republic?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any other essential difference?—A. I do not know of any.

Q. Are they not accustomed to the use of the ballot-election in China?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Do they not elect the elders of their villages?—A. Ah, they elect their elders, the authorities. That is a representative election, probably, but they do not elect with the ballot; they meet together.

Q. Then they are not entirely unaccustomed to the use of elections?—A. No, sir. The system of electing officers as it prevails in this country, however, is not a prevailing system in China; but every village has its elders. The old men are the elders.

Q. What do you mean by elders?—A. The elders answer to something like what you might call a standing jury of persons to whom all cases are referred.

Q. Magistrates?—A. They are hardly appointed magistrates by law, and yet they do the duty of magistrates.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are they not more nearly referees, and then when they settle disputes there may be an appeal from them to the law?—A. The elders of a village are supposed to settle all small troubles in the community.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are their decrees binding in law?—A. They are binding in custom. I do not know whether the code recognizes these elders or not, but in custom the decrees of the elders are law.

Q. Are these elders a general institution in China, in all parts?—A. All over China; and they are generally composed of older men in districts or villages, but sometimes a younger man is chosen on account of superior ability or judgment.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Since this committee has been in session here have any outrages occurred in this city upon Chinamen?—A. I think I have noticed one or two; but I could not now tell the date.

Q. Do you remember one upon Merchant street?—A. I could not tell where it was. I remember noticing it in a paper and making the remark, "Here is one performance while the committee is here." I have seen so much of it that I got tired of noting it. I did for a while cut out scraps and made a large book of them.

Q. Do you remember one on Dupont street?—A. As I stated, I cannot remember any particular place, time, or occasion when one occurred. I remember reading one or two.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you read one in the Chronicle last week in which a China boy from Van Ness avenue was sent by his mistress to the butcher, and he was knocked down?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In comparing the Christian civilization with the Chinese, is not your opinion influenced somewhat by your own belief? Do you think the opinion of a Mussulman, for instance, would be the same as your own?—A. What do you mean?

Q. If a Mussulman were asked to say which civilization was superior, the Christian or the Confucian, would his opinion be necessarily the same as yours? In other words, is not your opinion in that respect caused by the fact that you yourself are a Christian?—A. I cannot tell. I should hope that I had a good many ideas different from a Mussul-

man. I should think that even a Mussulman, however, would recognize, on the whole, the civilization of the Christian religion to be higher and more progressive than the Chinese civilization. The Chinese civilization is not progressive; the Christian civilization is; and I think that is one of the grand differences between the two.

Q. Do you think the civilization taught by the Chinese code of morality, or induced by it, would compare with the civilization deduced from the Darwinian system?—A. I like Chinese civilization better.

Q. That would be better?—A. Yes.

Q. How does the Chinese literature compare in moral tone and tendency with the French?—A. I think that Chinese literature is better.

SOLOMON HEYDENFELDT sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. Nearly twenty-seven years.

Q. Were you at one time associate justice of the supreme court of this State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many years did you keep that position?—A. Five years.

Q. You are conversant with the various institutions of California, mining, manufacturing, and farming?—A. Tolerably, sir; practically from observation, &c.

Q. And with the Chinese question and legislation in reference to it?—A. I have been an observer of what has been going on for the last twenty-seven years.

Q. The committee are here to get information. I should like to have you detail your information as to the facts, if any, since the Chinese advent to California.—A. I think California owes its prosperity very much indeed to the industry of the Chinese who have come to this country. I think without them we would not have had our harbor filled with ships; we would not have had railroads crossing our mountains, and we would have been behind, probably, a great number of years. I think we would not have had as many white people here if the Chinese had not come.

Q. You think, then, that the Chinese who are among us have conduced to bring white people here and give white people homes and employment?—A. I do.

Q. As to the construction of this new railroad, the Southern Pacific, which is some 400 miles in length, would that have been built but for the Chinese, in your opinion?—A. I think not; and I have been assured so by those who are interested in completing it.

Q. It has opened a vast territory of farming-land to the immigration of this State?—A. It has.

Q. Do you think that the benefits of the Chinese among us have been wide-spread?—A. I do.

Q. How do you look upon the Chinese, as a class, for honesty, integrity, &c.?—A. I think they are the best laboring class we have among us.

Q. Do you think they compare favorably with other laboring classes?—A. I think they are the best we have.

Q. Have you been connected with any of these reclamation land companies as attorney or otherwise?—A. Yes; I was trustee and counsel for the Tide-land Reclamation Company from its organization for two or three years.

Q. It was considered years ago a hazardous thing to undertake the reclamation of those lands?—A. Very.

Q. Capital was rather diffident about taking hold of it?—A. Very; and is yet.

Q. There has been a large area of these lands reclaimed and brought into market?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What labor has been used to do that?—A. Chinese labor.

Q. Could they get white labor to do that work?—A. I imagine not. I do not see where it could have been obtained. I do not think that our white laborers would undertake it. They are generally in favor of undertaking something that is a good deal easier than that, and something that pays better.

Q. Do you think we have a surplus of labor in this State, either white or yellow —A. No, sir; I think there is employment enough for everybody.

Q. To what class of labor do we owe our present success in manufacturing?—A. I think to the Chinese, except founderies and such things as that.

Q. You think our farming interests, then, are far in advance of what they would have been except for the Chinese?—A. Very far.

Q. The Chinese are employed as domestic servants, farm-hands, and laborers pretty generally all over the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Irrespective of a man's political views?—A. Yes, sir; I have seen them in the various branches of industries, manufactories, gardens, farms, reclaiming lands, railroads, and almost every employment of the coarser kind.

Q. Mr. Swift was on the stand yesterday, after traveling over entire portions of this State, and stumping it as a politician, and he stated emphatically in substance that the people throughout the State everywhere, farmers, merchants, mechanics, laborers, are unanimous in opposition to Chinese immigration. What is your opinion upon that subject?—A. In my opinion, I think there is no prejudice against the Chinese on the part of native-born Americans, unless it is politicians, probably, office-seekers. I believe that the great prejudice against the Chinese originates among the foreign-born citizens.

Q. Then you think it is confined to a class?—A. I do. I do not mean to say that that is exclusively so, but I speak generally; and I think that is the truth.

Q. In your experience through the State and through the mines and in Nevada, you find Chinamen employed by almost every one, do you not?—A. Yes, sir; I find them everywhere on this coast where I have been, I think.

Q. Is not their character as domestic servants generally praised by every one of your acquaintance?—A. Yes; I have heard nothing to their disadvantage upon that score, nor indeed upon any other in regard to their labor. As far as concerns their industry and their frugality and fidelity and general intelligence and their cleanliness, I think those who have been in the habit of employing them and know something about them place them above the corresponding class of other people.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you lived on this coast?—A. Nearly twenty-seven years.

Q. Have you, by your profession, been brought in contact with the Chinese?—A. Sometimes.

Q. You have a general knowledge of their condition and habits?—A. I have observed a great deal of them since I have been in the State.

Q. What is your opinion of the unrestricted immigration of the Chi-

nese?—A. I will answer the question by stating in the first place that I am not in favor of the immigration of anybody to the United States. I think we have people enough for production and for progress. I am very much in favor of leaving some room for the descendants of the people we have; but if people will come we cannot help it; and if people will come I think it is as much to our advantage to have Chinese as any other people.

Q. Do you think it desirable that a limit should be fixed upon this immigration?—A. I do not; and I do not see how it can be done. If a mere matter of opinion is asked I do not see that it is possible for it to be done. I think that any attempt to make a proposal of that kind to the Chinese government would be an insult to that government in the eyes of all the world, if it would not be a disgrace to ourselves.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Suppose we attempt to limit the emigration from China, without the consent of the Chinese government, by simple legislation, how would that be regarded by the Chinese government?—A. I should say that it would be an infraction of the treaty. They would regard it, as a matter of course, as a breach of good faith.

Q. Would that be more or less an insult than asking them to abrogate the treaty on the subject?—A. I do not think that there is much difference. That is getting rather too far below a good system of ethics for comparison.

Q. Would such legislation be in compliance with the treaty or in violation of the clause which secures to them the same rights which the subjects of other nations enjoy?—A. It would be a violation unquestionably.

Q. You are familiar with the legislation of this State?—A. Tolerably familiar.

Q. Has the legislation of this State been impartial as between the Chinese and our own people or the immigrants from other countries?—A. I do not recollect any distinctive differences of sufficient importance to remark upon. There have been some ordinances probably of the city which, while general in their character, have been aimed more particularly at the Chinese on account of their peculiar habits, customs, &c.

Q. Do you remember whether at any time in the legislation of this State there was a tax imposed upon every Chinaman who landed here?—A. There was a tax imposed upon all foreign passengers coming here in vessels. That was probably intended for the Chinese, as they were almost all the foreign passengers who arrived.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Perhaps it would be more satisfactory to produce the law.—A. It was a general law. It was not pointed directly to the Chinese.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You spoke about the legal difficulty of inhibiting them by legislation. If in legislative judgment the immigration of any people is regarded as injurious, do you doubt the power of the Government to inhibit that immigration by legislation?—A. The Government has power to do anything it can fight for. If it has army and navy enough it has the power to do anything.

Q. I speak of constitutional power. Is there any constitutional inhibition against it?—A. There is no constitutional inhibition on the part of the United States, unless you would consider that having a consti-

tution, and being ranked among the civilized people of the world, our Government is bound by the law of nations.

Q. Has not the Government the power to prevent immigration of any kind that would be injurious to our people, as, for instance, paupers, criminals, &c.?—A. Yes, sir; unquestionably.

Q. And it exercises that power even to the prohibition of the landing of diseased cattle from other countries?—A. Yes, of course.

Q. Then if, in the legislative judgment, Chinese immigration should be regarded as hurtful, you do not question the power of the Government to inhibit it by legislation?—A. It unquestionably has the power.

Q. And if that was their judgment, it would be proper legislation, would it not?—A. Yes.

Q. In answer to the broad question which the chairman propounded to you, reserving any consideration of your general views about comparisons of immigration, are you or are you not of the opinion that unrestricted Chinese immigration is desirable to California?—A. As I said before, I do not think any foreign immigration is desirable to California.

Q. Then your reply is that unrestricted immigration is not desirable?—A. Unrestricted immigration of any sort.

Q. I ask you in regard to the Chinese?—A. I speak of Chinese or Europeans. I would not confine my answer to the Chinese alone, because I look upon them as just as good as the laboring people of Europe or of the United States.

Q. Do you believe that the enlarged immigration of Chinese would or would not improve the morals of our people?—A. I do not think it would have any bad effect upon the morals of the people.

Q. An unlimited immigration would not?—A. O, no.

Q. Suppose that we have a million of people upon the coast, and you add two millions of Chinese, do you think that would be calculated to have a good effect upon our young generation and upon our general civilization?—A. I think our people would take care of themselves. I think the Chinese, who are an imitative and progressive race, and learn very rapidly, would conform themselves to our habits, our views, and our ideas. They would adopt our civilization instead of dragging us into a semi-barbarous civilization.

Q. Has your mind ever been directed to the parallel between the condition of this country to-day with its broad acreage unoccupied, fruitful soil, climate, and the desirableness of labor, and cheap labor, in comparison with that which was the condition of Virginia two hundred years and more ago, when it had the same inducements to produce labor?—A. Yes.

Q. How do you carry the parallel?—A. I do not think the parallel holds at all.

Q. And why?—A. Because we have enough people here to protect ourselves. We have the whole United States, with 40,000,000 people, at our back.

Q. You say to protect ourselves. Had not Virginia the same protection?—A. No; she had internal foes. She was surrounded by Indian tribes who were all the time making incursions upon her white settlements; her frontiers were sparsely settled. Virginia had not population enough for protection, and certainly not enough for rapid progress.

Q. Do you understand that African importation was for the purpose of physical protection to the planter of Virginia?—A. To some extent.

Q. Had it any elements of that character in it?—A. There is no doubt of that. It increased the white population, and it made the country prosper by their labor. It produced a greater increase of whites.

Q. Then there was the same argument in favor of the introduction of slaves to Virginia as there is in favor of the introduction of Chinese to California?—A. I do not say that there was any argument in favor of the introduction of slaves, particularly as slaves, but there was the same argument in favor of the introduction of people who would work.

Q. I ask you if there was the same argument in favor of the introduction of Africans at that time as there is now in favor of the introduction of Chinese?—A. I have no doubt of it. I do not say, however, that I want Chinese; I do not say there is any argument in favor of their introduction. I do not say that we want any addition to our population. I utterly repudiate the idea of immigration societies and exaggerated efforts for the purpose of bringing in vagabonds from abroad.

Q. If immigration is to come, do you think there is no choice in the character of the immigration; in other words, are European families not better than the people who come from China?—A. Not a particle better.

Q. Do they not assimilate with us soon?—A. Hardly. Give the Chinese a chance and I think they will assimilate with us.

Q. That chance would embrace the elective franchise?—A. Certainly.

Q. Would you be in favor of giving the franchise to the Chinese the same as to European immigrants?—A. Unquestionably. If the one is entitled to it I would give it to the other; and if the negro is entitled to it, I do not see why it should not be given to the Chinese.

Q. Then you regard the Chinaman as equal in all respects to the European immigrants?—A. I see no reason why he is not equal.

Q. Is the Chinaman equal in his civilization and morals?—A. In every respect.

Q. In every constituent that goes to form a State?—A. I think the Chinese would make very valuable citizens. I think if you would give them a chance they would very soon acquire our language and become identified with us; they would become homogeneous; they would intermarry with us and make the best sort of citizens.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The cry used to be "Would you have your daughter marry a negro?" I was going to ask you, in the same sense, would you have your daughter marry a Chinaman?—A. I do not see why the Chinese should not intermarry. I think if you will look at the question practically, as a question of providing for family by industry and frugality, and in regard to that kindness and consideration which is due to a woman, that the Chinamen would make better husbands than usually fall to the lot of our poor girls.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In speaking of the homogeneity of the two races, let me ask you if you were in favor of slavery?—A. When it existed I was in favor of it.

Q. You believed it was a beneficent and desirable institution?—A. We had it; we found it among us; and I was, as a matter of course, for making the best of it.

Q. You were in favor of keeping it?—A. Yes.

Q. In the crossing of races between the African and the white race, what has been the effect; I mean what sort of a race has it produced, in your opinion, ethnologically?—A. I do not think it has produced any race at all.

Q. Is it not the tendency of such an admixture to die out?—A. That has been observed to be the case.

Q. Would not that be likely to be the case with intercommunication between the Chinese and our race?—A. That I do not know. That would have to be tested by experience alone. There are more points of similarity, however, between us and the Chinese than there are between us and the negro.

Q. As between the naturalized citizen, the white laborer of California I embrace the whole laboring population and the Chinese laborer, you would not be willing to have any legislation that would favor the one to the prejudice of the other?—A. I would not.

Q. You would put them all upon an equal plane?—A. Thoroughly equal.

Q. What is your opinion with reference to the introduction of very large numbers, we will say, as Mr. Loomis fixed it the other day, eight million Chinamen to one million whites upon this coast, assuming that we have one million people here and eight million Chinamen are brought here. Do you think our civilization superior to theirs, preliminarily? A. You can always put an extreme case. As a matter of course such an excess of Chinese as that might breed harm. Extremes, however do not prove anything.

Q. When you regard four hundred millions of people, the occupants of China, as against the forty millions only who inhabit our empire, how does that strike your mind?—A. I do not think that all the ships which could be employed could bring over as many Chinamen in a year as our natural increase of population.

Q. Then to the extent that the mercantile and marine navy of the world could be used for that purpose, it would be desirable to bring Chinese here?—A. No, I did not say that. My doctrine is that it is entirely undesirable to bring anybody here. If they choose to come, we cannot help it; and when they do come, let us treat them all alike.

Q. They are all entitled to the same treatment?—A. Exactly, as man and brother.

Q. With the same rights?—A. The same rights.

Q. You believe, then, in the unrestricted doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man?—A. On political questions, undoubtedly.

Q. And socially, too, as you want them to marry our white girls?—A. Social questions regulate themselves. No man is obliged to go into any society that he does not want to enter.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Your profession is that of a lawyer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been on the bench in this State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The supreme bench?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that?—A. From 1852 to 1857.

Q. From your acquaintance with the population of California of all kinds, making a general comparison, how does the morality and the behavior of the Chinese here contrast with the morality and behavior of an equal number of immigrants from Europe?—A. Taking the classes that we have here before us, the Chinese are something better; I think that they are more faithful, more reliable, and more intelligent.

Q. What is their general character in regard to industry?—A. I think that they have more industry than the corresponding class of whites.

Q. How do they compare in regard to keeping contracts; in their fidelity to engagements?—A. I think they are thoroughly reliable and perfectly faithful to their engagements.

Q. What is the character of Chinese merchants for ability and for

integrity?—A. Practically and in detail, probably, I am less acquainted with their little commercial trading than I am with the ordinary labors which are pursued by the Chinese generally; but as far as reputation goes they have an exceedingly good reputation here, especially the higher class of merchants. I have indeed heard no complaints against any of them in relation to unfair dealing. I have heard no charges brought against them at all as merchants.

Q. What do you think would be the effect upon the Chinese as a class if our laws should be so altered as to admit them to citizenship?—A. I think that, comparatively speaking, a good many would accept it and be very willing to undertake the duties of a citizen. I think that they understand, probably, our institutions as well as our ordinary, ignorant class of whites understand them. They understand substantially the first element of our institutions, that all men are equal before the law.

Q. You think they understand that?—A. They understand that most essentially.

Q. If they were admitted to citizenship, would it increase the tendency to assimilation?—A. I think so. It always will increase that tendency whenever people are treated with the proper degree of courtesy and regard. If the Chinese were allowed to vote, I have no doubt that they would receive much more attention and courtesy from white people than they receive now. A great many probably would coalesce with Chinese who now avoid them, and possibly are inimical to them.

Q. How does the number of Chinese business men, merchants, manufacturers, those who employ others, and who may be said to be business men, compare with the business men among European immigrants, taking man for man?—A. I cannot answer that question. It would require a good deal of thought and probably some statistical information, which I have not at hand.

Q. I am asking your general impression?—A. I do not think I have any particular impression about it. There are large numbers of both classes engaged in ordinary commercial trading, retail business. Our corners are occupied almost everywhere with Germans who keep little grocery-shops, saloons, and little trading-shops of different kinds, as well as dry-goods shops. A large number of foreigners are engaged in that kind of business here. The Chinese business I suppose is occupied with about as many commercial traders as supply the wants of the Chinese inhabitants. They have no customers among the whites, I take it, as far as I know.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You refer to the small traders?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How is it with the larger traders?—A. Of that I cannot speak, either. I suppose the number would be governed pretty much by the same rules, although the large importing merchants no doubt have a large custom among all classes.

Q. They have an American trade?—A. Yes, sir; I presume so.

Q. What ability do the Chinese display to manage a large mercantile or manufacturing business?—A. I cannot speak of that, except merely to judge from results, and I should suppose that they keep at their business; it gives the appearance of success to them.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. There are contractors among them?—A. There are contractors among them for large works, such as reclamations, &c. That I am

familiar with. They show a great deal of executive ability. A contractor will undertake, for instance, to build a levee, and furnish so many hands, keep them employed, &c., and engage to do the work in a certain time. In the management and conduct of his business the Chinaman will show a great deal of executive ability.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How does the intellectual ability of the Chinaman, so far as your observation enables you to judge, compare with that of Americans in the same corresponding class?—A. I think their general intelligence is greater. My impression is, from my information and observation, that there are very few Chinamen of the ordinary laboring class who cannot read and write their own language. In my intercourse with them I find them always quick to understand and very quick to appreciate. They exhibit also a ready intelligence, much more so than you will generally find among the ordinary laboring class of whites.

Q. What is the general knowledge or comprehension of the Chinese of the character of our institutions and the nature of our government?—A. It would be very hard to say. It is a subject that they never speak upon at all; and, if they are ever addressed in regard to it, it is in the most general manner, relating to the administration of the law or something of that kind. They recognize perfectly that each man is equal before the law, and that there is a redress for every wrong; and they understand also that if they fail to get the redress it is from the lack of evidence, or from the lack of catching the culprit. They understand that our courts are conducted in the most judicious manner for the purpose of ascertaining what is right and what is wrong. Those ideas I have derived from occasionally having interviews with them, where they have had business with the courts.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In your intercourse with these people whom you have employed have you had an opportunity of forming an opinion as to whether they are under the control of any masters, or are they independent men, acting for themselves?—A. I can only answer that by saying it never seemed to me that they are controlled. I do not know whether they are or not.

Q. Did those employed by you act for themselves?—A. Yes.

Q. Independently?—A. Yes, in engaging them as servants for the various employments they seemed to act for themselves. In making contracts for the reclamation of swamp-lands, that is generally done through contractors. One Chinaman, a man generally of considerable intelligence will make the contract, understand it, and live up to it. He employs the Chinamen who do the work. Whether he would have any control over them, whether they belonged to him, or whether they were perfectly free, I do not know.

Q. If they become dissatisfied, do they consult their own pleasure about leaving, or do they act under anybody else?—A. They always consult their own pleasure where they are domestic servants, cooks, or anything of that kind. I have employed some, and they have left on Saturday without asking leave of anybody else, or without consulting anybody else, so far as I knew.

Q. What is the condition of commerce between the United States and China, and how has it been, or may it be, affected by the Chinese immigration? Can you answer that question?—A. It is rather too speculative. I do not think I will undertake to answer.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. It has been the custom here somewhat to ask witnesses their politics. What are your politics?—A. I am a democrat.

Rev. OTIS GIBSON, recalled.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. Have you read a book entitled "Confucius and the Chinese Classics, or Readings in Chinese Literature, edited and compiled by Rev. A. W. Loomis?"—Answer. No, sir. I have read the work by Dr. Legge, a larger work.

Q. Is Dr. Loomis a good authority upon Chinese matters?—A. Very good.

Q. Is he good authority upon Chinese literature and the writings of Confucius?—A. Very good.

Senator SARGENT. As some question was raised about the teachings of Confucius as it bore upon the future state of man, on page 51 of Dr. Loomis's work, under the head of "Life of Confucius," it is stated:

> The leading features of the philosophy of Confucius are, subordination to superiors, and kind, upright dealing with our fellow-men; destitute of all reference to an unseen power to whom all men are accountable, they look only to this world for their sanctions, and make the monarch himself only partially amenable to a higher tribunal.

Again, on page 61:

> The remarks of Confucius upon religious subjects were very few; he never taught the duty of man to any higher power than the head of the state or family, though he supposed himself commissioned by heaven to restore the doctrines and usages of the ancient kings. He admitted that he did not understand much about the gods, that they were beyond and above the comprehension of man, and that the obligations of man lay rather in doing his duty to his relatives and society than in worshiping spirits unknown. "Not knowing even life," said he, "how can we know death?" and when his disciples asked him, in his last illness, whom he should sacrifice to, he said "he had already worshiped."
>
> Wise and learned as was Confucius, and with all his abstruse discussions about the Tai Kik, the Yin and the Yang, and the Chung Yung, he knew less about the world he lived in than the merest child who has learned that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth;" and as to what might lie beyond the present life, all was unknown.
>
> He instructed kings, but his teachings lacked that element which once caused a Roman governor to tremble when the great apostle to the gentiles, though a prisoner in chains, reasoned before him concerning those subjects which constituted the distinctive doctrine of his faith.

ALFRED WHEELER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am an attorney at law.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?—A. Twenty-seven years this month.

Q. Are you a real-estate owner?—A. Yes, sir; and have been always since I have been here.

Q. What business have you been engaged in besides the practice of the law?—A. I have been engaged in farming and in mining, and in the practice of the law; those have been my chief pursuits.

Q. To what extent have you been a farmer and land-owner in this State?—A. I have been a land-owner to a large extent in the vicinity of this city. Do you mean in the extent of acres, &c.?

Q. Yes.—A. I own several thousand acres of land.

Q. I will ask you to cast your eye over the questions proposed by the committee, and give your views in your own words, so far as they come within the sphere of your observation.—A. The first question which I see here is as to the numbers of Chinese in California. I perhaps would

state some results of my own investigations in regard to that matter. I have been frequently led to note what seemed to me erroneous computations upon that subject in the various papers; and, more especially, three years ago my attention was called to the subject at the time of the agitation of the same question in San Francisco with regard to the immigration of Chinese. I took then the pains to investigate at the custom-house the numbers of Chinese who had arrived in and departed from the State for the previous twenty years. I wrote a few articles at that time, voluntarily, for the press.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. When did you make that investigation?—A. That was in 1873. I have not followed it up since, but the custom-house statistics can be readily furnished since, so as to add to what I then prepared. I cut out to bring with me the data which I furnished at that time, and which was then published, and was not refuted. It had been alleged then that there was a very large number of Chinese in the State. The subject was one of such interest that I thought it worthy of getting at the accurate facts; so that, upon making this investigation, I produced the actual arrivals and departures of the Chinese into the State, from 1853 down to 1873, showing each year's actual result—the net gain or the net loss of Chinamen. I found that, in five years of that period of time, there was an actual diminution there; that more Chinese departed than arrived in five separate years. In the other years there were more arrived than departed. The sum total of arrivals up to 1873, including the first quarter of that year, was 135,399, and the total departures were 60,909, leaving an actual gain in the State of 74,490 Chinamen, without including deaths and without including the departures eastward; that is, in round numbers, a little less than 75,000 up to 1873. A great many of them, of course, passed inland, and may have returned to this State again. Of course I could make no count of that. Many die. The percentage of deaths in this city is about 2 per annum of the white population. I presume it is fully as much of the Chinese. If it is, the percentage of deaths of each year should be deducted from that 74,000, which would leave a ratio of actual departures from the State eastward in order to get at an actual knowledge of what number of Chinamen there were in 1873 who had arrived in the State. I did not go into those figures because I had no data; but that was the result at that time; since then, for the last three years, I presume, the immigration of Chinese into this State—I have seen the figures but have them not in my mind now—has kept pace with the immigration of whites; that is, about the same percentage of Chinese immigration as preceded; so that, at this date, there would, probably, in my opinion, be 90,000 Chinamen within the State proper.

Q. Do you mean within this State, or on this coast?—A. I should say on this coast, because all that come here spread in every direction. They go to Nevada, Utah, and some of them have gone east.

Q. State whether there are any arrivals of Chinamen from Hong-Kong or China at any other port than this, and to what extent?—A. None that I have heard of, except there may be a few that have gone to the northern ports at British Columbia and Oregon; I do not know as to that; but not to the ports in the State of California. Again, upon that subject of immigration, I listened to Mr. Pixley's suggestions to Judge Heydenfeldt in regard to the immense number of immigrants. I think upon all those subjects we take unnecessary alarm. There is al-

ways a proportion betwixt supply and demand for everything. As labor is required it is supplied. If it is not required it is not supplied. The transportation of a million Chinamen to California involves the necessity of a thousand ships bringing a thousand men each; that makes a million. A thousand ships to go to China and to come back here with Chinamen must have something else to do besides merely bringing back a load of Chinamen and going back empty. Commerce regulates immigration as well almost as the demand for labor does. When we count ten millions of Chinamen to come here, that is ten thousand ships; that number does not exist in the world in the business of commerce. I do not know what the cost of a Chinaman's passage to this country is, but it must be large enough to pay a ship to do that business alone, otherwise she could not do it, and there must be great inducement for labor here if it can pay a large passage-money.

Q. According to the estimate that you have just submitted of Chinese immigrants, the general opinion of the community is hardly exaggerated as to the number?—A. As to the number, it is because people do not generally go into statistics. They see a great many Chinamen in the city and they guess there are a hundred thousand of them, and they imagine that if 400,000,000 would come here they would cover us all up; and they do not look at the impracticability of the thing at all. If we have less than a hundred thousand in the State after 25 years of immigration, that is 4,000 a year. If we are to go on at the proportion of 100,000 for every 25 years it would take 250 years for a million to come here. The probabilities are, however, that they could come here faster in future as the white population increases. The one will always regulate the other.

Q. What is your largest estimate of the number of Chinese who have come to this coast?—A. Over and above those that departed?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Less than a hundred thousand.

Q. From the time of the first settlement of California?—A. Yes, sir. I would suggest, in order to get at these facts, that the committee engage Mr. Gray, who is connected with the custom-house, to furnish, with some other gentlemen from that quarter, the actual statistics since 1873. These are accurate, as I have carefully examined them, and I published them at the time, in 1873. They have never been controverted, and I am certain the figures there stated are to be relied upon. It was a matter of a day or two days' labor.

Q. Are those figures taken from the books of the custom-house?—A. No, sir. I went to the custom-house and was referred by the collector of the port at the time, to whom I applied, to the San Francisco Commercial Herald, a paper which gives the weekly statistics of the port, publishing all through this entire period every week the arrivals and departures as well as the commercial statistics. I took a file of that paper as far back as 1850 and went through every week's arrivals and departures of Chinese and of whites also and carried it down to date. I spent several days in the office over the matter.

Q. Would the books of the custom-house show these statistics?—A. They would now show it, because they have kept a record since of passenger-arrivals more carefully than they did in early days.

Q. Is there any record here showing the whole number of arrivals from the beginning?—A. I do not think there is, except the Commercial Herald, which has been published for a long time here, indeed from the beginning.

Q. That is regarded as good authority?—A. It is good authority in

the opinion of all the merchants; it is used by them as a matter of record and reference.

Q. You have no doubt, then, of the accuracy of your statement?—A. No, sir; none whatever. It was prepared for the purpose of being accurate, and I presume it is. There is another fact which, in this same connection, I might properly state. I observed, in getting these facts, that during six or seven months of the year, that is, from February to October, there has been an increase of the arrivals over the departures, and from October to February there has been an increase of departures over arrivals. There is a flood-tide in and out to and from California of Chinese in those two periods of the year, and that has always been the case. In noticing that fact from the figures I made inquiry of Mr. Otis, now dead, who was then mayor of this city, as well as from other gentlemen in the Chinese trade, as to the cause. They informed me that the Chinese came to California at the period of the year when our greatest demand for labor exists, the harvest season, in the expectation of getting work gathering the harvest, that being the period when there is more demand for labor than at any other period of the year; and that those who were about to return to China always chose the period of the year when they could reach home and enjoy the Chinese new year, which comes in February, and that, induced by the desire to enjoy the Chinese new year, they leave in our fall season when the weather is propitious and the chief part of the work of the season is over.

Q. What is your observation in regard to the return of Chinamen to this country who have been here and gone home? What number come here the second time?—A. I have never made any note or observation of that fact.

Q. There are a good many who come back after having returned to China?—A. A good many come back. I have had Chinamen in my employ who have left me to go to China, and who told me when they left that they were going home to see their parents and come back again; but those were only a few isolated cases.

Q. State your opinion in regard to the effect which the presence of Chinamen has had upon the progress and growth of the State of California.—A. I think that the immigration of Chinese has been vastly beneficial to the growth of California, and I think it is greatly beneficial to every white man, woman, and child in the State. I think the white laborers of the State are vastly benefited by that immigration instead of hurt by it. If I did not think Chinese immigration beneficial to white labor I should feel much more inclined to consider that it ought not to be encouraged, because it is not from any humanitarian point of view or friendliness or affection for the Chinese that I think we ought, by any means, to encourage their immigration. If it can be shown that it is beneficial to the white laborer, the white laborer ought to be taught to see that fact and made to understand that he is working against his own interest when he attempts to shut the door against Chinese immigration.

Q. Does the presence of Chinese labor here increase or diminish the demand for white labor?—A. It greatly increases it. It has opened avenues to white labor which never would have existed but for it. That can be illustrated in a dozen matters.

Q. State whether, in your opinion, there is any plethora of labor on this coast.—A. I can hardly answer the question; the men now connected more particularly with the field of labor, who are giving employment, would be better judges upon that subject. I do not see that there is any plethora of labor here. There are certain seasons of the year,

during the gathering of the harvest, when we must have an immense amount of labor, but that is only temporary. That lasts but three months. Then there is a very greatly diminished demand for labor throughout the rest of the year. For that reason we require a class of labor in that season of the year which must be idle the rest of the time. There is not work in this State for all the laborers during the winter and during the spring who can find employment during the harvest season. It takes a few men to plow and put in grain, as that is done with gang-plows, plowing ten acres a day with one team and one man. One man with a seed-sower will sow twenty acres a day. But when you come to reap the harvest and bind the grain, and gather and thresh it, there are large gangs of men required. In consequence of that demand we must have an immense number of men during the summer months who necessarily can find but little to do during the rest of the year. We have been getting those men from China, and they go away in the fall, just as formerly in England they got their labor from Ireland to go over into England to help harvest and gather hay, and when that was over they went back.

Q. You must have a greater amount of labor for certain periods which cannot be used at certain times?—A. Yes, sir. To be sure, there is a demand for labor all the year around, but not to that extent.

Q. State whether, in your judgment, the presence of the Chinese here deprives white men of their labor?—A. Of course, in answering that question, a man can readily see that a Chinaman who makes a pair of boots, makes a pair of boots that a white man might make if the opportunity were afforded him, if it would pay him to make it; but when you come to consider the fields of labor in which the Chinamen chiefly operate, and see the door for white labor opened which otherwise would be closed, I can understand that Chinese labor makes great facility and furnishes many opportunities for white labor. As, for instance, the Central Pacific Railroad have in building their roads used the Chinamen to grade the road, to use the pick and shovel at the wages of a dollar a day. They could not have got anybody else to do that work, and the road would not have been built but for the Chinese. If it had not been for the five or ten thousand Chinamen who were employed in building that road, there would not have been a demand for the ties, which were made by white labor; for the bridges and culverts, made by white labor; for the stations and depots, built by white labor; for the railroad iron, the cars, the engines, every branch of business which followed, all being done by white labor; and now the road is run and carried on for all time by white men, furnishing a field for white labor. Then, by laying a foundation for that superstructure by means of Chinese labor, there is a door opened for white men always. The same thing applies to any other branch of business in the State. Take the making of boots and shoes. Before we had much Chinese labor here, or any manufacture of them, or other manufactures in the State, we imported mostly from Massachusetts. The money of California went out of the State to contribute to the manufacturers of Massachusetts, and every man paid a hundred per cent. more for the boots and shoes that he wore in this State, and for the blankets that he used, than he pays to-day. The 750,000 or 1,000,000 men in California must pay the 500 or 1,000 shoemakers in the State double price for boots and shoes, or pay it to Massachusetts, or let the boots and shoes be manufactured by cheaper labor, in which case the greatest good is done to the greatest number. Every man now gets his boots and shoes for less money than he could get them by having to pay it to boot and shoe makers in the white trade.

In addition to that, by encouraging the manufacture of boots and shoes in this State, we give use for our own leather; we encourage our own tanneries; we encourage the raising and production of hides. In our woolen mills it is the same; we give encouragement to the production of wool; we use white labor in carrying on the industry in every way, except in the simple manipulation of the wool by Chinese. The white laborer is able to get everything he buys cheaper to-day because the Chinese are here, and every man who lives in the State to-day would have to pay twice as much for living, if we had no Chinese, as he does to-day. The same is true of the food he eats, the luxuries of life, the various melons and fruits of every sort. The white man gets his flour cheap, because we have cheap labor to raise wheat; he get his boots, shoes, and clothing cheap, because these are made here by cheap labor. In fact, the white laborer of California has got the most blessed spot in the Union in which to live, and live well and cheaply."

Q. What is your observation of the general morality and behavior of the Chinese population as compared with an equal number of other people of the same class?—A. I have only observed them in such individual cases as have come under my particular notice.

Q. I am only asking you for your observation here.—A. I have found them a pacific, mild, and gentle people, so far as I have had a limited experience with them. Those who have been in my employ as domestic servants I have always found extremely subordinate and respectful, quiet, attentive, and rather avoiding difficulties, in such cases as I have seen, than seeking them. They are conscious, evidently, of the prejudice existing against them. The children of the community are disposed to pelt them with stones, and they avoid the opportunity. I have seen them go around a block rather than pass by four or five boys whom they thought might stone them; not because they personally feared those boys, but they did not want to be subjected to the annoyance.

Q. What do you know about their provoking conflicts or insults?—A. I never saw them provoke any one. I saw a well-dressed Chinaman the other day going up Third street in a car with an American hat on. The car window was open, and three or four urchins were on the street. One of the fellows, thirteen or fourteen years of age, ran out into the street, reached his hand into the window, snatched the hat, and ran down the street. The Chinaman looked out amazed; nobody stopped the boy, and the Chinaman remained in his seat.

Q. What is their general character for industry?—A. Those who have had them in their employ have always given the highest indorsement of them as an industrious, hard-working people. I have never seen them working in any very large gangs, except in the cut on the other side of Mission Bay, on the Southern Pacific Railroad. I was there a few times and looked to see the progress of that work, being somewhat interested in its advancement, and for other reasons. There I have seen three, four, and five hundred of them working like bees, digging, grading, and working as industriously as white men could work.

Q. What is their comparative skill in the various employments as compared with white people?—A. I can only speak from general information from gentlemen who have employed them. Mr. Seby, who had them in his smelting-works at North Beach, and Colonel Fry, who is connected with the Mission Woolen Mills, and some gentlemen with factories here in the city with whom I have talked on the subject, all speak of them as being expert, ingenious, and capable men in all the branches of business in which they are placed.

Q. What is your opinion as to the propriety of restricting Chinese

immigration in any method that might be agreed upon?—A. There are some questions that might be considered by statesmen upon that point in regard to which, probably, I would hardly be able to give an answer, questions of social science; as, for instance, whether the Chinese, as a race, are a people that can become homogeneous and amalgamate with the American people, and blend with them; and, again, whether it is desirable that we should have any race come among us that cannot be homogeneous. Then I would consider whether or not we might afford to lay aside and sacrifice the material advantages that we get from their presence to these social questions. Leaving those two questions out of view, and looking at it only in a material aspect, as to whether it is beneficial to the industries, prosperity, and wealth of the country, I consider that the immigration is advantageous.

Q. If our laws permitted them to become citizens and members of the body-politic, what, in your judgment, would be the effect upon the Chinese so far as assimilation is concerned?—A. The experiment, then, would undoubtedly be more easily tested. One of the greatest prejudices now existing against the Chinese, probably, independent of their rivalry as laborers to certain classes, is that their dress and manners are peculiar, and that they retain those individual characteristics which make them obnoxious. The Japanese come here and dress as we do. Although the Japanese has a face similar to that of the Chinaman, yet he cuts his hair short and wears an American dress, and you never see one of them in the street stoned or hooted at. I think a great deal of the prejudice against the Chinese arises upon that ground. If the Chinese would dress as we do, and mingle freely with our people, and if they had not been driven into a corner by themselves, as they are, for protection, they might become homogeneous, and become citizens. Upon that subject I have hardly formed a determined opinion of my own. I have thought on the subject; but I consider it a very delicate question, and one of that nature which requires the reflection of persons of more experience than I have had, and more observation than I have given to the matter.

Q. What is your observation in regard to their intelligence?—A. They are very bright and intelligent as workmen, as much so as anybody.

Q. In business how are they?—A. In business I think they are exceedingly sharp as tradesmen. In fact they have the reputation with all who have known them in China, with whom I have talked, and by all who deal with them here, as being sharp men of business, but true to their obligations. Mr. Otis had transactions with hundreds of Chinese merchants in this city, and he told me that in all the transactions he had had with them he had yet to find the first Chinaman who violated any pledge or promise of any kind. They keep their obligations, he said, with most remarkable exactness.

Q. Do you consider them intellectually capable of comprehending our institutions?—A. I am hardly able to answer the question, not having had sufficient intercourse with them.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you examined the statistics taken from the Commercial Herald and from the Alta's report for nine months of this year of the arrival and departure of passengers by sea and by rail?—A. I do not know anything about the correctness of those statistics, because I have not examined them; but I have here the number of arrivals of passengers over departures for six years to 1875, being 212,000. That in-

cludes, I suppose, Chinese and all. There was a gain in 1875 of 44,937, and by sea of 21,000; that is, whites and Chinese.

Q. A gain of 65,000 in the year 1875?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are there any more of the printed questions of the committee that you wish to make remarks upon?—A. I should like to answer this question: "Do the Chinese prevent the immigration of white labor to this coast from Europe and from the Eastern States?" I have seen it stated, but am not able to form any opinion upon that subject myself, that the prices of labor East are less than the prices paid to Chinese labor here. Consequently I cannot understand that the Chinese labor in this State would prevent the influx of eastern labor.

Q. In regard to the immigration from the East of the white population for the last three or four years, has it been on the increase or on the decrease?—A. Very much on the increase since the completion of the Pacific Railroad.

Q. What has been the effect of the completion of the railroad down the San Joaquin and the Salinas Plains, and to Los Angeles?—A. I have not traveled over the road, but by general reputation I know it has largely settled up that country, and has brought a great many farms into operation, and introduced a great many families there.

Q. During these last years in which the Chinese immigration has increased, has it kept pace in increase with the white population?—A. In its proportion?

Q. Yes.—A. I presume that it has. I presume that was the case until this last season. Up to the present season, from the best of my recollection, the Chinese immigration has increased in the last three years; that is, the arrivals over and above the departures have been greater than any previous years, just as the white immigration has been greater than it ever has been before.

Q. Do you know anything about the facility of obtaining white servants to go into the country?—A. I know that it is a very difficult matter. I am told by those who reside in the country permanently, or at specific seasons of the year, that they find very great difficulty in finding domestic servants who are willing to go to the country.

Q. Have you had any experience of that yourself?—A. I have not, because I have not had my family living in the country where the employment of domestics was required.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You think that immigration to a country like California is governed by the supply and demand of labor entirely?—A. Not entirely; in California somewhat by the facilities and the expense of getting here.

Q. Do you not think that the attraction of our unoccupied country, our broad domain and our climate, our peculiar productions and fertilities, is calculated to bring a larger supply of labor than the immediate demand for it?—A. It might for a season; but whenever laborers find they cannot get employment, although attracted by a fine climate, we are a people of correspondence, and they inform friends and relatives and kindred at home of the difficulties of getting employment, and that will very soon stop an increase of immigration.

Q. You speak of the cost of coming here; you have also spoken of the unlimited numbers of population in China, supposed to be, for the purposes of this interrogatory, about four hundred million Chinese

against about forty millions of our own people. Do you know what is really the cost of passage-money from the port of Hong-Kong to the port of San Francisco?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know the fact that it has been as low as $12 during the times of steamship rivalry?—A. I know there has been a very great variation in the price at different times. When vessels were bound here for wheat, coming *en route* from Liverpool to China, and thence here, having no cargoes to this port, or but a small cargo, probably they have taken Chinamen at lower rates than sailing-vessels.

Q. Do you know that the general passage on a vessel from Hong Kong to San Francisco is $30?—A. I do not.

Q. You know that generally it is about that?—A. I should suppose so.

Q. Do you know that the price of transportation of an immigrant from Chicago to San Francisco is about sixty-five dollars?—A. Not so much, I guess, from Chicago.

Q. First class, $112, besides sleeping-cars; second class, $65?—A. Yes, sir; or rather $60 for immigrants from Chicago.

Q. Then if it costs $60 to come from Chicago, which is a central place of our country, and only $30 to come from Hong-Kong, is not the inducement of passage-money much stronger for the Chinese than it is for our own people, and are not the possibilities of immigration greater from China than from the East?—A. I do not know that that is true necessarily. The Chinaman comes here to get work in the harvest season chiefly, and I do not suppose he has a certainty of employment. We know they go back; we see by the statistics that almost as many go back as come here.

Q. Is there not this difference between the two classes of immigrants, that the Chinese come here to get summer employment and go back?—A. Many Chinese come here and get summer employment, and then go back.

Q. What is the rule in reference to the immigrant who comes from east of the Rocky Mountains?—A. He comes here to remain.

Q. And to become a permanent citizen?—A. He does, and in that respect he is more desirable than the Chinese. I have always considered that a white immigrant, all things else being considered, is far better for us than a Chinese immigrant.

Q. You spoke of the number of Chinese returning as about one-third those who come here. I think your figures show that, and I believe that is about the fact. About one-third return of those who come; they come and go?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You also spoke of the difficulties in the way of the marine tonnage of the world accommodating this immigration. The cost of the passage, then, being $30, and the capacity of a first-class clipper-ship, we will say, being 1,200 passengers, (it varies from ten to fifteen hundred,) a single cargo would produce in passage-money $36,000, would it not, at $30 each, there being 1,200 passengers?—A. At that rate, yes, sir.

Q. Could not that ship make two passages in a year?—A. I suppose so.

Q. Then that would be twice $36,000? The ship would carry back, in the course of a year, $12,000, would it not?—A. Eight hundred.

Q. They obtain $36,000 for a single passage of the ship, and the return of that ship would carry back one-third as much, or $12,000 in emigrant passage-money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That would amount to $48,000 to that ship coming and going?—A. It would.

Q. Suppose that ship makes two trips a year; that would be twice that amount; in other words, $96,000 passage-money for the two voyages of the year?—A. No, it would not.

Q. Why not? Regarding the expenses of that passage, do not the Chinese supply themselves on board the emigrant-ship?—A. I do not know how that is.

Q. You would not be surprised if I state it to be the fact that they do cook and supply their own rice and food on the voyage?—A. I would not question it at all.

Q. Then the ship would make gross, $96,000; the net, of course, would be the sum remaining after deducting its expenses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That would be an inducement for the merchant-marine to engage in that trade?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the supply of ships is practically unlimited if they could get that employment?—A. There could be ships built to pursue that trade, I suppose.

Q. Are there not ships existing now, taking the navies of the world?—A. Taking them from all other branches and fields of commerce, and stopping the commerce of other portions of the world to enter into this grand movement of Chinese, I suppose it could be done.

Q. Then there is no real practical difficulty in the way of bringing millions of Chinese to the coast of California?—A. Yes; the millions there is practically a difficulty, I believe.

Q. Then say hundreds of thousands?—A. You can figure it up; the ships making two trips a year and bringing 1,200 passengers, which, I think, is a very large average to bring Chinamen here over the hot seas; I think 1,000 would be extreme, but giving 1,200 for a ship's voyage twice a year, that is 2,400; it would take 40 ships to bring 100,000 in a year, and it would take 400 ships to bring a million in a year.

Q. In other words, then, 400 ships would bring as much population from China here as we have now upon our coast of white people?—A. It is a possibility; it could be done. If you had 400 ships at your disposal, and a million Chinamen ready to come, you could get them here; that is, if you were moving an army of a million of men you might possibly, with great effort, perform that operation; but I consider that those Chinamen would not come here without an inducement to come; and I so stated.

Q. You stated that Chinese immigration is beneficial in your opinion, because it furnishes additional labor to whites?—A. Yes, sir; it opens the fields of labor here in the State.

Q. In that connection you stated that our railroads would not have been built without the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I ask whether the road from Omaha to Ogden was built by white or Chinese labor?—A. It was built by white labor.

Q. Might not the road from Ogden to San Francisco have been built by white labor?—A. It might have been built by the Union Pacific people after they got to Ogden. They might have gone on with their road with white labor until they got to San Francisco, but it could not have been done by white labor from this State.

Q. How much longer would the transcontinental road have been deferred in its construction without Chinese labor?—A. That is a difficult question. If there had been no rivalry, the Union Pacific might have been years longer in building their road.

Q. Do you not know that during the construction of that road it was a subject-matter of complaint that this great, rich corporation, with its hundred millions of subsidy, would not employ white labor, but that

they employed Chinese labor because it could be had cheaper?—A. It is possible that there might have been complaint of that kind. There always has been complaint here on account of the employment of Chinese labor.

Q. The railroads throughout America have been built by white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And also in Europe?—A. Yes, sir; but there has never been any part of the world where the wages of white labor were so high as in California. The high price of labor here makes the doing of many things impracticable which we could otherwise do.

Q. You know that there was a demand on the part of the white labor to be employed by the Central Pacific Railroad, but that they would not employ it because white labor was too expensive?—A. I do not think that was the case. There may have been individual instances of demand, and there may have been white labor that could have been obtained. I am not able to answer the question as to whether they could have got the thousands of laborers that were required.

Q. There were only about ten thousand Chinamen employed at that time?—A. At that time our population was much more sparse than it is now.

Q. Do you doubt that with an ordinary effort and the payment of reasonable prices there might not have been ten thousand white laborers obtained in California?—A. At the payment of sufficient prices they could have obtained ten thousand to do anything.

Q. Do you not think they would have been justified in paying sufficient prices from the subsidies they got from the General Government and the endowment of lands made by this State?—A. I am not at all endeavoring to defend the Central Pacific Company for not employing white men.

Q. Do you not know that about that period in California the placer-mines were being worked out; that there was a change of labor, and many laborers who had been in the mines were seeking employment elsewhere, and would have accepted work on the Pacific Railroad, if it had been given them?—A. I do not know anything about it; it might or it might not have been the case.

Q. Have you ever made any calculation? If you have not, I wish you would make it here. Take the bonus given by San Francisco, Placer County, Sacramento County, and our domestic subsidies to the Central Pacific Railroad, would it not have more than paid the whole labor they performed on their road?—A. I would be utterly unable to answer that question. Governor Stanford is in the city, and can give you all those facts.

Q. We are obtaining opinions now, as well as facts. Is it not a fact, in your opinion, that the railroad could have been built just as expeditiously with white labor as with Chinese labor, and that the only difference really would have been the surplus wealth left to the five gentlemen who built that road—that they would have been a little less rich?—A. I have only such opinions on that subject as I have probably derived from the railroad people, and from what has been published by them as facts. I know it has been stated, and I think it is the fact, that during the construction of that railroad, the Central Pacific Railroad people were very short of money; indeed, they came very near being bankrupt while the road was in the course of construction.

Q. Before they started, what was their condition?—A. Before they started they were men of moderate means, and had, probably, only $100,000 or $200,000 among them.

Q. The whole company?—A. Yes. But I have also understood that during the construction of that road with the subsidies they got, and bonds, converting them into money at the low rates at that time, it would have been a very sharp effort with them to have constructed the road without the cheap labor which they had at hand. Their profits and advantages came to them afterward in the increased value of the bonds and in the business of the road; but I do not think at that time they had the money, nor would it have been possible for them to have paid labor at advanced prices. They hypothecated many bonds and borrowed money on them.

Q. Is it not the fact that the corporation, and each individual member of the corporation, is now enormously rich?—A. It is so said, and I believe it to be true.

Q. In your opinion, would it not be better for the State if part of that enormous wealth had gone to the labor of the nation?—A. It would. It is always better that wealth should be distributed among the many.

Q. Then, if the road had been built by white labor instead of Chinese labor, what, in your opinion, would have been the effect upon the State? Would it have brought to us a large amount of adult white working people, who would have become the heads of families?—A. The railroad has brought to us a large amount of white labor.

Q. If instead of 10,000 Chinese laborers we should have had 10,000 white laborers, what would have been the effect upon the State?—A. They would not have been brought here if they were already in the State, as you thought they were.

Q. That was one hypothesis. The Senator suggested that by multiplying labor you would have increased it and induced others to come.—A. You would have induced others to come in the same way that we had always done; but you must remember that the cost of a laborer getting to California in those days, before the railroad was built, was a great consideration. He had to come across the isthmus, or by the slow, dragging process of crossing the plains with his ox-team. That is one reason why labor was high here. There was no rivalry among those who were here, and it cost so much to bring it here.

Q. Do you know what the cost of importing a ship-load of emigrants by the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, per capita, from New York to San Francisco, by the isthmus, was at that time?—A. I suppose it was a hundred and odd dollars.

Q. Do you not know that immigrants were brought often, owing to the competition between the Nicaragua route and the other, at $40, previous to building the road and at the time it was being built?—A. During the early days there was competition, but at that time I do not know how it was.

Q. The cost of a first-class passage was about $100?—A. I do not know what it was.

Q. And if there had been a demand for a large class of immigrants, could not a thousand have been brought for $40 per capita?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Were they not brought at that rate by the Nicaragua line?—A. I do not think they ever were, except during times of rivalry; not during the construction of the Central Pacific Railroad.

Q. Could they not have been brought for a little more than that, say $60?—A. I do not think there ever was a time when immigrants could have been brought by Panama, not considering questions of rivalry and momentary competition, short of $75 apiece, as I am informed.

Q. You think for $75 apiece they might have been brought here?—A. They might have been brought here for that sum.

Q. Suppose the American emigrant who came here for a permanent home and permanent business had to pay $75 passage-money, could he not as well afford it as the Chinaman to pay $30 to come for three months' work? You have stated that the Chinamen come here to get employment three months in the year.—A. I said that six months in the year the flow of the Chinamen is this way, and the rest of the year it is the other way.

Q. The time for their greatest demand is in harvest?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That gives them three months of reliable employment?—A. It is the period of greatest demand. There is employment during the whole summer-season in the various branches of industry, gathering fruits, &c.

Q. You think Chinese immigration has added to the wealth of this State?—A. I do.

Q. We admit that. Then you say that the question, as you have discussed it, is the material question?—A. Entirely.

Q. Is it not the whole length, breadth, scope, depth, and thickness of your argument that it contributes to the wealth of the country?—A. To the wealth of the country, and to the benefit of the people of the country.

Q. Have you considered, or do you consider in your answer here, the effect upon the morals, the civilization, or the future political welfare of the country?—A. I have not taken that into consideration. I have not answered that question.

Q. You confine yourself, then, in your remarks to the mere fact that the introduction of Chinese immigration makes more money?—A. It makes the country richer, and makes the poorer classes more comfortable and richer.

Q. Do you not think it has a tendency to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, as a rule?—A. I do not. If I thought that, I should be very much averse to speaking in favor of the immigration of such a people to any extent whatever.

Q. Taking the various large enterprises, as the railroads; the railroad proprietors have gotten very rich, and the Chinese labor is an element of that wealth, is it not?—A. Not entirely.

Q. It is an element of their wealth; I do not say entirely so?—A. I consider that it has produced only a very small portion of the wealth of the rich.

Q. The reclamation of tule-lands can be better done with Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To whom does that benefit first inure, to the stockholders or projectors of such enterprises?—A. The benefits pass through them, of course, to the masses; but all are benefited by the increased production and cheapened food which is derived from that reclamation.

Q. To come, then, to the shoe-shop and the boot manufactories; Chinese labor makes the manufacturer of boots richer, does it not, by enabling him to compete with Massachusetts industries?—A. I do not know how far it may make him richer; the business pays, or he would not conduct it.

Q. The competition, then, of Chinese cheap labor in the boot and shoe trade comes in competition and rivalry with the boot and shoe trade of Massachusetts, does it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that, if you regard Massachusetts as part of our nation, and entitled to the same immunity from unfriendly cheap labor, the Chinese labor would be injurious to the labor of Massachusetts?—A. It would lessen the demand in Massachusetts for that article, because it would cut off one of their articles of export.

Q. Would it not lessen the demand for labor in Massachusetts?—A. It would fail to increase the demand for labor to the extent that California was a customer.

Q. Then if in the whole United States of America there are one hundred thousand shoemakers, and we should import one hundred thousand Chinese shoemakers to take that labor, would or would not the Chinese shoemakers injure the white labor?—A. Of the one hundred thousand white laborers?

Q. Yes.—A. I take it it would do that, but it would benefit the forty millions of people who wear shoes.

Q. I am asking what would be the direct effect upon the white shoemakers. If there were one hundred thousand white shoemakers here, and one hundred thousand Chinese shoemakers could be brought to do their work at a less price, it would drive the white laborers out of employment?—A. Undoubtedly, if that were a practical thing to be done.

Q. In regard to the manufacture of woolen garments, if there are a hundred thousand white manufacturers engaged in that trade and their place was supplied by Chinese labor, would it also affect them in the same way?—A. It would; and it would also affect the demand from Europe, or anybody in the world who manufactured woolen goods.

Q. If there are one hundred and fifty thousand white people who manufacture cigars in the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and if the same number of Chinese would come in and do their work at less price and as well, would it not drive them out of employment?—A. If you put the question only with reference to that one fact, of course; but you assume that a Chinaman should be put in every branch of trade and industry in the United States.

Q. I am not assuming anything.—A. It is the same thing.

Q. If one hundred and fifty thousand white men are engaged in the manufacture of cigars, and one hundred and fifty thousand Chinese laborers come here and manufacture them, what is the effect upon the one hundred and fifty thousand whites?—A. I will answer that by saying simply that if by the introduction of Chinese labor the effect would be to cheapen the manufacture and there would be no increased demand for the article made, and none were to be made but what just so many laborers could do, the Chinese might, of course, push aside the laborer who was getting a higher rate in making that commodity; but if by a little lessening of the price the demand for the article is doubled, so that there is work for all the labor that existed before as well as for the newcomer, I do not see that it would push white labor away. We find an increased demand existing always as the price of a commodity is lessened. The same result is observable in regard to sewing-machines.

Q. If from the source from which 150,000 Chinese were imported to compete with 150,000 whites, inexhaustive to the extent of 400,000,000, of which 100,000,000 are adult laborers, would they not come in as fast as the increased consumption would demand labor, and would they not control the labor-market in respect to making cigars?—A. If all things else were to stand still, if the population of the United States were not also to increase in its proportion, and we were to bring in Chinamen to the country, and commerce was to furnish all the facilities, and if all things were practicable that you have suggested, the Chinese might become a very powerful element in weakening the fields of labor to other men; but I look at the thing in the light of the questions you put, as being surrounded with so many impracticable ideas that I cannot see the conclusions and results from it in the same light that you do.

Q. If there are 1,000,000 white people out of our 40,000,000 people

who are laborers in the sense of working with their hands and unskilled laborers, would or would not the introduction of 1,000,000 of Chinese labor be a serious blow to their comfort and prosperity?—A. It is a question whether it would, whether the million Chinamen coming in might not open new avenues of labor, so that this million and another million of white men would find employment.

Q. Then this million displaced would be compelled to seek new avenues for employment?—A. Any that were displaced would necessarily seek new avenues of employment.

Q. Then what effect would it have upon those men who had attained middle age, or passed middle age, to drive them from their employment and drive them to the learning of a new trade?—A. I do not know.

Q. Would it or would it not, in your opinion, be disastrous to them?—A. I could not answer that question; it is hypothesis entirely.

Q. All things then being equal, which do you prefer to see advanced in material prosperity as well as in morals and civilization, the white race or the Chinese race?—A. The white race.

Q. If you thought, then, the Chinese would be hurtful by their immigration, you would be in favor of having that immigration restrained?—A. I would consider it our duty to ourselves in that case to do so.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You spoke of the avenues for white employment that the railroad furnishes in its operation, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose the railroad, in addition to employing Chinese as it now does to repair their road and keep up the road-bed, to relay the ties or rails if they get out of order, should also employ the Chinamen to load and unload their cars, which they may be doing now for aught I know to act as brakesmen, to fill all the places of labor in the conduct of the business of railroading, what effect would that have upon the two or three thousand white men, probably, who are now employed in that capacity? Would it compel them to seek other avenues of employment, and would Chinese labor then be the blessing to white labor that you have stated it to be?—A. If the railroad company were to substitute a Chinaman for any one white man who is now in its employment, it would not be beneficial to that one white man by any means.

Q. Is it beneficial to society or injurious that a laborer should be deprived of work?—A. Simply to diminish labor and turn a man out of work is not beneficial to society.

Q. What is to prevent the railroad company from employing Chinese as their brakesmen, in loading and unloading cars, and in performing all the labor about the road that does not require a very high order of intelligence; as, for instance, the conductors?—A. The conductors do require considerable intelligence, and they are a class of people that I do not think a Chinaman would be very apt to be substituted for. There may be branches of work on the railroad which the railroad company, if they choose, might substitute Chinese labor for. I do not know what branches they are.

Q. If that work is very considerable, it would so far lessen the benefit to white labor which you state flows from the railroad?—A. To that extent.

Q. Do you not consider, then, on the same principle, that where in any field now occupied by white labor a Chinaman is substituted, it is so far an injury to white labor, just as it would be on that railroad?—A. In the individual case it may be an injury, but I speak rather of the general result.

Q. Society is made up of individual cases. The theory of the law is that if an individual is injured, society is injured.—A. At the same time the greatest good to the greatest number is a principle that governs as well; and sometimes many have to suffer inconvenience for the benefit of the whole.

Q. You consider that a benefit to the greatest number is obtained by weeding out white men from the railroad and putting in Chinamen?—A. I did not say that.

Q. Suppose that a shoe-factory in this town is employing five hundred white men, as was the case for a year or two, those men supporting their families, &c., and the employers discharged those men and cast them on the street, and employed in their stead Chinamen, would that be an injury to those discharged?—A. Of course, so far as a Chinaman displaces a white man who now has work it is a disadvantage and an incovenience to the individual man. The query is whether the many are not benefited more than the one is inconvenienced.

Q. Suppose that, instead of one man being discharged in a shoe-factory, five hundred are discharged, and that from another shoe-factory five hundred are discharged, and from another shoe-factory five hundred are discharged, from a soap-factory twenty-five men are discharged, from a tannery one hundred men are discharged, and so on through the city, would not that be an injury to the community at large?—A. I do not know whether it would or not. The advantage to the million of population of the State is more to be considered than the advantage to any one particular class of laborers in the community.

Q. If in the various branches of business carried on in this city the Chinaman displaces the white man, you say that would not be an injury to the State?—A. Understand me; the only benefit that could be derived to the people of the State would be in the lessened cost to them of the articles they buy; as, for instance, boots and shoes, or blankets.

Q. Suppose the white man cannot get the making of those articles, and wherever he turns for the kind of labor which his education renders him most capable of he finds the Chinaman fills the trade; in other words, if you cheapen flour, for instance, you may make it impossible for a man to buy it.—A. If every avenue of labor should be filled with Chinese, I grant you would do a very great injury.

Q. If you fill half the avenues of labor, would not the injury be half as great?—A. I could not answer as to the effect of that.

Q. Does not the same principle apply?—A. I do not think it does.

Q. So you think half of the avenues of labor could be filled without injury?—A. I do not say whether it would or would not be injurious.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. At what period of the history of California, from your tables, was there the greatest Chinese immigration?—A. I can only answer from the table computed up to 1873.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How far does that table go back?—A. To 1853.

Q. In 1852 the number was twenty thousand, which was the greatest number in any one year?—A. The table gives the arrivals and departures from 1853 to 1873. In 1854 there were 16,000; and then there was no larger number after that. In 1855 there was a loss of Chinese in the State, and in 1856 the arrivals were 4,800; in 1857, 5,900; the next year, 3,500; the next, 3,100; and the next there were 3,000.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you giving the number over and above departures?—A. I am giving the arrivals. Then the number was 2,600; in 1865, 3,000; in 1866, 2,200; in 1867, 4,200; then in 1868, 1869, and 1870 the arrivals were 11,000, 15,000, and 11,000; then they fell off to 5,000 again. Those were the years just about the time of the completion of the Central Pacific Railroad.

Q. What were the departures? I want to get at the years when there was the largest excess of arrivals over departures?—A. The largest excess of arrivals over departures of late years was in 1869, 10,000. In 1854 there was a gain of 13,754; in 1869 there was a gain of 10,000. In five years there was a loss, and in the others the gain amounted to 1,700, 4,800, 3,400, 700, 6,800, and then that year, 1869, of 10,000. Then in 1870 there was a gain of 6,800; in 1871, 2,000; in 1872, 4,000, and in 1873, first quarter, 2,000.

Q. Could we ask you to complete your tables up to the present time, or as near to it as you can get the data? Will you take the trouble to do that?—A. I will.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Go one year earlier, if you can.—A. I went as far back as I could find any data.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Complete your tables as near as you can from the beginning, say 1849, up to 1876, so as to arrive as near as possible at the whole number of Chinese who have come here. You stated in your testimony that you regarded this immigration subject to the law of supply and demand. I want to ask you whether the increased arrivals or the diminutions from year to year have been the result of increased demand or want of demand for labor. What has given the impetus to one year over another?—A. Undoubtedly, from my information, it has been caused by the requirements of labor here. In the years of 1869 and 1870, which were the years of the completion of the railroad, there was the largest immigration and the largest gain of the immigrants over the emigrants. I think that the demands for labor that have existed in this State since then during the building of other railroads by the Southern Pacific and Central Pacific have caused the increase of immigration from China which has taken place in the last four or five years.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. We were in a state of civil war, were we not, at the time this railroad was being constructed?—A. Yes, sir; that is a matter of history.

Q. We could not very well have got 10,000 laborers from the East at that time?—A. I presume there would have been much greater difficulty then in procuring white labor than during ordinary times.

Q. Most of the questions asked you have been supposed questions. I will ask you if you ever heard of 500 or 250 men being discharged here and Chinese put in their places in any occupation?—A. I have no cognizance of any such fact.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not know that in establishments which a few years ago employed large numbers of white men they now employ large numbers of Chinamen, as, for instance, in cigar-making, the manufacture of boots and shoes, &c.?—A. I have heard it stated that formerly what cigars were made here were made by white labor, but that now vast quanti-

ties are made by Chinese labor, and as a consequence cigars are very much cheaper.

Q. Are you not aware that there are establishments here which employed white labor in the manufacture of boots and shoes which now employ Chinamen?—A. I have heard so. I do not know what the fact is, but I presume that is true.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Has not the growth of this manufacture been brought about by the presence of Chinese labor?—A. I think it has. I have been told by the proprietors of the woolen-mills that they never could have carried on the manufacture of blankets in this State at all except with the advantages they have in using Chinese labor.

Q. It is not the case then, altogether, of manufactories having sprung up by white laborers who were displaced afterward by the introduction of Chinese labor?—A. No, sir; it is in the light of such an establishment as that of the woolen-mills that I make the remark that the introduction of Chinese labor is beneficial to the white laborer entirely—that it enables the white men of California to get blankets at a reasonable price, and every one uses them, and also that there are a thousand avenues of labor which a factory furnishes which are not performed by the Chinese: all the manufacture of boxes in which the goods go, the drayage, the building and manufacture of machinery, keeping it in repair, the distribution of goods when manufactured on the railways and steamers; there are a thousand avenues of business and trade which follow the introduction of such an industry.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know that there is a box-factory here owned and operated by Chinese?—A. I do not know it. I should not be surprised at that. I know a great many Chinese are engaged in that manufacture.

Q. If the Chinese have invaded that business, how long will it be before they absorb it, judging by our experience in other things?—A. I could not answer that question.

Q. Would not that be the tendency, as they can make the goods cheaper?—A. I have no doubt they would absorb the business if they could; they absorb all industries they can.

Q. Then why should they not continue absorbing until that avenue is cut off, and so in reference to other industries?—A. I do not know that they might not do so.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Does the free competition in labor ever injure any people of a State which is not overcrowded by population?—A. I do not see myself how it does. The more labor there is the greater is the production; and the richer we become as a people, the more our material wealth is increased, the less taxes we must pay and the cheaper we get the necessaries of life; and we have a thousand and one advantages which come to the people collaterally, which probably they do not reason upon nor appreciate in considering the Chinese question.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I would be glad to have you complete your tables so far as you can in regard to these arrivals and departures. Have you any means of ascertaining the number of Chinese arriving in Oregon or other ports?—A. No; I have not.

CORNELIUS B. S. GIBBS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident of this State?—Answer. Over twenty-eight years.

Q. What is your profession?—A. An adjuster of marine losses.

Q. Does your profession bring you in contact with the Chinese merchants of this city and State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell the committee what your experience has been with them as men of business and men of integrity.—A. As men of business. I consider that the Chinese merchants are fully equal to our merchants. As men of integrity, I have never met a more honorable, high-minded, correct, and truthful set of men than the Chinese merchants of our city. I am drawn in contact with people from all nations, all the merchants of our city, in our adjustments. I have never had a case where the Chinese have attempted to undervalue their goods or bring fictitious claims into the adjustments.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Undervalue or overvalue?—A. I mean undervalue. You see in general average they pay on the market-value of the goods; and as they make the goods less they pay less.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Your business is connected with the white race——with the merchant class here?—A. There is not a merchant in this place with whom we do not have business.

Q. How do the white merchants compare with the Chinese?—A. As a class, I think the Chinese are more honorable than other nationalities, even our own.

Q. Are those with whom you deal generally educated scholars, mathematicians?—A. I think they are the best mathematicians I ever saw in my life.

Q. They are good business men?—A. Yes, sir; in fact, they are the only persons who will go through an adjustment and seem to understand it. I never met a Chinaman that if you gave him any figures to calculate he could not calculate it.

Q. Everything being equal with other foreign immigrants of this State, if the Chinese had free access to our schools, and everything were open and free to them as it is to others, what kind of citizens would this class make with which you come in contact?—A. They would make good citizens. I am speaking of the merchants.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do say about the masses?—A. I have never had anything to do with the masses.

Q. You confine your remarks simply to the merchant class?—A. Simply to the merchant class of the city.

Q. Do you know what proportion that bears to the whole number of Chinese?—A. I do not.

Q. Is it not very small?—A. I have no doubt it is. I should judge about one-fiftieth, if the number of Chinese here is a hundred thousand. I do not think there are over two thousand Chinese merchants in the city.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you lived here?—A. Over twenty-eight years.

Q. How long have you been in the business of an adjuster?—A. Over fifteen years.

Q. You speak of their general character for integrity; you say they are quite equal to others?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in their capacity for business, too, I understand you?—A. They understand it thoroughly. They are excellent merchants. They appear to be educated men.

Q. Do they understand the principles of insurance?—A. They do.

Q. Do they insure liberally?—A. That I cannot say.

Q. Do they insure largely?—A. That I cannot say. They insure in foreign companies and in the companies here, and I make up the adjustments and do not know the extent of their insurance at all.

Q. You have no general knowledge of the masses of the Chinamen here?—A. I have not.

Q. Take the average of Chinese merchants, how do they compare with the average of American merchants?—A. Favorably.

Q. In all respects?—A. In all respects.

Q. Are some of them doing a large business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are their losses generally adjusted without lawsuits?—A. I never had a lawsuit with them or never had a complaint from them in my life. You have got to get their confidence and explain to them, and they generally go through with the figuring themselves. They can figure very fast and very correctly, and when they are convinced everything is right, there is no trouble. There is no class of people that pay up as quickly as the Chinese. On Saturday we send them notice that the average is closed, and on Monday by ten or twelve o'clock all the certificates are paid. I have had fifty and sixty thousand dollars in a case, and they would come straight forward and pay it before twelve o'clock, while we have to send around to the other merchants a month and sometimes two months before we get it all from them.

Q. You think they are distinguished for their promptitude in business?—A. I do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you ever visit these merchants at their homes?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you find their houses as cleanly as the houses of American merchants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they smell as well?—A. No, they do not smell as well.

Q. Why not?—A. Because there is a Chinese scent about all their houses. They may to them smell as well.

Q. Can you tell us where some of these Chinese houses that are as cleanly as our merchants' houses are situated?—A. You will find Chi-Long and Qui-Nong-Chong.

Q. Where does Chi-Long live?—A. In Sacramento street.

Q. Can you give me the number?—A. No, sir.

Q. Between what streets does he live?—A. Between Kearney and Montgomery, I think.

Q. What is the next name?—A. Qui-Nong-Chong; but I think his family has gone to China.

Q. Where is Qui-Nong-Chong?—A. On Sacramento street, between Dupont and Kearney.

Q. You say that their houses are as cleanly as the house of any member of the firm of Macondray & Co., or the house of Mr. Hecht, or of any other American or foreign merchant here?—A. Yes, sir, for cleanliness; but you will find their materials and China goods around them, which give the place a scent that you would not like.

Q. Are their accommodations as ample?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever seen their sleeping apartments?—A. I never have.

Q. How do you know that their sleeping apartments are as cleanly?—A. I do not know anything about their sleeping apartments. I do not think they allow any white persons to go in and see their families. I never saw a Chinese wife, although I have gone to their houses to see the merchants in relation to their averages. I have seen their children; but I never saw the wife of one of them.

HERMAN HEYNEMANN sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. A merchant.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that business here?—A. Fifteen years.

Q. What is the character of your business?—A. I am engaged in importing goods and also in manufacturing on this coast.

Q. What character of manufacturing?—A. I am the president of the Pioneer Woolen Factory and the agent of the Pacific Jute Manufacturing Company.

Q. How long have you been connected with these institutions?—A. I am the originator of the Pioneer Woolen Factory.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What are your manufactures?—A. Woolen.

Q. Cloths?—A. Cloths, blankets, flannels, shawls, yarns, and everything that is made out of wool, almost.

Q. Fine cloths?—A. Not so fine as the French cloth, because our wool is not adapted for that; but we make good cloths.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you a general acquaintance with manufactures here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is our manufacturing here more for our own use or for export?—A. Entirely for our own use. We are not able to compete with Europe yet so as to export.

Q. What is the character of our manufactures generally as to magnitude of operations?—A. Very limited. I believe we consume about two million pounds of wool here, and we export thirty-eight million pounds.

Q. In what branches of manufacture are there the largest institutions here?—A. In money value, I believe the largest incorporations of industries are the Pioneer and Mission factories. I do not know how much they have invested in the rolling-mills, but there is a million dollars now invested in the Mission and Pioneer Woolen Mills.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Those are your mills?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is the character of the other manufactories here, generally, as to size and extent?—A. I could not answer from my own knowledge. I do not know any as large as ours. The Pacific Rolling-Mill is the only establishment that could compare at all, and I do not know how much capital there is invested in that.

Q. In the other branches are there any other large manufactories?—A. Yes; latterly shoe-factories have been started here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What number of operatives do you employ?—A. In the two mills, I should judge that we employ 600.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Which two mills?—A. The Pioneer and Mission, which is one corporation.

Q. How large a number is employed in any one shoe-factory?—A. I do not know. I do not think anything like that number.

Q. As to the general character applicable to all the manufactories on this coast, are they not generally of small capital and limited in their product?—A. No, I would not say that, but I do not think any other is as large as this one.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. When did you first establish your manufactory?—A. In 1861 this corporation was established. There was a little private establishment that burned down, and then I started this corporation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What operatives were employed in the old factory, before this corporation was established?—A. Some Chinese and some whites.

Q. Are all the operatives in your factory now Chinese?—A. No, sir; I have been listening to testimony here of late to the effect that a good many white laborers have been displaced by Chinese. Just the contrary has been taking place in our factory. For instance, white girls have taken the place of Chinese. As a matter of course, any superintendent will always give the preference to people whom he can understand rather than to people with whom he has difficulty to speak. That is an immense advantage in favor of the white labor.

Q. Why do you employ Chinese in your factory?—A. Originally we could not get any others at all. At that time it would have been an absolute impossibility to have run the factory upon white labor, simply because we could not get white operatives.

Q. Would the factory have been established with white labor?—A. No, sir; as a matter of fact, even with the Chinese labor competition has been so active that we have had no dividends whatever.

Q. You say originally you could not have established the manufacture without Chinese labor. Why do you continue then with Chinese labor?—A. We do not continue upon Chinese labor or upon any labor; we continue simply upon human labor. I do not make any distinction whether it is Chinese or white. I think such a distinction is an artificial one. I think if a Chinaman ate meat for a length of time he would be white, and he is yellow simply because he has eaten rice for generations.

Q. You say that you employ a certain number of Chinese. Have you the option of employing an equal number of boys or girls at the same rates?—A. That is a very hard question to answer. If you have got a number of employés who know exactly what you can do, you are not going to discharge them and take another number without knowing whether they can do the same thing; but as labor is offering in this particular factory every day the number of white girls is increasing and the proportionate number of Chinese is decreasing. Of course that will take some time yet. I might say, in the course of time as labor becomes more plentiful here, I have no doubt the Chinese will be displaced altogether, except where they amalgamate so that they really would lose the distinctive name of Chinese. Inherently, I do not believe there is any difference between the two races at all. I do not believe the Chinaman is different from any other man.

Q. Could you discharge the Chinamen you have now employed and

displace them with white labor without any disadvantage?—A. We could not do it. Of course we have taught a certain number of laborers, and to discharge them all would disorganize everything.

Q. How do the Chinese compare as operatives with American boys and girls?—A. I do not know that they are any better. I think American boys and girls would be fully as good.

Q. What is the character of the Chinese as operatives?—A. They have very great power of imitation, but very little power of invention. I think an American, or what we would call a white laborer here, and especially those who descend immediately from native-born Americans have got an ingenuity that is not to be found in any other class of laborers. They will try to perfect their work; they will study out something. That quality is not to be found in a Chinaman. I do not think for generations the Chinaman will ever be the peer of the American laborer.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is their character for industry and fidelity?—A. I have found in our factory during the last fifteen years, that we have not had a single case before the police court. All these Chinese laborers live on the premises. They have a building there; and we have not had a single case of any kind before the police court of murder, or rows among themselves, or theft upon the proprietors. I think that speaks well for them. I think there are few factories run entirely by white labor where the laborers live on the premises that could say that much; and I ascribe it simply to the fact that a white man has more energy; he is more full of life, and for that reason he will very often break the rules of society.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What do you say in regard to their honesty?—A. I say we have thought them very honest; all of which I ascribe more to their indifference. If a Chinaman has enough for his daily wants he is satisfied, and does not look for more. He is not ambitious.

Q. What do you say in regard to their steadiness?—A. They are not any more steady than the whites. At first until they get down to it they will run off, so much so that we told our Chinese foreman that we could not afford to pay the men before they got down to the work, for after a week or two they would run away. He said he could not help it, that he was doing the best he could and using all the control he had over the men; but he could not keep them if they did not want to stay. But as soon as they have become accustomed to the work they are more steady. We have got men who have worked there several years steadily, but as a rule I should think that steadiness is not one of their virtues at all.

Q. What is your observation as to whether they are under the control of any person or whether they are free?—A. I think this so-called cooly business is a mere trick, a sham and illusion. I do not believe they are any more slaves than any other people at all, except as a general rule they are absolutely very poor in their native country, and have their passage money advanced. Many of them have not been able to repay it all, and thus they are constantly in debt, which hangs over them. When any white man has a debt hanging over him he is not as free and independent as a man who owes nothing, and that is the way with Chinamen.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Of the whole number of your operatives, how many are Chinese?—A. I should think about one-half, exclusive of the Pacific Jute Factory. There the number is almost entirely Chinese, except the foremen.

We tried there to have Scotch help, white girls. We imported them for that very purpose, but could not keep them a fortnight. They ran away and we could not keep them, so that we have very few now.

Q. What is the charactar of the Chinese for honesty?—A. I think there are a good many thieves among them just as there are a good many thieves among the whites; probably more, because as a general rule they are poorer. I think a man who has nothing, is more apt to take from others than a man who has something. I think their greatest fault is their poverty. That is unpardonable.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What effect has the establishment of manufactories here had on white labor?—A. I am quite of the opinion of Mr. Wheeler. I heard his testimony. I think it has largely increased the work of the whites.

Q. Is that cause still operating?—A. Yes, sir; every day. The same cause has operated ever since the world existed. I know very well from the books that in the introduction of the first railroads the same cry existed. Anybody who has read of the riots which took place in England when the railroads were first introduced knows how the poor carriers and shippers on the canals all cried out that they had to starve; that they would be driven out, their occupation would be gone, and everything else. So great was the feeling, that in some counties they tore up the poles for the surveys and mobbed the surveyors who came there; but eventually they petitioned Parliament to have railroads made there. I am satisfied that if we were to drive out the Chinese there would be more petitions going to Congress to have them brought back again than ever can be got up now to get Congress to drive them out.

Q. Is it your opinion that it would be an advantage to the State or nation to place any restriction upon the coming of Chinese at the present time?—A. Not if there is no restriction upon any other immigration. It might be beneficial to the political welfare of this country to place some restriction upon immigration generally, but I do not say that it should be done. To place a restriction on Chinese immigration to this coast, and not restrict other immigration, would be a restriction upon the commerce of California which I would consider highly partial against California and against our best interests.

Q. Is there any reason for making any distinction either by law or treaty against Chinese immigration?—A. There are a great many reasons which, to a reflecting mind, must arise, but I think just as many operate on the other side. For instance, to take the religious standard, we may say that the Chinese are infidels; but if we take the Protestant standard, we may say that we are introducing a certain class of Roman Catholics here who are bound by the dictates of their own particular church, without respect to other political doctrines. I think there would be so many questions that I would not be prepared to answer them at all.

Q. Do you think the presence of Chinese here diminishes the immigration of white labor to this coast?—A. I think it increases it.

Q. What effect has the Chinese immigration had upon commerce?—A. It increases it.

Q. What has been its tendency?—A. O, it has increased it no doubt here. I have also noticed that something was said as to the value of real estate. I think it has immensely increased the value of real estate in the city of San Francisco.

Q. What is our chief element of wealth at the present time?—A.

Commerce. California is entirely dependent upon her unrivaled position on the Pacific Ocean.

Q. What are our great articles of export?—A. Grain, wool, wine, precious metals; grain, of course, leading everything.

Q. Without the grain trade and the export of grain would there be the same amount of building of cities, grading, and other work that is done by white labor?—A. California would not exist as a State as she now does.

Q. There has been a great deal of talk here about sending silver to China. Is that an article of currency with us or of merchandise?—A. That kind of silver is merchandise everywhere.

Q. It is one of our products, is it not?—A. Certainly; not of California alone, but of this coast.

Q. An object of export from San Francisco?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you consider the export of silver from this city for sale to be of disadvantage to the State?—A. I do not suppose that anything sold by us is a disadvantage, because we would not sell it if it was.

Q. Then the mere fact that silver is exported from here to China would not be considered a disadvantage?—A. I think this ought to be the center of the silver and bullion market instead of London, and it is to a large extent now, just because of the proximity of this country to China.

Q. Does the fact that a large amount of silver is sent from here to China, which is not represented by return products, tend to any injurious influence?—A. England, according to that, ought to have been a pauper hundreds of years ago, because the statistics show that the exports of England are always very much smaller in value than her imports.

Q. If I may be permitted to put a leading question, I wish to know whether or not silver is sent from this port to China to pay for goods which are imported from England here; whether it is a roundabout way of paying England?—A. It is an exchange transaction. It would be very much to our benefit, of course, if we would get more money for our silver, if we could establish the bullion market here so that the price here would regulate London; because it is certain that we can send silver to China cheaper than they can send it to London, simply on account of transit.

Q. Have European nations been in the habit of paying a considerable amount of silver to China?—A. Immense sums.

Q. Would it be of advantage to us to pay that money from this port?—A. Undoubtedly; it would throw in the first place a very large amount of commissions into the hands of American merchants, or bankers rather, that has for centuries been paid to the London merchants or bankers. To-day one of the large sources of revenue to England generally is the immense commissions paid to London simply because of its being the banking center of the world, and the bullion center, too.

Q. Would silver be worth more or less here if the silver was sent direct from here to Hong-Kong, or China, to pay the amount the English have to pay the Chinese, or if it was sent from here to England to pay for our imports from there, and thus get around to China in that way?—A. It would be worth more if sent from her to China by English orders.

Q. It would increase the value of silver there?—A. Certainly; because the transit is so much less; but at the same time there are questions that might modify that, such as the supply and demand of silver there; but the general proposition is correct. Of course if you decrease

the cost of transportation you increase the value of the article we are producing.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have you noticed the increase and decrease of Chinese immigration from year to year?—A. I have not. I have always thought there were not Chinese enough.

Q. You know that there has been a difference in different years?—A. Quite a difference.

Q. Has that difference depended upon the demand for labor here, in your judgment?—A. I rather differ with Mr. Wheeler; I think that the supply sets in after the demand. Thus, for instance, suppose there has been a good year in 1875, and the Chinese companies have found employment for all the men who have come here, and that their passage-money has been paid back. I do not know what commission they charge, but of course it must be large enough to induce them to bring Chinese here. The fact of there being plenty of employment for those who came would induce others to come, and when these next arrivals come they may not find any employment at all, which was the case in the early part of this year.

Q. Would the result be, then, that the immigration would be smaller the next year?—A. Exactly; in other words, it would be a question of supply and demand, only it would not be so immediate.

Q. The supply would not come directly upon the demand?—A. Precisely.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Would the treatment the Chinese receive in California have any effect upon commerce with China?—A. Naturally so. I think this is the greatest position for the commerce of the universe that any nation ever had, and, as is the case very frequently in such things, we try to shut the door to the very greatness of our nation by this prejudice which has been started and fomented by the press; organs which ought rather to lead the people than to pander to them.

Q. Is it your opinion that this movement to restrict Chinese immigration has had any beneficial effect on the white laboring class of California?—A. I am just of the opinion of Mr. Wheeler in that regard. I consider that every machine invented for economizing labor is a benefit to the poor man. We are running a machine that is called a mule which in one day does the work in spinning that formerly was done by perhaps a hundred women in a year, and yet we see, in spite of that apparently throwing all the women that ever spun out of employment, the general condition of the female part of the human race is vastly improved when we compare them with the days when they all spun night and day.

Q. Is it possible for the Chinese until they become Americanized to compete with the English-speaking artisan, or the German?—A. I think when that time comes they will be English-speaking themselves, but up to this time I do not believe that any Chinaman is the peer of an American operative.

Q. I am not speaking about the operatives, I am speaking about those artisans like the carpenters, masons, and that kind of skilled workmen?—A. That is the kind I am speaking of.

Q. I say can a Chinaman until he becomes Americanized compete with any of them?—A. No, sir; it is a perfect impossibility. It is not in the nature of things.

Q. Are those trades and occupations intruded upon to any extent by Chinamen?—A. If a Chinaman builds a house who does he employ? He does not employ Chinese. That is the best answer to that question.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Does the Chinaman build houses?—A. Certainly. At the corner of Dupont street, near California, there are three houses which have been finished within the last month.

Q. There were some houses there some time ago as completely built up as they are now.—A. There are three houses on the corner of California and Dupont streets just built now, and they were all built by white men. I am only giving you an example that has come under my notice. It is a proof that if the Chinamen could do the work better and superior to white men, a Chinaman would patronize his own people. Why do they not? Simply because they find the white race can do better. They look to their own pockets; and if a Chinaman will do the work worse and poorer they will not employ him. They do not seem to have such a narrow prejudice that they look to the skin.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the cause, in your judgment, of the hostility to the Chinese?—A. The same cause that has been prevalent all over the earth, strangeness of manners. It used to be in England that any man who did not speak English was a "bloody foreigner." It did not make any difference whether he was the best man in the world, he was a "bloody foreigner," and it was the height of contempt to use that expression. I am just of the opinion of Mr. Wheeler; if this race, instead of keeping themselves in their peculiar dress, were to drink whisky and patronize the bar-rooms to-day just like others do, the prejudice would disappear immediately.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You think the only objection to the Chinese is that they do not drink whisky?—A. There are a great many other objections.

Q. What are they?—A. As I explained before, it is rather leading me into topics I would rather not touch on, for instance, religious topics and social topics.

Q. Your remark that if they would patronize the bar-room and drink whisky the prejudice would disappear, led me to suppose that that was the only objection against them in your mind.—A. I did not speak about objections against them, I was referring to prejudice.

Q. You say you now employ about one-half Chinamen and about one-half whites?—A. In the woolen mills.

Q. The proportion is gradually growing less of Chinamen and more of whites?—A. Of late years.

Q. Do you find the conditions favorable to this change?—A. I find the condition favorable to white labor increasing and of course displacing Chinese.

Q. Do you find yourself able to compete as well with the white labor?—A. Quite as well.

Q. You think there is no danger of your manufactory stopping if you do not employ Chinese?—A. None at all.

Q. Then there would not arise, so far as your manufactory is concerned, which is quite extensive, an objection to a reasonable restriction upon the Chinese coming here?—A. None at all.

Q. Would you still be able to go on?—A. I think it would be a pre-

judice generally to our factory. I would say as to the Pacific Jute Factory, that it could not go on without Chinese labor.

Q. What is the difference?—A. In the Pacific Jute Factory the looms are so much heavier that very few women can stand to run those looms.

Q. Do women run those looms in Scotland?—A. Yes, sir; whether they are stronger there, or how that is I do not understand; but it is very hard work. We are in direct competition with them there now with Hindoo labor here. In fact, I do not understand how this cry of cheap labor should be any cause for the restriction of the Chinese; because assuming that we were to restrict the Chinese on that account, and they were to go back to their country and establish those same factories there, we could never raise a tariff high enough to protect us, provided they had the same ingenuity as the white race.

Q. Suppose we did not raise the tariff high enough to protect us, and our farmers, who use these bags by enormous quantities, could get them cheaply made in Hindostan?—A. He would get them, of course.

Q. That would bring down the price of wheat, and so far help to cheapen the handling of wheat, and make it cheaper to the consumer?—A. It has actually done so. Before we established this factory on this coast all the bags consumed here came from Scotland.

Q. The argument of Mr. Wheeler, or his testimony, as I understood it, tended to show that the employment of Chinese cheapened the productions, so that the consumers got their products cheaper?—A. Yes.

Q. Would it not have the same tendency if bags, which are so important an element in the handling and cost of wheat, could be introduced into the country without this almost prohibitory tariff?—A. Undoubtedly; but there are a great many things that have to be taken into consideration. For instance, when bags are manufactured here it creates a local competition with importers, so that the importers can never get an extravagant rate for the bags they bring here.

Q. Would there not be that competition between Scotland, Hindostan, and other places where labor is cheap?—A. In fact, as the result has shown, Calcutta is beating Dundee.

Q. Then that competition brings goods down cheaper in this market?—A. Of course.

Q. It has the same effect as local competition?—A. Of course.

Q. How many persons own this jute factory?—A. I should judge about thirty.

Q. How many Chinese do you employ?—A. In the jute factory, I should judge about 120.

Q. So the tariff is kept up for the benefit of 30 white persons and 120 Chinamen?—A. We have not asked particularly to have the tariff kept up, except that we introduced the industry, and we found that we could not compete without Chinese labor.

Q. The cost of bags to the farmer is the cost of production, with the cost of manufacture added?—A. Not at all.

Q. If it were not for the tariff, bags from Scotland and Hindostan would be likely to absorb the market here?—A. You might have a bag that would cost five cents, but if there were no local factory it might cost twenty cents.

Q. I am speaking of the competition between Dundee and Hindostan.—A. Suppose you have no local factory, you might have to pay twenty cents, as you did last season.

Q. You spoke of the mule throwing out apparently all the spinning-women in the world?—A. Yes, sir. If all the women were busy spin-

ning night and day, they could not do as much work as a few of these machines.

Q. The apparent effect of the mule was to throw them out of employment?—A. Apparently.

Q. Do women run the mules?—A. We would not say that women run them.

Q. There are a great many more of these mules, because a great many more people have bought cloth and have worn their clothes a shorter length of time.—A. Exactly.

Q. That probably was in a great degree the cause of the compensation in that case; that is to say, there being more mules, more women were employed to run mules?—A. People were more profligate with their clothes, more luxurious.

Q. Then the multiplication of mules from that cause led to the employment of greater numbers of women?—A. In other words, the cheapness of yarn led to increased consumption.

Q. And consequently there were more mules, and it required more women to run the mules?—A. Women do not run mules.

Q. The women are employed about the mules?—A. Very little indeed.

Q. They are employed in the factories where the mules are run?—A. But to a very small degree.

Q. Take the cotton-factories of New England.—A. O yes, cotton; but I am speaking of our mills.

Q. In the cotton and woolen mills of England and New England generally the women are employed largely because the use of the mule brings other machinery into play which the women tend?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Consequently, the introduction of the labor-saving mule did not throw the women out of employment?—A. It did throw them out of employment.

Q. For the moment, until they became adjusted to this new labor?—A. No; it did throw them out of employment. For instance, if, before that time, the consumption consisted of a hundred pounds of yarn, and it took a hundred women to spin that hundred pounds of yarn, afterward you invented the mule, and, according to your theory, it took one woman to run that mule, another woman to manipulate the yarn, and another woman to do something else about the machinery. There are three women who produce as much as a thousand women could produce before.

Q. Are there not more women employed now about manufactories of that character than there were employed at that time in spinning?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Was not the employment of women in spinning at that time rather as an auxiliary to their regular work—for instance, at nights—and not their regular employment?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there not more women regularly employed who earn their living in manufactories now than at that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the rule has not thrown them out of employment, but only apparently seemed a disadvantage to them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose instead of the women you put in the Chinamen, how is it an advantage to the women?—A. They would find some other work. But they would not be displaced; you adopt a theory that is impossible. If that theory were true you would be right.

Q. Suppose for each woman entirely employed in these factories you put a Chinaman in her place, so that there would not be a woman employed in them?—A. All the women would have to starve. But I would

answer the question in this way: suppose every American in this country were to die, there would be no more American population left.

Q. That is not an answer to my question.—A. That is precisely the same. It is a theory that is impossible. You cannot drive the women out by Chinamen.

Q. I was trying to get at the difference between labor-saving machinery, which makes a wide employment for persons, and cheap labor, which excludes a higher class of paid labor.—A. I understood what you were driving at.

Q. Then your comparison hardly applies. The mule, as you admitted, gave regular employment directly and incidentally to a large number of women.—A. And with Chinamen it is precisely the same way.

Q. But if the Chinaman takes the place of the woman?—A. I assure you he does not. For instance, take the Chinamen in our factory. Before that and others were started a woman might have run about here from one week's end to the other without being able to find any employment, if she could not do domestic service. I do not know of any other employment that was open for a woman here in early days. A woman comes to our factory where Chinamen are employed. Instead of being apparently displaced she goes to our superintendent and she says, "Have you got any work for me?" He will ask, "Can you make button-holes?" She says, "Yes, I can make button-holes." A Chinaman cannot make button-holes. He does not know how to do it so well. By means of these Chinamen having manufactured so many yards of flannel this woman finds employment in making button-holes for shirts.

Q. Did you notice the testimony the other day of the women themselves, who stated that up to a certain length of time they found employment in making night-shirts, and things of that kind, and had no difficulty in getting employment?—A. I did not.

Q. It would seem they are now reduced to button-holes, where before they had the whole garment to make.—A. I did not read that testimony, but there is a great deal of prejudice on this subject. When you hear people speak about their own circle of employment you must always make due allowance.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. There are six or seven hundred Chinamen in your employ who have never been before the police?—A. None of them have ever been there.

Q. Have they ever been interfered with by the whites?—A. Yes.

Q. To any serious extent?—A. I do not think that they have ever been fatally injured. For instance, there is Ho Sun, as good a man as any one, who, in walking backwards and forwards from the factory, several times had rocks thrown at him, and once he had his cheek cut terribly. Of course we could not find the man who did it.

Q. Do I understand you to say that you think there is no choice as to the desirableness between Chinese immigration and other foreign immigration?—A. I think there is.

Q. Which do you think is the more desirable class of immigrants?—A. I think that so-called white people, if we could have them thoroughly examined and one thing and another, might be preferable, but I would a good deal sooner have the Chinese than a good many of them.

Q. As between the Chinese and Germans, how is your preference?—A. I would a great deal rather have some Chinamen than some Germans.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Take the average class of Germans who have come to California,

and the average class of Chinamen who have come here, which do you prefer?—A. The Germans by far.

Q. Which do you think the superior race?—A. There we come into some metaphysics.

Q. Answer the question.—A. I do not know that there is any difference at all. I believe they all come from the common stock.

Q. Which do you think occupies the higher moral standard?—A. At the present time?

Q. Which is superior, the German population in California or the Chinese population in California?—A. I think you will have to ask a different question. In some respects I think that the Chinese are better, and in other respects I think that the Germans are better. The Germans appear to be very frugal, but I think the Chinese have a great deal more frugality than the Germans.

Q. Which do you think, considering all things, frugality, industry, and their kind of civilization and morality, the most desirable as the future population of this continent and this State?—A. The Germans.

Q. Do you think that the unrestricted immigration of Chinese would have a tendency to prevent the immigration of Germans?—A. No.

Q. Or to encourage their immigration?—A. I do not believe it has anything to do with it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you find many Germans in these anti-cooly leagues?—A. A great many. There is just as bitter hatred among the Germans as among any other class of people.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are you an immigrant?—A. No, sir; I do not consider myself an immigrant. I came here a merchant.

Q. Are you native-born?—A. No, sir; I am not native-born.

Q. You are a foreigner?—A. Yes, sir; a native of Germany, and for that reason I am very much opposed to the prejudice against foreigners. I consider a Chinaman nothing but a foreigner.

Q. You put them upon the same plane as all foreign immigration?—A. The same as any other foreigner.

RICHARD G. SNEATH sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in this State?—Answer. A little over twenty-six years.

Q. You are the president of the Merchants' Bank, I believe, at present?—A. I am vice-president and manager.

Q. You were president of the Merchants' Exchange a few years ago, I believe?—A. I was president of the Chamber of Commerce and manager of the Merchants' Exchange.

Q. You have had extensive dealings with the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you to give your experience to the committee in reference to their honesty.—A. I have been a merchant most of my time in California. I have dealt a great deal with Chinese, and with the Chinese merchants in this city particularly. I have always found them truthful, honorable, and perfectly reliable in all their business engagements. I have done business with them perhaps to the amount of several millions of dollars. I have never had a single one of them to fail to live up to his contracts. I never lost a dollar by them, one way or the other, in all my business engagements with them.

Q. Could you say that much of the white race?—A. No, sir.

Q. During the time that you were a merchant you came in contact with these people in large transactions?—A. O, yes; quite large.

Q. Did it not get to be common during the time you were in mercantile pursuits that a Chinaman's word would be taken for a cargo of goods, while a bond would be demanded of white men?—A. I think it was a rule, as a general thing, that we entered into a written contract with white men, but with Chinamen we did not.

Q. You would take a Chinaman's word?—A. As a general thing.

By Mr. PIXLEY;

Q. What is your opinion regarding the advisability of the unrestricted immigration of Chinese to this coast?—A. I think it is quite a serious question myself. I am inclined to think that there are not more Chinamen here at present than are really needed. I think it is a question how far this immigration should go. It is possible we might be able to accommodate twice as many, and possibly not so many.

Q. Do you think it a proper subject of legislation to have a general restriction, or power to restrict?—A. I should say so.

Q. I suppose we have not undertaken to assume that many of the material interests of this State have not been advanced by Chinamen. I assumed that in our opening arguments, but there are other considerations. Let me ask you, is it your opinion that they can assimilate and become a portion of our people, or are they likely to do so?—A. I should think not.

Q. The coming of Chinamen here and remaining for a time, and only adult males coming, would not change the relative relation of the two peoples to each other?—A. I should think not.

Q. They would remain the same general alien people?—A. I think so.

Q. They do not speak our language as a rule?—A. They learn it very quickly.

Q. The younger people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I speak of the masses?—A. No; they do not speak it.

Q. As to civilization, which do you regard superior?—A. Ours, by all means.

Q. Is it your observation that they become converts to our Christian religion and believers in our peculiar views?—A. I should say not, although I know but very little about it.

Q. I do not speak of the kind of men of which Mr. Heynemann spoke, but as between foreign laborers who come from Europe and the Eastern States and as a class from China; which, in your opinion, is most desirable?—A. I should think other than Chinamen would be most desirable.

Q. Is it not your opinion that the influx of Chinese has a tendency to prevent the immigration of white labor from the East?—A. I should say not. I should say that the immigration of whites depended very materially upon their material success here; that is, the wages they receive, their advancement, and all that. Wages are about the same here now that they were ten or fifteen years ago. I can see but very little difference. We have had a great many Chinese come here and go away for the simple reason that they were not earning sufficient to be satisfactory; but that is to be taken in connection with the manner of their reception in this country.

Q. And their general love of home?—A. Their general love of home,

and all that. I do not think they would be willing to come here and stay unless they made a great deal more than they can make in their own country.

Q. As a rule, do they come here for permanent residence?—A. I think not.

Q. How as to foreign and eastern immigrants?—A. I think, as a general rule, they come here for the purpose of remaining and making their homes here.

Q. If you should consider the whole broad question, then, independent of material interests, I suppose you would consider it much more desirable that our State should be built up with foreign and eastern immigrants rather than by Chinese, aside from money-making, throwing that out of the question?—A. The question is pretty broad. The fact of money-making goes to enlarge the State in various ways. It may be personal consideration or political. I think that without Chinamen it would be impossible to develop very many of the material interests of the State. With them I think that our people, perhaps, are better off, we can progress more rapidly.

Q. You would hinge the political and social upon the material?—A. I think they all belong together.

Q. Would it be desirable to make the Chinese citizens by giving them the elective franchise?—A. I should rather think not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about the integrity of the Chinese in keeping their engagements. That is among the merchants?—A. Yes, sir; I spoke of the first-class merchants.

Q. The business men?—A. The business men.

Q. What are the general habits of industry of the Chinese?—A. I have employed a good many common Chinese, and find them a very industrious people, and, as a general thing, very reliable. In fact, in a great many situations I much prefer the Chinese to white labor. Then, again, as now, I am employing a considerable number of persons, farming pretty extensively, and employ nearly all white men, for the reason that Chinese do not understand farming. It is impossible to understand them and direct them properly on account of not being familiar with their language. They can only be worked in gangs, where they have their own headman; but still, after a while, as they soon take up with our language and pick up a great many mechanical ideas, some of them become very useful. I paid higher wages to Chinamen than I ever paid to white men, as cooks, for instance.

Q. What effect has Chinese labor had upon the growth and prosperity of the State, in your judgment?—A. Without the Chinese labor I do not think there would have been half the material wealth in this State.

Q. What effect has the presence of Chinese and their labor had in the increase of the white population here?—A. I am very well satisfied that the presence of the Chinese has furnished more high-priced labor among the white laborers than we could have had here without them.

Q. What, in your judgment, would be the policy of restricting Chinese immigration?—A. I should think it doubtful policy just at this time. I think it is a question whether a few more would not be an advantage. I should dislike very much to see this part of the country overrun by Chinamen, or that they should be entitled to the franchise, or take advantage of it. I do not think they would, however, because they are not inclined to care about voting or holding office. They are clannish and keep together. Socially, they mix very little with our people, but

I consider their presence here very important from the mere fact of its being cheaper labor. They do what white men do not care to do. My idea is made up from that nearly altogether.

Q. For what purpose do you consider them important?—A. In order to compete with other countries it is absolutely necessary that we should have cheap labor. They have it in other countries, and we must have it. Then, cheap labor necessarily furnishes a higher order of labor for a better class. I will state an instance that happened this morning: A gentleman, one of the largest butter and cheese makers in this State, came in. He milks perhaps twelve or thirteen hundred cows. He employs Chinamen to milk the cows at sixteen dollars a month. He says that it is impossible to compete with eastern factories in cheese and butter with white labor; he is trying now to make an arrangement at ten dollars per month, to contract for three years, and he says if he can do that he can make it successful but that if he cannot make that arrangement he will turn his cattle into beef and dispose of them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Who is this gentleman?—A. Mr. R. T. Buell, of Monterey County, an old resident of the State. I never met him before, myself, until this morning, when I happened to ask him incidentally in relation to his milk, because I have a milk-dairy myself. He is paying sixteen dollars a month for Chinamen, and I am paying thirty-five dollars for white milkers.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is it not the tendency of men who make money by the employment of Chinese to insist that they cannot get along without them and thus excuse their employment of Chinese instead of employing white labor?—A. I think the leading idea with them is to make money out of them, of course.

Q. If they succeed in making money out of them, is it not the tendency of their mind to insist upon excuses for their making it, that they could not do without them?—A. I think not. I know plenty of cases where it is demonstrated by figures that it is impossible to employ white labor.

Q. Do you know that in your own experience?—A. It is in the experience of a gentleman that I am acting for; I do not care to mention names. In this particular I do not know that he would like to have me mention his name. It is a case in the mines, hydraulic mining, where a mine will not pay with white labor, and with the use of Chinese labor they are able to pay expenses and a little more, and hope to make it up eventually. I know of two other men whose experience is the same.

Q. Is it the tendency to give the Chinese a position in the mines?—A. The tendency is to find cheap labor so as to make the mines pay. They do not care about Chinamen; it is a question of dollars and cents, cheap labor.

Q. What chance will there be for white men when the mines, and farms, and factories are all in the hands of the Chinese?—A. As I stated in relation to this gentleman in the butter business, he said if he could make something out of his farm he could go on and improve it.

Q. That he would get richer?—A. That he would be able to make some money out of the business, improve his farm, and get richer. In the case of the gentleman who owns these mines, by employing a certain number of Chinamen now he is able to get the mines open and furnish employment to a great many white people.

Q. Does he employ white persons?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In doing what?—A. Superintending the Chinamen and looking after the machinery.

Q. How many Chinese does he employ?—A. I do not know exactly; I think perhaps one or two hundred.

Q. How many white men does it take to superintend that number of Chinese?—A. He requires superintendents and he requires men to manage the machinery.

Q. What machinery is there about a mine?—A. Hydraulic machinery, timbering about the mines, &c.

Q. Is it a hydraulic mine?—A. Some of it.

Q. What timbering is there about a hydraulic mine?—A. I know of a mine where the tunnel is perhaps one hundred and fifty feet below the surface, and they have to timber up a shaft to run the material down.

Q. Do you not know that is a mere temporary expedient?—A. That is temporary.

Q. Then for temporary expedients they may employ the white men?—A. O, yes.

Q. But the enterprise is carried on by Chinamen?—A. If this gentleman will make money out of that mine, he will go on and improve property he has in this city, and invest the money he gets out of the mine in other ways.

Q. The fact is he will get richer, and it pays to hire the Chinamen?—A. That is the idea.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. This gentleman milks about twelve hundred cows?—A. He may milk five or six hundred out of that number.

Q. He finds he cannot make money unless he can obtain milkers at $10 a month?—A. At less than $16. He is now paying $16.

Q. You are a little in the Jersey line—so am I. Now, is the value of common milking cows greater or less here than in New-England or in Orange County, New York, which is the great butter-heart of the continent?—A. I think there is not much difference.

Q In point of climate, which is the most favorable?—A. I should think ours is.

Q. As to the economies of food?—A. No, sir; I do not think so.

Q. We do not house our cattle?—A. No, sir.

Q. And if we have grazing, we do not have to feed them?—A. They have longer periods of grazing there than we have; they have the whole summer-season.

Q. You say the general economy rather favors our climate and pasturage?—A. I think it is an even thing.

Q. Is the price of butter here in excess of what it is in New York?—A. I think butter, as a general thing, is cheaper here than in New York. Some seasons it is higher, and sometimes it is lower.

Q. Enough to make the difference of importation?—A. They send it both ways. We are not able to compete with the East yet in butter.

Q. Then it is about on an average?—A. Not far from that.

Q. Then the economy of feeding being less, and a little more favorable on account of the climate, and the value of cows being the same, it is a question of labor, the milk being about the same?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what the price of labor for milkers in Orange County, New York, is?—A. I do not, except in a general way. Ordinary farm-labor I understand to be about $15 a month.

Q. And this gentleman cannot prosper in his business unless he can

get Chinamen for $10?—A. He may labor under some disadvantages as to his peculiar locality. If his ranch were close by here he would have advantages which he would not have 300 miles away.

Q. Suppose out of these 1,200 cows there are a thousand milkers, and a man can milk 25. It would require about 40 people to milk them. Do you think it would be the most desirable, all things considered, for the country, and for the trade, and for the future of the country, its morals, its material interests, that we should have 40 white milkers from New England, or from Orange County, to do this milking, or 40 Chinese, aside from the individual interest of this particular gentleman?—A. This gentleman would certainly prefer the New England people, if they would come here and he could get them at a less price.

Q. In other words, if he could get New England prices down to Chinese prices he would pay white people?—A. He would prefer white labor at a much higher rate. I asked this gentleman in relation to the employment of white labor. He said it would be impossible for him to conduct his ranch if he had to depend upon white labor; he could not get white labor to stay there. I pay, myself, $35 a month for good milkers, and he pays $16 a month for Chinamen. I cannot get any milkers for less than $35.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you find a market for your butter?—A. I am not making butter for the market; I furnish principally milk to the city.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If you lived farther from the city, so that you could not send any milk to the city, and had to use it in making butter and cheese, could you afford to pay $35 a month for labor?—A. No, sir; I do not think I could get my money back at that rate.

Q. You are able to pay $35, then, because you are so near the city, and can sell milk to the city?—A. I can sell the milk to the city and make more out of milk.

Q. Do you employ white labor or Chinese labor in milking?—A. White labor altogether; all except cooks. I employ Chinese cooks altogether.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Why do you not employ Chinese milkmen?—A. I have never tried them. I have only been in the business about a year, and I should prefer to employ our own people at anything like a reasonable price. If I could afford to pay for them, I would rather have them about me. If I was there myself, and had to depend entirely upon that for a living, and it was necessary to economize down to the last dollar, I should probably employ Chinamen.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are a sort of fancy farmer?—A. I do not economize as closely as others do; still I propose to make my business pay.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do not the Eastern States export to this State large quantities of butter through the entire year, and are you not governed by that in your price here?—A. Butter is coming from the East nearly all the time. We have tried to export butter from here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do they manufacture cheese in this State?—A. O, yes, sir; cheese is manufactured here largely; I think we are consuming a large

amount of cheese. Eastern cheese will sell for four or five cents a pound more than our cheese here. The average price of our California cheese is about thirteen or fourteen cents a pound, and the other runs up to seventeen cents and twenty cents.

Q. What is the reason?—A. The reason is that the dairies there are slower, and they make better cheese than we do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Taking our country as a whole, we have an interest in every part of it; which is the better, to buy our products, our butter, &c., so as to give employment to white labor in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, or to make it here at home so as to give employment to the Chinamen?—A. Looking at it in a national point of view, I do not know; perhaps it would be better to get it from the East; but the citizens of California look at it from our own standard.

Q. Our standard is to benefit the Chinamen?—A. Our standard is to benefit California, and give employment to as many people as we can, and that those who have lands shall be able to occupy them and afford to own them and improve them. It is absolutely necessary to have as cheap labor as they have in the Eastern States in order to compete with countries abroad particularly, and in order to be a self-sustaining people and live in our own State. I do not believe in the idea of importing butter or anything else from another State that we can produce just as well here; but there is one point you have not asked me in relation to China. I think the presence of the Chinamen here in this State has made us familiar with them and their country and their commerce, and has led us into much closer relations. With the vast number of people they have there I believe it will eventuate in a very great blessing to the United States; it will furnish an opening for the labor of our skilled mechanics that we have no other opening for, perhaps. They are now using our flour to a very large extent, and they are using a great many things which we produce here; they are importing live-stock of all kinds; they are importing all sorts of manufactured goods. We have not been able to compete here with Europe, particularly in relation to the matter of manufactured fabrics.

Q. Do you know how many dollars all that amounts to in a year?—A. No, sir; I can find out.

Q. Do you know it is not one twentieth of the amount that we bring back from there, by the statistics?—A. I think, perhaps, that is our own fault. I think if we understood their country better, and had a number of their people here so as to manufacture a great many articles they are using elsewhere, and our relations were more intimate, we could furnish them a great deal more than they could furnish us. This trade has been going on all the time they have been here, and it has grown up to quite a handsome business.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 13, 1876.

VERNON SEAMAN sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You have been a resident in China?—Answer. Yes, sir; I was there about five years.

Q. In what place?—A. Most of the time at Shanghai, but also at Hong-Kong.

Q. Were you connected with the house of Oliphant & Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is an American house?—A. It is an American house doing business for the Chinese.

Q. It is a house of extensive commercial relations?—A. Yes, sir; they had stations at all the open ports in China.

Q. Have you prepared any statement on this subject?—A. I made a little memorandum to guide me in what I wish to state to the committee. I began by making an estimate of the exports and imports from China to and from the United States. It is brief, and it will take but a minute to read it.

The exports from China and Japan to the United States of America of teas are from fifty to sixty million pounds per annum, about one-half coming from each country. Of this, about eight million pounds is sold in San Francisco; the balance is distributed over the country, in transit through this city and by vessels, direct from China to New York and other northern cities. The better grades of teas pass through this city, and lower qualities are shipped by sailing-vessels because of the economy in freights. To England and the Continent about one hundred and sixty to one hundred and seventy million pounds of tea are annually shipped.

The silk trade is largely European, eighty-eight thousand bales being the average annual shipments to Europe, and some ten thousand bales to America.

For reference, I have compiled the following statistics from recent China prices-current, showing the annual exports and imports for the year 1875, the comparative value, &c.:

From China.

25,000,000 pounds tea, 50 cents	$12,500,000
5,000 bales silk, $500	2,500,000
12,000,000 pounds sugar, 8 cents	960,000
50,000,000 pounds rice, 4 cents	2,000,000
2,000,000 pounds cassia, 12 cents	240,000
300,000 boxes fire-crackers, $1	300,000
500,000 pounds camphor, 15 cents	75,000
60,000 bales matting, $4	240,000
700 cases straw hats, $40	28,000
2,000 cases fans, $4	8,000
2,200 cases preserves, $5	11,000
2,000 cases chinaware, $20	40,000
50 cases vermilion, $40	2,000
770 cases cassia oil, $110	84,000
2,200 cases cassia buds, $20	44,000
500 cases aniseed oil, $200	100,000
110 cases aniseed star, $20	2,200
Opium and sundry	1,000,000
	20,134,200

To China.

Treasure, about	$7,650,000
13,000 barrels flour	650,000
18,000 flasks quicksilver	1,000,000
2,000,000 feet lumber	50,000
15,000 tons coal	150,000
Sundry as per Commercial Herald, about	1,000,000
	10,500,000

From the foregoing it will be seen that we receive from China annually double the amount we send away.

The average arrivals of Chinese in California is about 20,000 per annum, against 80,000 of all other nationalities. Of the foregoing imports about $5,000,000 worth are consumed in this city and State.

I have had very good opportunities of getting a thorough knowledge of John Chinaman, having passed five years in China, some three years here in the China trade, and three years in the Southern States and the East studying this labor question.

In China they are a quiet, industrious people; their merchant class, with whom I have been especially identified, being strictly honorable and upright in their dealings. In all my experience there I never knew of but one case of dishonesty in packing teas or silks. This instance was that of five hundred and a half chests of tea shipped to London, and upon arrival there some scrap-iron was found between the outside mats and the boxes. The shipment was condemned and sold at a loss, which loss was promptly paid by the native merchant who originally sold the goods. Does this compare favorably with cotton shipments from New Orleans, or not? The wages of a cooly in Southern China is from $4 to $6 per month; in the north, about $1 per month higher. They come here, of course, to better their condition, and being poor, very gladly avail themselves of the advantages offered them by the six immigration companies. These companies advance their expenses, and they refund the same from the proceeds of their labor. They insure them work and take care of them in this to them a strange country.

I remember the death of J. Power Dore, referred to by one of your witnesses, (Mr. King.) It created a great deal of excitement at the time in Shanghai, yet it was a well-known fact that Dore provoked the assault by snatching a lantern from the supposed cooly. Instead of a cooly, the man was the brother of a woman whom Dore had abducted. Foreigners in China have very little to complain of. They do about as they please. They have extensive steamer-lines on the Yang-tse and Canton Rivers, and are largely interested in all branches of trade, insurance, &c.

The Chinese as a people have many peculiarities that are not especially in accord with the ideas of foreigners; still, they are inclined to be very industrious; and aside from the habit of opium-smoking, which is by no means a universal one, they are not dissipated. At their annual new year they drink unlimited quantities of "samshoo," a spirit distilled from rice, and consider that they can then have unlimited license; but I have never seen one of them under "*spiritual*" influences except upon such occasions. I have seen one hundred of them at work making shoes at Sampson's manufactory at North Adams, Mass.; one hundred and fifty doing laundry-work at Captain Harvey's steam laundry, at Bellville, N. J.; and some five hundred to six hundred on cotton and sugar plantations in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas; also have seen them railroad-building in Alabama, and levee-building at and near Baton Rouge. In these various works their employers were satisfied with their labor. That was at that time. It may have undergone a change since then. This was three years ago. In cotton-raising, on the place of Colonel Sessions, at Luna, Ark., are employed one hundred Chinese and one hundred negroes. Each class cultivated one-half of his plantation. The result of the year's work was, as he stated to me in 1872, five and a half bales to the negro hand, and eight bales to each Chinaman.

Q. To the acre?—A. To the hand—to the man—in the crop. The negro and Chinaman get on well together. The wages paid them in the South three years ago was $28 per month, and they boarded themselves. At that time the planters of the South were very anxious to get this class of labor. Some trouble between the Chinese and planters occurred, but in all the cases that I became cognizant of these were caused by the non-payment of wages; for the negro could not be depended upon for

steady work. This condition of affairs may have undergone a change since 1873. Then there were some fifteen hundred Chinese in the South. They had gone there originally under contract to Koopmanschap, Williams, and others; the most of them for the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad Company. They completed this work, received no pay, and were fearfully abused, and turned off in the swamps, where they managed to exist on roots, berries, and anything they could get, until they were relieved by Chin-Poo, a very intelligent Chinaman, who had made the tour of the country with me studying this very labor question. Chin-Poo obtained labor for them at good wages from sugar and cotton planters.

I do not consider them a desirable element for California by any means; still the matter of their employment, in my opinion, rests entirely within ourselves. We give them work, and as long as this continues they will come. All Chinese can read and write their own language. Their school-system in China is a compulsory one, I believe. All children go to school—that is, all male children. Females are looked upon in a different light there from the males.

Railroading and telegraphy are yet in their infancy in China; still, the prospects are that very soon these great enterprises will be opened there to foreign competition.

Our minister, Hon. George F. Seward, is urging, with his powerful energies, concessions that may lead to grand results for the American interests; and looking at the matter purely in a national light, I am inclined to believe that we are hasty in getting frightened at the "yellow man."

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If I understand you correctly, you state that the arrivals of Chinese in this country average twenty thousand a year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From what sources do you get that information?—A. I took those statistics from the tables of the Merchants' Exchange here in San Francisco.

Q. That is an important statement.—A. I think that can be verified by their records.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did the massacre at Tientsin occur while you were in China?—A. No, sir; it occurred subsequently; that is, the massacre of the missionaries.

Q. Do you remember the details of that massacre?—A. Nothing more than what I have read in the papers. It is a matter that I do not remember especially.

Q. How extensive was the massacre stated to be?—A. I recollect the foreigners took refuge on board of a steamer that was there at the time. I do not remember how many were killed.

Q. A great many women were dishonored and killed?—A. Yes, sir; missionary women.

Q. When was that?—A. I am inclined to think that occurred in 1870 or 1871. I will not be positive. It was several years ago.

Q. Do you know of other cases of that kind occurring in China?—A. No; I do not. That is the only case I have heard or read of.

Q. Did you have that massacre in mind when you stated that foreigners have no reason to complain of their treatment in China?—A. No; I was speaking more especially of the merchant class, or parties doing business with the Chinese. I was not speaking of missionaries.

The missionaries take upon themselves extra risks by going into the interior among these people.

Q. Where is Tientsin?—A. Tientsin is in the north of China, about six hundred miles from Shanghai. I think it is a drive of but a day and a half from Pekin.

Q. Is it on a navigable river?—A. There is a small river running up from the coast to Tientsin. I have never been to Tientsin.

Q. Is that city frequented by foreigners; is there access to it?—A. Yes; there is a line of steamers running to Tientsin. I suppose the foreign population of Tientsin is about two hundred. I do not think it can be more than two or three hundred.

Q. The town is not closed from access to foreigners; it is an open port?—A. It is an open port.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know how many Chinamen return from here to China each year?—A. No, sir; I do not. The statistics of the Pacific Mail Company will give that information very readily.

The CHAIRMAN. If my memory is correct, this gentleman's statement in regard to the number of arrivals is somewhat in conflict with the statement of Mr. Wheeler and others. If there is any way of getting at these statistics of arrivals, I think it is important, so as to know just what the truth is.

Q. (By Mr. BROOKS.) How is the record of arrivals obtained and kept at the exchange?—A. They keep a regular statistical table there of all immigrants and arrivals of merchandise.

Q. From what sources do they obtain their information?—A. From the passenger-lists of vessels, I presume.

Q. How is it that this table differs so much from the custom-house returns?—A. I do not see how they should differ, because the same papers which go into the custom-house go to the exchange. One is merely a copy from the other.

Q. Then the custom-house list is the original?—A. The custom-house record is certainly the official record.

Q. I wanted to know which source is the most authentic.—A. I should judge that the custom-house returns would be perfectly straightforward in every way.

Q. Is there any reason to suppose that the custom-house returns would not contain nearly all the immigrants?—A. No, sir.

Q. There would be no great amount over what they give?—A. I should think there would be none over what they give at all. I believe they collect a certain revenue from the passengers who arrive.

Q. Is it their business to know how many Chinese arrive?—A. Yes, sir.

ROBERT F. PECKHAM sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. At the present time I am a woolen-manufacturer.

Q. How long have you resided in California.—A. Thirty years.

Q. Where have you resided?—A. I have resided most of the time in Santa Cruz and Santa Clara Counties.

Q. What business have you followed since you have been here?—A. I was practicing law from 1850 until about 1869. Since that time I have been carrying on a woolen-mill.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You came here in 1846?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What institution are you connected with?—A. I am president and managing agent of the San José Woolen-Mills, situated in San José, California.

Q. Do you employ Chinese?—A. We do.

Q. Are Chinese employed by other parties in your neighborhood in San José?—A. Yes, sir; they are very generally employed, particularly in fruit-raising and hop-raising. The labor portion of business of that kind is nearly all done by Chinamen.

Q. How many Chinamen are employed in your county? Have you any idea of the number?—A. That I could not state.

Q. In what business, in what occupation are they employed?—A. They are employed to a small extent in farming. They are employed in washing; they are employed to a great extent as house-servants. In the business of raising fruits, strawberries, blackberries, currants, and everything of that kind they are very generally employed, and I think perform most of that labor.

Q. Why are they so employed?—A. I suppose because those who employ them think they can do the best with them. We employ them because it is necessary for us to do so in order to compete in the business.

Q. How many do you employ in your mill?—A. When we are running full we employ about twenty white hands in the mill, and our business gives employment to eight or ten white men on the outside. We employ about sixty-five Chinese. About three-fourths of the expense of running the institution, including the labor performed in selling our goods, is paid to white labor, and about one-fourth is paid to the Chinese. We employ Chinamen because it is necessary for us to compete in the business. To our white help we have to pay wages far in advance of what is paid in similar institutions in the Eastern States with which we come directly in competition. To Chinamen on an average we pay less. A year and a half ago we compared pay-rolls with several institutions in the East, and I found that in our business and theirs there was but very little difference; that with our high-priced white labor and cheap-priced Chinese labor we average with them. They are 20 per cent. under us at this time.

Q. How are you able to compete with them under these circumstances?—A. I do not know that we can compete with them the next year, but we have been able to hold our own pretty well by having the advantage of the market in the selection of wools.

Q. What are the advantages or disadvantages of employing Chinese labor in your business?—A. As compared with what?

Q. You have some advantage or disadvantage in employing Chinese. What is it?—A. With the prices that are demanded for white labor in California we could not carry on the business; we should have to close our works. There are about $3,000,000 of capital engaged in the business on the Pacific coast, and I suppose that all are in the same fix.

Q. Can you obtain white labor at the same price?—A. At the prices that we obtain Chinese?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Very seldom.

Q. Could you supply the places of the Chinese with boys and girls?—A. We have tried a number of boys, and our experience with boys has been that where their parents are with them in the mill, to look after

them and see that they perform their duty, we have no trouble with them. We have several boys of this kind ranging from 14 to 18 or 20 years of age, to whom we pay wages considerably in advance of Chinese wages. We have tried the experiment, though, of employing other boys whose parents were not there to look after them, and it has been a failure; they would work a few days and then stop and go off.

Q. They are unsteady?—A. They are unsteady.

Q. How do white boys and girls compare with Chinese as to ability?—A. I think where the white boys and girls are willing to work, and are trained to it, they are just as good as the Chinese. The Chinese, though, are very industrious people. Taking them as a class, they are the most industrious people I ever saw in my life.

Q. Do you see any difference between the two as to ability in performing their tasks?—A. I do not know that I do. If I were the superintendent in the mill I might answer the question.

Q. Is there any difference in regard to steadiness and persistence in their employment?—A. The Chinese, as I say, are a very industrious class of people. They are a little crotchety; they understand how to combine; they will learn you before you learn them. They understand how much work they can do and how little they can do, in order to give you satisfaction, before you will learn how much they are capable of doing. When they get your gauge, if they are properly managed, properly handled, they will come up to it all the time, and will not pass behind.

Q. Which requires the most watching?—A. They all require watching.

Q. You do not see any difference in that respect?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I do.

Q. So that the result is that color makes very little difference in ability, capacity, or fidelity?—A. They are the most powerful imitators that I have ever seen as a class. They imitate and do anything that you show them how to do, and adapt themselves to it with the most readiness of any people that I ever saw. I think that a Chinaman will learn to weave as well on a fancy loom in one month as most American girls would learn in two months, but they do not exhibit any inventive genius. They are conservative; they want to do the thing in their old way.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. They do not discover any new processes?—A. No, sir; they do not discover any new processes.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You stated that they were crotchety. What do you mean by that?—A. I mean that they will combine. They have the power of combining. If you do not happen to get along with them, and have a difficulty with one, the whole lot will stand up for each other, and as a general thing go together. It is pretty hard to understand, but that has been our experience.

Q. In your dealings with these people, have you formed any opinion as to whether they are independent and free, or whether they are dependent and bound to any one?—A. I am not of the opinion that they are bound to any one in our sense of the term; but when they agree to perform service for another, particularly if for a Chinaman, they observe their agreement in the utmost good faith. Our process of securing Chinese help is through a Chinese merchant in this city, who, I understand, acts in the capacity of an intelligence-office. He agrees to fur-

nish us so many men to do such and such work. He picks up those men where he can get them, and gets a commission from them for procuring their situations. They are bound to him; he stands between us and them. If we have any difficulty with a Chinaman, he or his overseer in the mill has to settle it with this merchant. In that way we get along with them without any trouble; but I am of the opinion that we would not be able to get along with them so well if we dealt with them directly and each man occupied an independent position toward us.

Q. Do you ever deal with them directly?—A. In a commercial point of view, I do.

Q. You do not contract with these operatives directly?—A. We get them in the way I have stated.

Q. In regard to those who come directly under your notice there, what is their character for honesty, sobriety, and general obedience to the laws?—A. I have seen one, and but one, drunken Chinaman in California.

Q. How about their honesty?—A. It is hard to speak of the honesty of any people as a whole class. There are good, bad, and indifferent among the Chinese, as well as among any other class of people. I can safely say, however, that they will average well.

Q. How do they compare with the same grades or classes among other people?—A. I think they will average well.

Q. As well?—A. As well. As to their honesty, I will say that we have been selling goods, the products of our mill, in San Francisco for the last six years. We sell to all classes of merchants, including Chinese. Our business with the Chinese is to a considerable extent. We have carried to the account of profit and loss from bad bills from $5,000 to $8,000 a year, and $75 covers all that we have ever lost by a Chinaman.

Q. What is the percentage?—A. I cannot state the percentage. I have not figured it out.

Q. You say that you have lost $75 by Chinese, and from $5,000 to $8,000 by whites, but unless we know the proportion of your dealing with the two classes it really affords no basis.—A. I have not figured out the percentage. It is decidedly in favor of the Chinese.

Q. You say you have employed some boys and girls at higher wages than you give the Chinese. Why do you pay them higher wages if the ability is the same?—A. I will say that, as a rule, whenever we can get a white person, be he boy, man, or woman, who can perform the duties of a Chinaman, we will give them $5 a month more than we pay the Chinamen for the same labor.

Q. What is the reason? Why do you do it?—A. It is probably attributable to feelings of humanity.

Q. Simply because you prefer to give a white man the labor if he can do it?—A. Yes, sir; we prefer it every time, provided we can do it and compete in our business.

Q. And you do that at some pecuniary sacrifice?—A. We do it at pecuniary sacrifice.

Q. Do you know how the Chinese domestics are employed?—A. I think they are picked up just where you can get them.

Q. The contract with them is made individually?—A. I think so. That has been my experience.

Q. Have you had any experience in their employment?—A. Not much.

Q. Do you hire any yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. How is it with regard to those who are engaged in agricultural

pursuits and other pursuits in your neighborhood? Do you know whether they are employed directly, or through a contractor or boss?—A. I cannot state positively. I think, however, my knowledge justifies me in making the statement that if I want ten, fifteen, or twenty Chinamen to do a job of work for me, almost any Chinaman that I come across will undertake to furnish men, and he will procure them.

Q. Do you pay those men, or do you pay the man who employs them for you?—A. I pay the man who employs them for me.

Q. In your country, is not the fruit business carried on to a great extent?—A. To a very large extent. Our fruit from San José goes all over the United States.

Q. You say that Chinamen are employed a good deal in that business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you tell me why they are employed in that business?—A. I cannot state of my own knowledge. I can only state of what fruit-raisers and the men who employ them tell me, that it is necessary for them to employ Chinese in order to compete in the business and make it a success. That I give you as hearsay.

Q. What facilities are there for obtaining white persons in the business of picking fruit?—A. They can be got if you will pay them the wages demanded. I think at the present time, if there were no Chinamen in the country, and no more white men than there are, it would be found that there would be a very short supply of white labor for the business of the Pacific coast.

Q. At the busy season of the year, when labor is most in demand, is there a surplus of labor here?—A. I do not think there is in our section of the country.

Q. What business is carried on besides fruit-raising in your section?—A. Fruit-raising, agriculture, merchandising, and the ordinary mechanical pursuits.

Q. Fruit-raising and agriculture are your two principal productive pursuits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Beside your own institution is there much manufacturing in your county?—A. There are some tanneries making leather; there are two establishments for canning and preserving fruit; there are two machine-shops where they make castings, steam-boilers, steam-engines; and then there is the ordinary number of blacksmith-shops, grist-mills, and such things of that kind as you will generally find in a city of about 15,000 inhabitants.

Q. The powder-mill is in another county, Santa Cruz County?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have lived there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are there tanneries also in Santa Cruz?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is Chinese labor employed in these institutions?—A. I cannot tell you. I have not lived there for eleven or twelve years. I have not lived there since the powder-mill was built.

Q. What is your opinion as to the advantage or disadvantage of the immigration of Chinese to this State hitherto?—A. My opinion is that if we had not had the cheap labor which the Chinese have afforded us, the industries of the State would not have been developed as much as they have by at least twenty years.

Q. What effect has that had upon the employment and the wages of white people?—A. It has the same effect upon the situation of white laborers, probably, that the invention of labor-saving machinery has. The street railroads have displaced the omnibuses; the gang-plow, the reaping-machines, and the steam thresher have displaced a great many

white laborers; on the other hand, by the employment of Chinese and the consequent development of industries upon the coast, situations have been made, and good situations, for a great many white people who would not otherwise have found employment. I do not know how the balance lies. I think that the nominal value in dollars of white labor may have been somewhat decreased by their presence, but my opinion is that the purchasing power of white labor has not been decreased. A man can live upon $1 a day now. With the wages paid to Chinese labor the white man purchases more of the necessaries of life than I could with my wages in 1849, when I worked for $16 a day.

Q. What influence has it had in increasing the comforts of the white population of the laboring class? I do not know but that you have substantially answered the question in your last answer.—A. I say that the purchasing power of labor from 1849 to the present time has been increased, whether you attribute it to the presence of Chinese or other causes. There are other causes operating with it; this Chinese question is not the only one in the country.

Q. To what extent has Chinese labor reduced the price of commodities here, such as the laboring class with the rest of us consume?—A. It would be necessary to have some little time for preparation in order to answer the question.

Q. Is our manufacturing in this State generally for export or domestic use?—A. The most of it is for domestic use. Where we only manufacture for domestic use and confine our manufactures to articles which the East cannot well send here, we do not feel the pressure of the competition; but whenever we are producing a surplus and have to send that surplus to the East for a market, we have got to learn what it costs them there to produce the same article, and we must gauge ourselves accordingly.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do your blankets, your woolen products, find a market to any extent in the East?—A. To a limited extent.

Q. What is the difference in the prices of labor upon farms here—white labor, if you please—and corresponding labor in the Eastern and Middle States?—A. White labor on farms here is worth, that is it commands, from $30 to $40 a month and board. I think that the value of such labor in the East, when I was there last, would range in different localities from $18 to $25.

Q. And board?—A. And board.

Q. What is the difference between the average price of white labor upon farms here and Chinese labor?—A. I think that you can get Chinese labor, where you have a large amount of work, for about thirty dollars a month, and they will board themselves.

Q. What difference would that make; what would be the per cent., taking white labor at the price you state, including board? Would it be 20, 25, or 30 per cent.?—A. Not being a farmer I can hardly answer.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What would be the cost of boarding a white man?—A. I do not know what it would be on a farm, how they would figure it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. State what is the average difference in the amount of work that a Chinaman and a white laborer will perform on a farm?—A. I have never worked Chinamen on a farm.

Q. State from your knowledge of what a Chinaman can do.—A. The

Chinese as a general thing are not very muscular, but tney are serviceable, though, in heavy work. We know that from what they have done in railroading as a matter of history.

Q. Take the fruit business that you speak of in your county.—A. A Chinaman will do as much as a white man. Some white men will do more than others. There is a great deal of difference in white men, and there is the same difference in Chinamen.

Q. I want to get at the average amount of work that each race will perform.—A. I do not think in my business that there is any difference; in fact there cannot well be, because our machine runs—that does the work, and the operative has simply got to attend it and keep it going. There is not room for any great difference between the labor of the two classes.

Q. Take farm labor, plowing, gathering and taking care of fruit, how does Chinese labor compare with white labor?—A. Not having been engaged in farming I cannot answer.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Would your business of manufacturing have been started, or now exist, without Chinese labor?—A. It could not be carried on without it.

Q. The work, then, that is done would not have been done at all?—A. The work that is being done would not have been done at all. It our Chinamen were taken from us we should close up to-morrow.

Q. You employ a certain number of white men who would not be employed if the Chinese were not employed?—A. Yes, sir; that is true in our case.

Q. What is the line of goods that you manufacture?—A. Blankets, cashmeres, flannels.

Q. What is done with the cashmeres?—A. They are sold in the market.

Q. Are they manufactured and used here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that manufacture carried on here before the woolen factories began to make those goods?—A. No, sir. It is only carried on to a limited extent now, and that by Chinese labor.

Q. The goods are made up here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Formerly ready-made clothing was imported from the East?—A. It was imported.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you credit Chinese as fully as the whites, and with more security?—A. Yes, sir; we trust a Chinese merchant.

Q. Who has a store?—A. There are Chinese merchants in this city whom I would credit to-day twenty thousand dollars, who have not got two thousand dollars' worth of property visible to me; at least I would not know where to go and point it out to the sheriff. They never fail to pay.

Q. You say the reason why you are compelled to have cheaper labor than white is on account of the difficulty of competition in your business with eastern products?—A. Yes, sir; that is the difficulty.

Q. Does the difficulty arise in no degree from competition here with other manufacturers?—A. If there was no competition in the East, and all the other mills here employed this cheap Chinese labor, we should have to do it too; but if we all agreed upon it here, and there were no mills in the East, we could employ white labor.

Q. Does not the expense of transportation, &c., give you the control of the market among your various mills here?—A. No, sir; it does not give us the control.

Q. The East still sends in goods here notwithstanding your cheap labor?—A. Yes, sir. The currency question is a very serious one with us.

Q. That modifies the proposition. Then, notwithstanding your cheap labor, you find difficulty in competing with the mills in the East?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In this home-market?—A. In this home-market.

Q. Mr. Heynemann, president of the woolen-mills here, testified the other day that formerly they employed more Chinamen than whites, but they were gradually reversing that, and were now employing more whites than Chinamen, and they found they still could do it and compete. Is that your experience?—A. We are trying to do the same thing. We picked up, within the last year, two or three poor women who were willing to go to work for what we could afford to pay them. We employed them, and they stay with us and make first-rate hands. When we find more of that kind we will employ them.

Q. Do they work for the wages that the Chinamen get?—A. We gave them an advance of from 12½ to 15 per cent. above what we pay Chinamen.

Q. You find you can still compete under that state of circumstances? Your mill still runs on?—A. We have not carried that to a sufficient extent to make it a test. We have picked up only a few in that way. Our intentions are, however, as soon as we can get that kind of labor, and compete, to employ it. I think there are very few men who would not employ white labor, if they could do it, instead of Chinamen.

Q. What dividend does your mill now pay to stockholders?—A. I have paid but two dividends.

Q. How much were those?—A. The first was three per cent. on a nominal capital, and the other six per cent.; nine per cent. in six years.

Q. You mean by nominal capital the amount named in your articles?—A. That was paid on the nominal capital of the mill, but about double that on the paid-up capital. About eighteen per cent. on the paid-up capital in six years, is what the mill has paid.

Q. Were those percentages paid lately, or in your earlier operations?—A. The first dividend, of three per cent., was paid a year ago last April; last April we paid six; and we shall probably pay six next April.

Q. Then as the mill is now running it pays about twelve per cent. per annum on the actual capital, aside from the nominal?—A. On the actual paid-up capital.

Q. Do you find the profit rather increasing, or diminishing?—A. This year we expect to make nothing. Last year we made something, and something the year before last.

Q. What will prevent you from making something this year?—A. The staleness of the market.

Q. Over-production in your line of business?—A. Over-production in our line of business. The cause is national.

Q. The general depression of business all over the United States?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. All over the world, I believe?—A. We so understand it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say you have declared two dividends in six years?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean that these two dividends represent the entire profit of your business for six years?—A. There is a little surplus.

Q. What do you consider the actual profits each year upon the capital invested, giving your own labor and time?—A. We have probably made, on a paid-up capital of $211,000, in the neighborhood of $75,000 in six years. I cannot state exactly, from the fact that from the commencement of this year we had a very large surplus of stock on hand, and we have been slaughtering that wherever we could, to get rid of it. We have necessarily lost on it, and I do not know how the balance will now stand.

Q. In order to make your answers intelligible, let me ask you what per cent. you consider the profit upon your capital employed each year, taking the six years together?—A. I do not think it over 9 per cent.

Q. Nine per cent. upon the actual capital employed, and does it include your own labor and time?—A. It includes the profits of the whole business in the aggregate.

Q. Your own labor and everything included?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About 9 per cent. per annum?—A. Yes, sir; I will state further that that was all or nearly all made in the years 1874 and 1875.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is about the cash value of your present stock?—A. Stock on hand?

Q. The stock on hand.—A. Accounts and everything?

Q. Yes. What is the cash value of your capital stock now?—A. The cash value of our capital stock——[a pause.]

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The corporate stock.—A. The market value of it?

Q. No; your value of it. You have got a nominal capital stock, and you paid 9 per cent. What is the value of your stock? What would you sell for?—A. I bought one hundred shares day before yesterday for 38 and a half cents, but would not sell for that.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you added new machinery during the last six years and improved your mill, or is it as it originally started?—A. We have adopted some new improvements in machinery.

Q. Is there any competition with the East in fruit-raising?—A. Our surplus fruit goes there for a market.

Q. They send none here at all?—A. I think not; but our fruit goes there by car-loads and by train-loads.

Q. Then the principle of competition would not seem to apply in that business as it does in yours?—A. I do not see why. If we can produce fruit and ship it there, and undersell their productions, we have got their market.

Q. Is it not really an absence of good fruit there which makes a market for us in the East?—A. I do not know to what extent they give preference to California fruit. There is certainly not an absence of fruit in the East.

Q. The fact that very large quantities of our fruit go there would imply that there is an absence of such excellent varieties of fruit there. I did not know but that you would imply so from the fact that fruit goes there in such quantities?—A. I know that our fruit goes there; but what it brings, or how much profit there is in the business, I do not know.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you attribute that to the superiority of your fruits of the same character over those produced in the East, or to the absence of enough

production in the East to supply the market?—A. I do not know whether it is attributable to one thing or the other.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. It is both, really. Do you not know that California fruit in the East, our grapes and our pears, bring a very high price, and that they were an object of particular interest on account of their size, flavor, and beauty at the Centennial Exposition? Did you see that stated?—A. I do not think I read of that.

Q. Were the tanneries when you were in Santa Cruz County run by Chinese labor?—A. I think not.

Q. They were quite extensive at that time?—A. Yes, sir; they had two or three pretty extensive tanneries in Santa Cruz at that time; they were not run by Chinese labor, and I do not think the tanneries there are run by Chinese labor yet.

Q. It has been testified that the tanneries in this city are run by Chinese labor?—A. That may be; I have no knowledge of the fact.

Q. Then, so far as tanneries are concerned, your observation would be that they may be run and run very extensively without Chinese labor?—A. I have never seen, to my knowledge, a Chinaman engaged in a tannery.

Q. Do you think that the unrestricted immigration of Chinese here is desirable?—A. That is a difficult question to answer.

Q. Still, we have to get at the opinions of those who deal with the Chinese?—A. There are many industries in this State which cannot be carried on successfully with Chinese labor.

Q. Such as what?—A. I will mention cotton. This State has millions of acres of land capable of producing as good cotton as is produced anywhere; but the business is not profitable with Chinese labor in this State, at the present wages; it is regarded by men most conversant with it as a failure. That industry cannot be carried on. The raising of olives, the making of olive-oil, the putting up of sardines, (of which we have any quantity upon the coast,) the raising of rice, castor-oil beans, flaxseed for oil, and all those things are in our future. In my opinion, the industries of California are in their infancy; we have hardly commenced to develop them.

Q. You think we ought to have even cheaper Chinese labor to develop these industries?—A. We want even cheaper labor than we have.

Q. Even by the Chinese?—A. Even by the Chinese; and as those branches of labor become developed, even if done by Chinese, they will give additional employment to whites.

Q. What proportion of Chinese to whites do you think our civilization could stand?—A. I would rather the statesmen would settle that question for me.

Q. The question has been asked of witnesses, do you think that 8,000,000 Chinamen to 1,000,000 whites would be too many?—A. The great difficulty in this State at present is, that while there is no want of capital to develop the State or carry on any kind of business, there is a want of confidence by capitalists in the industries of the State, even with what is called cheap Chinese labor. It is with the utmost difficulty that we can get any man of capital to put money into anything that is going to give employment to the people.

Q. Is it not one difficulty that the capitalist wants too much interest on his money?—A. I regard interest as large. There are many things brought into this scale; it is not all one thing.

Q. Then I understand that your opinion is that the material interests

of the State would be advanced by a large increase of the Chinese population; that is, the money-making facilities of the State and the development of its industries would be enhanced?—A. It would be increased by the importation of any class of people who can be employed in building up the industries of the country at rates that will command confidence on the part of capitalists, and induce them to put their money into it, be they white or be they Chinese.

Q. In other words, people who will furnish their labor at a low rate?—A. Yes.

Q. What effect will the Chinese have upon our civilization, our institutions? Do you think that they ought to become voters?—A. No.

Q. If we have a very large class of adult males, (non-voters)—setting aside, now, the mere question of making money—what would be the effect on our civilization, morals, and society?—A. If I should give you my honest opinion, I should answer that I think there are too many voters now.

Q. You do not propose that they shall be voters, and I speak of a non-voting class?—A. I do not think that the Chinese as a class want to be voters; and I do not think we ought to force suffrage upon them.

Q. Still you do not answer my question. I ask you what effect it would have upon our institutions and civilization to have a large adult male population here, disproportionate to the whites, who are not allowed to vote? How is it consistent with republican ideas that there should be a very large class of non-voting population, and what effect would it have upon our institutions, which we both equally like?—A. I see no cause why our institutions should not stand.

Q. You think that the presence of a class in a republic who have no right of self-government at all is perfectly consistent with its institutions?—A. That involves abstract principles of government.

Q. That involves a direct practical question, the question to be solved perhaps in this case; but I will not press you to answer if you have not thought of the matter enough to answer the question?—A. I think the answer is contained in the answer to a former question. I do not think there is any reasonable man in California but what would prefer white population to Chinese, and prefer to give them employment; but when it comes to a question of whether we shall stand still and do nothing, or go ahead with Chinese labor, I think a majority would say "Go ahead with Chinese labor."

Q. You think that is the opinion of the people of the State?—A. I think that is the opinion of the majority, putting the question in that way. There is a difference of opinion, though, as to whether that is really a fair statement of the case as it exists.

Q. Suppose these other elements were considered, that a large alien class, (by alien I mean those who have no part in government, no right of self-government, no right to vote, disenfranchised,) with peculiar habits, isolated people, were to come here in these great numbers, do you think, aside from the fact that capitalists might profit by it, and that some men might be overseers and drive this labor afield, still the opinion of the people of the State would be that that ought to be continued?—A. It is possible that they might come here in such large numbers as to be very detrimental. I do not think that they have done so up to this time. Whether they will in the future or not is a question of mere guesswork, and it is not safe for you or me to testify to it under oath; we cannot tell anything about it.

Senator SARGENT. It is a matter of opinion.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. I want to ask you two or three questions confined to your present occupation, which is manufacturing wool?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You work about two hundred Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. How many?—A. When we are running full about sixty-five Chinese.

Q. If you could not have that Chinese labor you could not work your factory?—A. No, sir.

Q. What would be the result of your not working your factory?—A. It would be a stoppage. We would have so much dead property on our hands.

Q. And the result would be that the commodities which you are producing our people would be compelled to purchase from Massachusetts?—A. Wherever they could get them.

Q. From a foreign market; and the only difference would be that our people would be compelled to buy in a foreign or eastern market instead of producing the article here? Would there be any difference to our people in the cost of buying those articles there which you manufacture?—A. I do not know that there would be.

Q. Then there is no advantage to the buyer in that respect?—A. I cannot say that there is.

Q. Then the advantage comes in, if that is the case, to the sixty Chinese whom you employ, and to the money that your stockholders make out of the institution? That is, what it pans out?—A. There is some advantage to the State.

Q. What is it? That you buy wool?—A. Producing so much.

Q. What other advantage is it to the State than that which is confined within the scope of your stockholders and the sixty Chinese whom you employ?—A. It lays the balance of the United States under contribution to us to the extent that we ship goods East and sell them; it makes the balance of the United States *pro tanto* tributary to us instead of our being altogether in their power.

Q. You buy the wool from our farmers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would that find a market in the East if you did not purchase it?—A. Readily.

Q. Then to the producer of the wool and to the buyer of the fabrics there is no appreciable or market advantage?—A. I do not think the amount of wool consumed in California has anything to do with the market price of it.

Q. You say also that the clothing is manufactured from the product of your mill as far as Chinese labor can go?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then that comes into competition with the eastern manufacture of clothing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you not know that the running of sewing-machines by the Chinese has deprived a great many white people of labor?—A. No, sir; I do not know that.

Q. Then, if I understand you, your argument is confined to the fact that, in your opinion, Chinese cheap labor has advanced the material interests of your stockholders?—A. I did not come here to make an argument; I came here to state facts as I understand them.

Q. Then I will accept the facts as you have stated them, and we will draw our own conclusions. I will ask you if, in your opinion, it is not the same with reference to all the general trades and industries occupied by Chinese that it brings us in competition with our people at the East to a very large degree?—A. Every article produced by the Chinamen in our own markets, and sold in our own market, such as woolen cloths, clothing, shoes, cigars, slippers, and everything of that kind, neces-

sarily, if sold here, excludes just so many of the same articles of eastern manufacture.

Q. I understand fully your argument. Supposing that California was an independent nation by itself and had no interest with the East, it would be for our advantage to exclude eastern products. My argument will be, not to you, but in conclusion, that we are in competition with our own people across our border-lines. Now, then, regarding the production of the olive, cotton, linseed-oil, and the various articles that you name, their production is deferred, is it not, simply for want of cheap labor; that is, if we had cheap labor we could produce these things now?—A. If we had cheap labor we could produce them now.

Q. Then those industries are left for the future?—A. They are left for the future.

Q. In your opinion, is it not wise to preserve the domain and the mines that cannot be profitably worked with labor as the heritage of future Americans rather than to develop them now speedily by the Chinese imported labor? What is your opinion as to that, taking your stand-point a hundred years or fifty years hence? Is it not desirable to preserve our domain, our mines, and our undeveloped resources as the heritage of the common people of our own country rather than to precipitate it by the importation of Chinese cheap labor that would give present profit?—A. That is a matter of argument, of deduction.

Q. It is a matter of speculation to some degree?—A. It is a matter of speculation upon which reasonable men might divide.

Q. Now then, Judge Peckham, if you will exclude from your mind all the facts and all the arguments tending to show the material advancement of the State under Chinese labor, and consider the moral and the political welfare and the future wealth of the country for our own people, what is your opinion regarding the propriety of limiting Chinese immigration?—A. I have no objection to limiting Chinese immigration.

Q. That is all we are attempting to do.—A. I have no objection to it, providing a reasonable restraint is to be placed, but I do not know how that is to be done. It is not for me to work out the problem.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How much paid-up capital is employed in your business?—A. Two hundred and eleven thousand dollars.

Q. If you were to use that money, loaning it as a banker here, what could you make out of it? What would it be loaned for?—A. One per cent. a month, compounded monthly.

Q. It would be more profitable to employ it in that way?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You spoke about the production of cotton—that this country will produce cotton equal to any other?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has that experiment been tried yet?—A. It has been tried, and fully demonstrated.

Q. What extent of cotton country of that kind have you here, do you suppose?—A. Any of the alluvial bottoms of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valley and its tributaries will produce cotton equal to that of the Southern States of our Union in quality. I have had both right side by side, and I prefer the California-raised cotton.

Q. How does it compare in quantity to the acre with that produced in the Southern States of the Union?—A. People who have produced cotton in the Southern States say that they can produce more to the acre in California.

Q. The reason, then, that California is not a cotton-producing State

becomes a question of the cost of labor?—A. Yes, sir; it is a question of the cost of labor.

Q. You spoke of some other industries; for instance, the production of olive-oil. Can you produce olives here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Equal in quality and quantity to other countries?—A. I think so.

Q. You spoke of the castor-bean?—A. Yes, sir; and flaxseed. Flax is indigenous, and native silk.

Q. Is this State adapted to silk-culture?—A. Yes, sir, so far as climate is concerned.

Q. And the quality of the soil?—A. The quality of the soil and everything else.

Q. And the quality of the mulberry?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is a question of labor?—A. It is a question of labor.

Q. Mr. Pixley asked you in regard to the advantage to be derived from manufactures here or buying the same articles in the East. I will ask you whether you regard the manufacture of articles consumed by the people here as contributing to the general growth and prosperity of the State?—A. I do.

Q. You say that without Chinese labor you could not carry on your branches of manufacture?—A. No, sir; we could not.

Q. Then, by stopping your mills, you would deprive a certain number of white people of their business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State whether by the employing of Chinese labor, and thus opening up avenues of manufacturing business, you provide in that way additional employment or avenues for the employment of white people?—A. We do. Independent of those white laborers in our immediate employ, we indirectly give employment to white people by cutting and hauling to our mills—a distance of 14 miles—from a thousand to twelve hundred cords of wood per annum. We give employment to the people of San Francisco—mostly Chinese, however—in the manufacture of our goods into pants and under-clothing. When we come to consider those that we give employment to directly and those we give employment to indirectly, it would probably increase the number at least 50 per cent. of white people employed.

Q. Do you consider the production by the State of the necessaries and comforts of life important to the general growth and prosperity of the State?—A. I consider it as a sound political axiom that a country is the most prosperous which manufactures its own raw material and exports it in a manufactured state; and for that purpose any kind of labor may be used—black or white. I do not believe that cheap labor in manufacturing or in producing articles for exportation ever ruined any country or any people.

Q. Do you consider it better for the United States as a country to manufacture her own goods rather than to buy them from Europe?—A. I do.

Q. What is true of the whole country you say would be true of a State?—A. Yes, sir; it is true of a State, and it is true of California. It is better for California to manufacture her own goods even with Chinese labor than to send her products abroad, to buy them in a foreign market, or even to send to Massachusetts. That is coming down to what I mean exactly.

Q. Mr. Pixley asked you in regard to restricting Chinese immigration. State what you think ought to be done in regard to that. Would it be wise to restrict the number of Chinese who are coming to our country by fixing some limit upon the number that might be taken upon a ship?

—A. I have no fixed opinion as to what could be done or should be done, or whether anything at this time ought to be done.

Q. Do you think that the number of Chinese who have come to this coast up to this time is in excess or not? Do you think too many have come up to this time?—A. It seems to be the impression among the Chinese themselves that there are too many of them here, and that they cannot, under the present state of things, all get employment. When they are unemployed they become vicious and idle, and an American is just the same.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You are a pioneer on this coast, I believe?—A. I came here in 1846.

Q. You have a vivid recollection of society here at an early day?—A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. And you have seen it grow up to its present state?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From 1849 to 1876?—A. From 1846 to 1876.

Q. We have had Chinese among us ever since 1852 and 1853?—A. The Chinese question first became a practical one, I believe, in 1851.

Q. Can you see that by having that grand influx of Chinese, that my friend called your attention to, coming upon us in 20 years, it has pulled down our society and civilization?—A. I do not think it has affected our civilization.

Q. You do not think we are degraded by the presence of these people?—A. I do not think we are.

Q. What would be the state of affairs in California if we should go back to 1856 or 1857; throw up all our manufacturing? The point my friend wanted to make out of you was that it was better to let Massachusetts supply us now with all these commodities than have them supplied to us, as now, by Chinese cheap labor. What would be the effect upon California? How much would we be set back, if we should throw away all this manufacturing that we are carrying on at the present moment, and go back to our old state? We then had forty or fifty millions a year from our mines, and did not do so much farming. Would it not bankrupt the State?—A. I do not know where the money would come from to pay for what we wanted.

Q. Do you recollect that we used to ship about $40,000,000 a year East to buy the very commodities that we now manufacture?—A. I think that the products of our mines at one time was estimated as high as $50,000,000.

Q. It took pretty much all that to keep us clothed and to get us something to eat?—A. Yes, sir; it took it nearly all; we had not much left.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is olive-oil produced in this State now?—A. Olives are produced. I do not know whether the oil is made here.

Q. Is flaxseed-oil produced?—A. To a limited extent.

Q. Is not that very largely produced in Oregon?—A. I do not know so much about Oregon, but I have information that there is a mill here in which there is flaxseed-oil made; they get their seed from wherever they can find it.

Q. Are not the sardines that we use put up on this coast?—A. I think I have seen sardines said to have been put up on this coast; but the great bulk of sardines that we use are put up on the Mediterranean. I do not think that I have ever seen more than one lot of sardines purporting to have been put up in California.

Q. Do you employ Chinamen in cutting your wood?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?—A. We have nothing to do with the cutting of wood. We buy our wood by the cord; contract for it at so much a cord.

Q. You were speaking about the persons employed through the running of your mill. Do you know whether the Chinese are employed to cut the wood?—A. I do not think they are.

Q. Do you not know that Chinese are largely employed to cut wood in the interior?—A. I have known of its being the case.

Q. Is there any reason why the Chinese cannot be employed to cut that wood, and if you could get it cheaper by that means would it not add to the profits of your business?—A. I do not know why it is that the Chinese are not employed more than they are in the cutting of wood. I do not know of any employed in the cutting of wood at the present time. It may be it is because it is too hard work for them.

Q. Do you use cotton in your mill to a large extent?—A. To a limited extent.

Q. Is that California-raised cotton?—A. Yes, sir; California-raised cotton.

Q. Is not all the cotton now used in the mills here raised on this coast?—A. I think not. We are using both kinds.

Q. Why do you use the eastern cotton if the California cotton is a better quality?—A. We could not get a supply of California cotton the last time we bought. We bought a lot to make out what we wanted here in San Francisco, and bought it as California cotton, but when it came to us it was eastern cotton.

Q. Then the demand for California cotton at the present time is greater than the supply?—A. The demand for California cotton at the present time is greater than the supply.

Q. If it can be produced in greater quantities and is a better article, why do they not produce it equal to the demand?—A. It can be imported cheaper. Last year cotton could be bought in Memphis, Tenn., for eleven cents and a half, currency; brought here for about three cents in currency. From the information I have from men who have raised cotton and of whom I have purchased cotton, it cannot be produced in California for less than fourteen and a half cents or fifteen cents, in gold.

Q. Nevertheless you say that you want more of this California cotton, although you cannot get the cheaper article from the East. Why do they not, then, raise it in sufficient quantities here to furnish you?—A. I suppose it is because it does not pay.

Q. You say the demand is greater than the supply, and that you looked for it and found that you got eastern cotton instead?—A. The demand is greater than the supply; that is, there can be more California cotton used than there has been raised.

Q. At California prices?—A. When I can get cotton that serves my purpose from the East cheaper than I can get California cotton I send East for cotton. When I can get California cotton at the price of importation, I buy California cotton and give it the preference.

Q. Then you do not buy California cotton unless you can get it at eastern prices?—A. Eastern prices, including freight and charges.

Q. Has anybody really and extensively gone into the business of raising cotton, or has it not been only a detached experiment which is necessarily more costly?—A. I saw a year ago in blossom and being picked what they told me was two hundred acres of cotton in one field on the Merced River. Colonel Strong had been experimenting on cotton for two or three years before in the same locality. He thought at first it would be a success. He stuck to it until it bankrupted him. At the time that I saw this cotton he had left there. His brother raised

the cotton. A man by the name of Inglesby furnished him the money to raise it, and it was from Inglesby that I learned the cost of raising the cotton. I went up there, saw the cotton, and bought ten thousand pounds of it, paying him sixteen and one-third cents for the cotton delivered at the railroad-depot in Turlock, which was then a cent or a cent and a half a pound more than it would have cost me to import midland upland cotton from Tennessee. My information is that that is the last crop that Strong has raised; that it did not pay them sufficiently, and that they have abandoned the business.

Q. Did he employ white men or Chinamen?—A. He employed Chinamen. I saw them in the field picking cotton.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The comparison you draw is between California cotton and midland-upland cotton?—A. Yes, sir; midland-upland.

Q. Upon the whole what is your opinion as to the effect of free competition in labor upon any people not over-crowded in population? Does it injure them or otherwise?—A. I do not think that free competition among laborers of good morals and correct habits injures a country any more than free competition in matters of property or merchandise. I regard it as all standing upon the same foundation.

Q. Would it not be different if we had an overcrowded population?—A. I do not know what constitutes an overcrowded population.

Q. Do you think the State of California is overcrowded?—A. My understanding is that Massachusetts has a population of 157 to the square mile. I do not think California averages four.

Q. Suppose California had 157 to the square mile, would it not have some effect?—A. We should have to take care of them or they would leave.

Q. It would have some effect on the competition of labor?—A. Certainly.

Q. Then competition injures?—A. Everything is controlled by the law of demand and supply, labor as well as anything else; but there is one limit beyond which labor cannot go.

Q. What is that limit?—A. They cannot compel capital to pay them more for their labor than the products of their labor will sell for in the market.

Q. Would not an overcrowded population affect that?—A. I have never been in a country that was so overcrowded that I thought it was injurious to the country. My opinion is that every nation and State is powerful in proportion to the number of population it supports and supports comfortably.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Without considering the character of the population?—A. The character of the population has something to do with it, as a matter of course.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You do not think any State can be overcrowded in population?—A. There may be such a thing; I cannot say.

Q. Take China for instance.—A. I should have to go to China to see what the condition of things is there.

VERNON SEAMAN recalled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. I understood you to get your statistics of arrivals from the Merchants' Exchange?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. I have a note from Mr. Coolidge in which he says "there are no statistics of such arrivals kept in this office."—A. Not in the office of the Merchants' Exchange, but above the Merchants' Exchange, connected with the building, they have full statistics, and that is where the table was compiled. It is from the books belonging to the Merchants' Exchange and attached to it, incidentally perhaps.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Who has charge of those books?—A. The gentleman's name is Mr. Stone.

Rev. WILLIAM W. BRIER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. My business upon which I make a living is raising fruit.

Q. What is your profession?—A. I am a minister in the Presbyterian Church.

Q. How long have you resided in California?—A. I arrived in San Francisco on the sixth day of August, 1850, and have resided since that time in California.

Q. In what part of California have you resided, and where do you now reside?—A. I resided eighteen months in Marysville, and, my health failing there, I moved to Washington Township, Alameda County, where I have resided ever since; but I have traveled a great deal in my profession over California and Nevada.

Q. You are engaged in cultivating fruit?—A. In cultivating fruit.

Q. What kinds?—A. The chief kinds are apples and peaches, cherries and pears.

Q. Will you look over the questions which have been proposed by the committee, and give such information as you have upon matters relating to this investigation when they fall within your observation?—A. Do you want me to answer each of these questions?

Q. No; those you do not know anything about you need not answer.—A. The first question is: "How many Chinese are there in this country?" I only know from what I have read in the papers. Secondly, "What is their moral and physical condition?" So far as the country is concerned, I regard the moral and physical condition of the Chinese laborers better than any other nationality by far. They are temperate, cleanly, and healthy. In regard to their religious condition, of course, I have nothing to say; I know nothing about it. "Do they come here voluntarily, and by what means do they get here?" That, I suppose, has been testified to by others.

Q. What is your own observation as to whether they are freemen or bondmen?—A. I think the only bondage, so far as I have ever been able to learn, the only obligation they are under is for money advanced for their passage here.

Q. They are debtors?—A. They are debtors, and they agree to work so long until that money is paid back. I think that is the only style of bondage that there is among them. I suppose they all come here for the same reason that most people come—to make money. Fourth, "For what purpose do they come, with the intention of remaining and making the United States their home or returning to China when they have acquired a competence?" My impression is that they all come here to make some money and then go back; that after being here awhile they are a good deal like other people; they become attached to the country, and when they do go back they want to return; as a boss Chinaman

said to me when he returned from China, "Old China is played out." "Do they become attached to our institutions and reconciled to live and die here?" I suppose that ought to be answered generally in the negative. "What kind of labor do they perform?" I suppose the Chinese mostly perform labor that is disconnected with team-work. They do not often work with teams; but almost every other kind of labor in the world, except in connection with the running of threshing-machines, the Chinamen perform, more particularly in the fruit-business. "What is their character as laborers?" I regard the Chinaman as superior to any other nationality as laborers in their own departments. In work that they are to take and perform, especially in the fruit-business, I regard them as superior to any other nationality. The fact is, in the fruit-business at present prices it would be impossible to carry it on with white labor. I regard the fruit-business as one of the great industries of California, and think it will be in a few years in the future far greater than our wheat interests or our mining interests, or both combined. At the present time, with the present price of labor it cannot be carried on profitably without Chinese labor, because they are more skilful than white men, they are more reliable than white men. They will stay until they learn the business. They will stay with a man until they know what to do and how to do it. White men will not do that. I have had Chinamen who have been with me four years. They learn how to trim the trees. White men you cannot keep. If the white man amounts to anything he will soon acquire enough to start business for himself; and if he does not amount to anything he will never learn anything; but the Chinese have not much disposition to do business on their own account, and they stay longer with a man and become familiar with all the intricacies of a man's business.

Q. Do you employ any boys and girls in your business?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why do you employ Chinamen instead of employing boys and girls?—A. I am a good deal like the old fellow who said, "A boy is a boy, two boys are half a boy, and three boys are no boy at all." I have one boy of my own, and that is enough. As to girls, I have never found any in our region of country who wanted to work for us. We tried to use them in our dry-house factory, but there are no poor people down there hardly. The boys go to school and the girls go to school. Furthermore, I have seen a good deal in the papers in respect to the employment of girls and boys. I am glad, as an old Californian, that our boys and girls do not have to work in factories. I think it is a poor place to develop the physical nature and make good American citizens, and I have no sympathy whatever with that idea.

Q. Why do you not get boys and girls from the city here to work in your orchard?—A. I would not have them if somebody would board them and put them in my orchard to work, from what I know of them. I could not afford it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You make that remark apply to all boys, I suppose?—A. Of course, there are some good ones; but I have had merchants and wealthy men of this city write to me, wishing to put their sons with me to learn the farming business. I have never thought that I could afford to do any such thing, even with the best boys, because boys cannot do the business of California. There is too much competition to make people who are wide awake employ boys. I am not in a condition to be sufficiently philanthropic to undertake the training of children for their good just now, except my own. I have enough of my own.

Q. Do you think that boys generally should be kept out of employment and allowed to run riot; that philanthropy should not be considered, nor the good of the State, aside from the interests of the employers?—A. I think that every wise parent should look out for the industry of his children.

Q. As I understood you, these parents tried to get employment for their boys, and you refused them because they were white boys?—A. None ever applied to me.

Q. I thought you spoke of wealthy parents who wanted their boys to learn farming?—A. Those were wealthy gentlemen, not those in need. I never had any person in need from the city to apply to me.

Q. If you would refuse the boys of the wealthy, would you take the boys of the needy?—A. If I undertook to work them at all we would take them.

Q. Do you think that your sentiments in that matter are shared by employers generally?—A. I think it is a matter of necessity that employers and farmers cannot work boys to an advantage.

Q. What do you think is the effect on the boys of not having employment in this large branch?—A. I do not know that farmers are responsible for the boys of cities. I do not understand that business.

Q. Suppose there is nobody responsible, that the boys can take care of themselves—is that the idea?—A. I believe that industrious boys might find employment in the country, if they would behave themselves. I am speaking for myself only. 8th. "Do they learn trades and work in factories?" We know they do. 9th. "What rate of wages do they receive?" I do not know what is the rate of wages for Chinamen in factories.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In your own business how much is it?—A. In my business I pay Chinamen a dollar a day, and they board themselves. I furnish them a house, and furnish them their wood; they generally pick up anything that lies around loose to eat, and they have the privilege of doing it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many hands do you employ?—A. I employ at this time eight—seven Chinamen and one white man.

Q. How extensive is your ranch?—A. I have about fifty acres in fruit.

Q. What kinds of fruit do you raise?—A. Apples and peaches, berries, and almost every kind.

Q. Do you put it up for the eastern market, or do you sell it here?—A. I sell it in this market mostly.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. All tree-fruit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Not berries?—A. Yes, sir; berries, gooseberries.

Q. What effect does the employment of Chinese in your business have upon white labor?—A. At the present prices of fruit we could not raise it without Chinese labor. I think that the employment of Chinese labor in this department and all other departments has kept up the price of white labor.

Q. Do you employ white labor?—A. Yes, sir; we always keep one white man to attend to the teams and supervise work that is going on.

Q. If you did not employ Chinese, would you employ him?—A. No, sir; I could not carry on the business at the present prices.

Q. The fruit business gives employment to merchants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Separate classes, fruit-dealers, commission-dealers, and retailers in fruit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has the immigration of Chinese to this country been an advantage or a disadvantage, pecuniarily, to the State?—A. I think it has been an advantage to the pecuniary interests of the State, and I think it has kept up the prices of the labor of white people. In 1857 I paid one dollar less to the white man that I always keep, per month, than I do now, and he was a much better hand than I have now. While I was traveling in the East this spring, I made diligent inquiry in various States, and I found that the price of white labor on farms ranged from $12 to $15 a month for that class of laborers which here receive from $25 to $30. I judge from that that something has raised the price of white labor among us or kept it up.

Q. For how many years has the present rate for white labor prevailed in this State?—A. I think it has remained very much the same since 1857. It has a little advanced, perhaps, for certain kinds of laborers over what it was then, that is, labor that the Chinese perform.

Q. For about twenty years, then, it has remained, on the average, at its present rate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What effect has Chinese labor had, if any, upon the white laboring population in regard to their means of subsistence and comforts, their ability to purchase?—A. I suppose that the Chinese labor has greatly cheapened fruit, because I know I would have to stop and dig up my trees without the Chinese labor, and the fruit that I raise mostly, I am told by commission merchants here, reaches the people who consume it in a very short course, and that is through peddlers, who take it box by box and distribute it among the poorer class of people, who buy a small portion at once.

Q. During the last twenty years have the articles of ordinary family consumption, such as are consumed by the poor, fallen or enhanced in price?—A. Most articles, I think, are cheaper now than they were twenty years ago.

Q. So that with the same amount of wages the laborer can purchase more now than he could twenty years ago?—A. I think so.

Q. The clothing, the meat, shoes, hats, &c.?—A. Clothing is cheaper, meat is higher than it was in 1850, as we all know, because then there was an abundance of Spanish cattle, but meat is cheaper now and better than it has been since the Spanish cattle were dissipated.

Q. Chinese labor has had no effect upon that at all?—A. No, sir; I suppose not.

Q. Has the price of those things which the Chinese have been manufacturing decreased or remained stationary?—A. It has decreased.

Q. Do you see any reason at the present time for placing any restriction upon Chinese immigration?—A. I cannot see any reason for it.

Q. Do you think the Chinese immigration has had any effect upon the moral condition of the white population?—A. I cannot see how it could have had any effect upon them in that way.

Q. Do you know anything in regard to the method of employing white servants in the country?—A. Do you mean house-servants?

Q. Do you know whether white girls can be obtained to fill the places of house-servants in the country?—A. I think they cannot possibly be obtained. The Catholic girls do not like to go to the country, because they have not got their churches, and they will not stay. It used to be, before we had any Chinese servants in the house, it was almost impossible to get girls, or any servants, to go into the country. We had to depend upon Indians and such classes of people.

Q. Do you know whether or not it is difficult to obtain white girls to

do all the work of small families, what we call a maid-of-all-work?—A. It is very difficult in the country.

Q. In the city is it difficult?—A. I do not know about the city.

Q. Who are house-servants, generally?—A. They are generally Chinese, in the country.

Q. In the city?—A. I do not know.

Q. I mean who are the white girls who go to service; are they generally American-born or foreigners?—A. I suppose they are almost all foreign-born, Irish girls and Germans.

Q. There are very few Americans generally, are there not, in California in this service?—A. I have seen but very few American girls going out.

Q. Have you ever seen any in house-service?—A I have seen American women in wealthy families, but they were in the higher departments, not cooks, but waiters—women to wait upon the ladies.

Q. Housekeepers and such as that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the ordinary capacity of maid-of-all-work have you ever seen an American-born woman?—A. I never knew but one in California, and that was in my own neighborhood, and she was rather living there as a home, but received wages.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do I understand you to say that the wages of white people in this State have not been reduced in the last twenty years?—A. I think that farm wages are about the same.

Q. What were farm wages twenty years ago?—A. From $25 to $35 a month in 1856, 1857, and 1858, and along there.

Q. About the time that the Central Pacific Railroad was being built?—A. No; before that time.

Q. Before that they were as low as the wages you speak of?—A. My testimony in regard to the price of labor means where laborers were boarded on farms. They always board their men at the wages I speak of. I do not testify in regard to labor where the laborers furnished their own boarding.

Q. Do you think the wages of women in service have not been reduced during the last twenty years?—A. Yes, sir; I think that they have been reduced.

Q. What do you think has caused that reduction? The population of the State has enormously increased.—A. I suppose there is some competition there.

Q. Is it not the competition of the Chinamen that has reduced it?—A. I think not.

Q. It has been testified that there are six or seven thousand Chinamen doing service in this city in families.—A. They all think the wages are high enough yet.

Q. You are in favor of very low wages?—A. I am in favor of low wages.

Q. You are in favor of a large profit to the employer?—A. I am in favor of a profit sufficient to carry on the business; and if a man who has capital does not make enough to pay him for his time and his capital, he is going to stop.

Q. Have you ever had any occasion to complain of too much in your business, or would you complain if you were making too much?—A. I do not think I would have much room for it this year.

Q. You think that the share the laborer gets should be small and decreased, but you do not think the share that the capitalist gets

should be small and decreased?—A. I think the more labor put into our country the more prosperity there will be at large, because we can compete with foreign countries and other States of the Union.

Q. Do you not think the more the capitalist can make on the employment of his capital the better it is for the country?—A. I do not think that I comprehend the meaning of the question.

Q. Do you not think that it is to the interest of the country that the capitalist should make more and more profit by the enterprise which he sets on foot?—A. I suppose there might be a limit where it would be beneficial. I think, however, it is decidedly to the interests of the country that in the employment of capital in the manufactories and in the production of such things as can be exported, there should be such pay to the capitalists as would induce them to go into it, otherwise these industries would not be carried on; and, therefore, it would be a detriment to the capital of the State and to the laborers.

Q. Do you not think that the more the capitalist can make in the employment of his capital and by his enterprise, the better it will be for the State?—A. That might be true in one sense, but in another sense it might not be true.

Q. I do not refer to a capitalist, but to capitalists generally. Do you not think in all these branches of business carried on by capitalists that they should make a large return on their capital so as to encourage them to go into business, &c.? Is not such your idea?—A. No, sir; I believe that in the best state of society, and I believe that is the natural state, it always will occur that capitalists will give for labor as much as they can afford to give; and I believe that is what they are doing in California. I believe, further, that the laboring class of people have an advantage over the capitalists.

Q. Do you think, if the capitalist could get a man for $1 and if the profits of his business would enable him to pay $5, that he would pay $5 rather than $1?—A. Of course not.

Q. Then is it true that the capitalist will give as much as he can afford to give, if he can get equally good labor at a cheaper price?—A. I believe they are in California giving as much as they can afford to give. I believe they will get labor as cheap as they can. It is human nature to get anything as cheap as we can. But I believe our cheapening of products and of manufactures, and cheapening them through our own manufactories, has been a great advantage to the laboring class of people.

Q. Does not the interest of society require that in the division of the profits made by any business the laborer shall have a decent share?—A. I believe it is so, and I believe it ought to be so, but I think they do more than get that share in California.

Q. Then is it to the interest of society that labor should be continually coming down, the laborer getting a smaller share?—A. If we cannot compete with foreign countries with the price of labor at a certain figure, I believe it is the interest of the country to reduce the price of labor so that we can compete, because if a man cannot make anything in his business he is going to stop his business.

Q. It is stated that the wages of laborers in India is ten cents a day. Can you imagine any condition of things in this State where it would be to the interest of laborers that they should get but ten cents a day, whether they could compete with India or not in producing the articles of manufacture?—A. I do not think that is a comparison that we have any right to bring in. We are not in the condition of the people of India.

Q. How long will it be before we will be in the condition of India if we allow an unlimited influx of people from India, or China, which amounts to about the same thing?—A. I imagine there can be too many Chinamen here, but I do not think there are too many now.

Q. Then, would a reasonable restriction of Chinamen be an advantage or not?—A. If you ask me for my opinion, it is only an opinion; but my opinion is that if restrictions are to be made in respect to China, they ought to be made upon people who are far worse for us than Chinese. I would trade a certain nationality off for Chinamen until there was not one left of the stock in trade.

Q. You consider those other nationalities an evil?—A. I consider some of them so.

Q. Is it worth while for us to multiply evils? Because you have small-pox in the house, do you want to set it on fire? Because you say that there are undesirable foreign populations here, are we to encourage others not so desirable to our own people?—A. The only question is whether we want more laborers or not; whether we are going to set down and say, as Mr. Pixley indicated, that we want something left for future generations to develop. I think that style of argument would lead us to adopt the old Spanish mode of life here, settle down by a little creek and dip water up to cook your squirrels with, and leave the wealth and soil of the country to future generations to develop.

Q. Is that the habit of American populations?—A. That was the habit of old Californians.

Q. We are speaking now of a State settled by American populations. Is that the habit of American populations?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then we are not to fear that, even if the Chinese do not come, from American populations?—A. That is the argument that it has been tried to testify to here.

Q. Let us test that argument. This State has now in its bosom probably a thousand millions in gold, deep in the hills, &c., yet to be taken out. Would it be the interest of the State to allow the Chinaman to come here immediately to take it out and carry it off to Asia, or would it be better for the permanent prosperity of the State to allow those mines to be gradually developed by American populations, settling in the State and remaining with families among us, and gradually building up the State?—A. When it comes to that, an extreme in anything is always wrong. An extreme of Chinese population, of course, would be an evil, but my opinion is that we have not arrived at that extreme yet.

Q. Do you understand that the proposition is to exclude the Chinamen who are now here? Is that the object of those who ask for a restriction of the immigration from China?—A. I do not understand it.

Q. Do you understand that it is the object of those who asked for this investigation to absolutely exclude any Chinamen from coming to this coast hereafter?—A. No; I supposed their object was to make political capital.

Q. You think that was the object?—A. I think that was the chief thing. As I have observed from the papers, the men mostly engaged in this raid against the Chinese are men who have nothing to do with our industries and our development, our farming or our mechanism.

Q. Do you think that is true of the witnesses who have appeared here and testified?—A. I do not know the witnesses who have appeared here, but I mean the men who have made speeches and written in the papers on this subject.

Q. You, I believe, are of a religious profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you not see that conscientious men might believe that a very

large influx of heathen population here, with the vices which have been described by writers upon China, and which have been observed here, or which are feared, might have the effect on some minds to question whether it is worth while to have our State made a slop-bucket into which all these dregs could be poured? Can you not see that there might be something besides a desire for political capital in view of those considerations?—A. I should like to testify to just what I know of this thing.

Q. But you were testifying to an opinion that this was political capital. I wish to ask you if you cannot see that conscientious men might think that there was something in this question of the State being deluged by an inferior element? I should like to know whether you can see that men possibly might have a motive aside from a desire to favor a party?—A. Of course they might have had some other motive, but I think the chief reason was political.

Q. You have expressed an opinion that there are certain nationalities who come here extremely undesirable, and worse than Chinamen. Have you formed that opinion because you want to make party capital out of it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Can you not give the same charity to other people, who think the Chinese are undesirable here, and not say that it is a mere question of party capital?—A. I did not refer to anybody who testified here, but to the speeches which have been made and to the general movement against the Chinese.

Q. You refer to those speeches which stated that there is a population coming upon us from ten to twenty thousand a year; that they have strange vices; that they have isolated habits; that they are not capable of assimilation; that they will injure our civilization. Can you not suppose that men who advance those ideas in Congress and out of it may really have some care for the improvement of the State aside from the question whether they would be popular thereby?—A. That may be the case with some of them; but I believe the laboring class of Chinese are less corrupting on the people here than any other class of foreigners that we have in the land. That is my firm belief. I have employed them; I have had them on my place; I have had them near to me, and I put more confidence in them than in any foreign nationality whatever.

Q. You derive your opinion from what you have observed in that way?—Yes, sir.

Q. May not others equally conscientious believe that this is a corrupt and dangerous class, and if they are seeking to save our State from it, in their judgment, can they not do so without being stigmatized in your mind as being actuated by low motives?—A. I cannot change what I have said. I have said it from my own convictions, and in all my acquaintance I do not know a farmer of my district who agrees with me precisely in all these opinions. I do not know a solitary man in Washington Township or indeed in Alameda County that disagrees with me in some things; that is, so far as I have heard them express themselves, they have all expressed themselves as of the opinion that this thing was gotten up by people who did not understand the business that they were after; that the Chinese population so far as it has come here is a necessity to the farming interests of the country, and that to interfere with it would be a serious mistake. That is the universal opinion, of both republicans and democrats, so far as I know them in Alameda County, without an exception. I can bring every man who carries on business in my neighborhood, and he will testify to the same thing.

Q. You think that is the universal opinion of Alameda County?—A. That is the universal opinion of my district of Alameda County.

Q. Will you please tell me, then, how the agitation of the question of the Chinese coming here could be popular in Alameda County?—A. It cannot be popular there.

Q. Then where is the party capital to be made out of this agitation?—A. It is made for this city, I suppose.

Q. Are not the same speeches, the same arguments, made in other parts of the State and in Alameda County itself, that are made here?—A. I never heard anything of the kind in Alameda County.

Q. You never heard a speech against Chinese immigration in Alameda County?—A. No, sir; I never did.

Q. I should like to refresh your mind. Did you ever attend any political meetings there?—A. I did, but they were all republican meetings.

Q. Did you never hear any republican there discuss this Chinese question adversely?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Page there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you say he said nothing about it?—A. He merely alluded to the subject, but he passed over it very lightly.

Q. Is it not generally known that he was the author of the law to restrict the immigration of certain classes of Chinese? Is not that generally known in Alameda County?—A. I know that.

Q. Did not Mr. Page run ahead of his ticket very largely in Alameda County?—A. Yes, sir; but we believe in restricting that class in Alameda County. I do.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the class referred to?—A. Women; Chinese prostitutes.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you think that intermarriage between Chinamen and white women would be desirable?—A. I should not think it would be very good taste in a white woman to marry a Chinaman.

Q. You do not think that would be desirable for the State?—A. I should think not, of course.

Q. Do you know what the Chinamen are to do for women provided only males come? Have you ever thought what the consequence might be to have sixty thousand Chinamen in this State without any women of their kind?—A. The fact is that they have come here and they remain as laborers, and I regard them very much in the light I do any other thing we want to use, horses or machinery. They do a certain kind of work that we cannot have done unless by some such labor. I do not wish the committee to understand that I am for an indiscriminate and universal immigration of the Chinese; but I have not seen any reason for any interference with the present treaty with China. I believe it would be in the future a great advantage to California to have the most friendly relations with China. I do not think the immigration of Chinese to this coast has interfered with white labor, or will in the future, or that the number coming here will be so great as to be feared; but if the time should come when they should begin to be in excess of the demand and of the use that we can put them to, then I should certainly be in favor of breaking up any treaty at all hazards.

Q. Do you know Rev. S. V. Blakeslee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What kind of a man is he?—A. He is a man who has traveled a great deal over California.

Q. What denomination does he belong to?—A. He is a Congregationalist.

Q. Is he a worthy man?—A. Yes, sir; so far as I know.

Q. In a letter addressed to the committee, under date of November 8, he says:

In view of the object of your visit to this coast, I deem it no presumption to address you freely, as follows: I came to California in 1849 as a minister of the Gospel, to make here my permanent home, and now for more than twenty years, I have been acting as traveling editor of The Pacific, the oldest weekly paper of the far West. I have had, therefore, the opportunity to know fully the facts pertaining to the subject on which I write. I believe the influx of vast numbers of Chinese into our country to be fraught with immense evils to Americans in every light in which it may be viewed. This is true as to the desirable homogeneity of our population, as to our moral character, as to our political status, our military strength, our acquisition of wealth, our social relationships and all our civil and religious nstitutions.

He writes from Oakland. Would you exclude him from those persons in Alameda County who universally believe in the propriety of those things?—A. Mr. Blakeslee is not a man who employs any hired labor. I spoke of men who employ workmen.

Q. You referred not to the general sentiment of the county, but of those who employ Chinamen?—A. I referred to those who employ men to work. That is my testimony. I know there are plenty of men who do not carry on business, never employ anybody, know nothing about the physical interests of the country, who make a great noise over the presence of Chinese; but I think you will find it to be true, if you go over the agricultural districts, that every man of every party looks upon this as all noise, and that there is no occasion for any fear, or for any law, or any disturbance of our relations with China. That is my opinion.

Q. Is Mr. Blakeslee a conscientious man?—A. I suppose he is; he is not a man who employs labor.

Q. He is not a man who employs Chinamen?—A. He is not a man who employs any human.

Q. You put this question upon the ground of the material prosperity of the State. He seems to put it upon the social, religious, and political aspects of the matter; I do not mean partisan, but in the light of our institutions. Would you draw the same distinction?—A. The religious aspect is another thing.

Q. You have left that entirely out of view.—A. If you wish to ask me any questions, I will give you my opinion. What I did say was in respect to the origin only of this excitement. I believe that it sprang out of political motives. The democrats last winter passed a resolution about raising a Chinese commission in order to make capital in this State, and the republicans had not the backbone, though most of them believe in the presence of the Chinese, to take the other side for fear they would be beaten; so they all howled for an investigation against the Chinamen. That is the way I put it up in my own mind.

Q. You do not believe that the republicans could possibly believe with Mr. Blakeslee that the influx of vast numbers of Chinamen to our country is fraught with immense evils to Americans, so far as our institutions and so far as the purity of our society are concerned?—A. That is a supposed case. I say myself that if there comes a time when the immigration of Chinamen to this coast seems to be dangerous to our interest, then I am in favor of breaking up our relations and making almost any kind of a disturbance with China; but I do not think that time has come.

Q. In all charity, may not all the difference between yourself and the republicans and democrats also, to whom you refer, be that you do not think that the time has come and they do? When that time comes,

and you are of that opinion, will you think it is right for others to say that you are trying to make party capital?—A. I do not know of any man who employs whites or Chinamen in all my acquaintance in Alameda County who believes that we have too many Chinese.

Q. They do not believe that that time has come?—A. No.

Q. Men who make money out of them believe we have not enough?—A. Of course.

Q. Men like Mr. Blakeslee, who do not make money out of them, who do not employ them, may conscientiously believe otherwise, may they not?—A. It is my opinion that the men who employ Chinamen and employ other men are the best judges.

Q. You speak of them, you say, as you would of mules, of machinery, &c., aside from any social or moral question involved.—A. I was speaking of them in a physical point of view. If you wish to ask me questions, I would answer them on my belief. All I can do is to tell you my belief on this subject as in regard to other things. I believe that God has sent these Chinamen here for a great and good purpose to the human race. I believe in all the human race; that they are all alike—the children of God; and that God has sent these Chinamen here to learn something of our institutions and religion, and by their going back and forth they may diffuse virtue to a great and dark people. That is the chief ground of my opposition to Congress interfering with the present relations with China, or interfering at any time before there is an absolute necessity for it.

Q. How can that necessity arise at any time whatever, provided this going backward and forward and carrying light to China continues?—A. I do not believe there ever will be any necessity for interfering with them myself.

Q. In order to carry out this good work, would it not be a good idea for the Chinese to take California absolutely, as much so as they have taken the province of Hong-Kong?—A. That kind of reasoning might do for the Congress of the United States, but I do not think it would do in a synod of the Presbyterian Church; that is running to an excess.

Q. There are four hundred millions of them in China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is to prevent their coming in greater numbers?—A. I think they will come just as long as they find it is profitable to come.

Q. I suppose there is a chance, then, so far as the supply of Chinamen is concerned, of there being an unlimited supply?—A. I think they will come only as the demand calls them here. I think there has never been an oversupply, and I do not believe there will be for the reason that I shall state. There is one fact I should like to state to the committee about the Chinese, because I did not come here to argue the question, and I want to state facts: It is a truth that the Chinese, in their labor system, differ from all other people, and from our own people. They have companies. You all know the six companies here. Most of these Chinese in California are members of these companies. Those companies have no absolute control over them, but they are for security—the security of their persons—to take care of them if sick, and to look after them generally, and see that they get employment. All these companies appoint certain men to look after the Chinamen in a given district.

Q. How do you know all this matter that you are now testifying to?—A. I know it from the Chinese—from talking with them. Every man who employs Chinamen has one that he calls the boss Chinaman. When he wants men, he does not go around over the country to look

them up, but he just says to the boss, "I want so many more men next week than I have;" and that boss obtains the men. He gets a small percentage, I suppose. I know it is the case with my Chinamen; I suppose it is universally the case with the boss Chinaman, who secures employment for other Chinamen, to get a certain percentage of the wages of all the men who work, to reward the boss for his agency in the matter. All the contracts for Chinese labor, so far as I know, are made with what is called a boss Chinaman, and he hunts up other Chinamen and brings them in. The consequence is that it is a great advantage to labor, because when a man has any large amount of labor to perform that must be performed in a limited time, he can get men in this way. You can not do it with white labor, because white men have their place, and continue for a long time; but there are here a great many Chinamen going from one point to another, and from one job to another, and if a man has a crop exposed, and there is great haste, he can get a large number of Chinamen to work for him.

Q. That is in reply to my question as to the liability of a large number coming here. I infer from it that you suppose the number that will come will be limited by the demand for their labor; is that correct?—A. Yes, sir; when these companies find out that there are about as many as can be profitably employed in the country, I take it they will not advance money to bring any more.

Q. Are you not aware of the fact that the Chinese are buying up quite largely all the best lands in the State and starting Chinese colonies on their own hook, independent of white men?—A. I have heard of their starting in on their own hook.

Q. Is not that a little different from the question of demand for their labor by white men? If they are actually now taking possession of the State, that which they are now doing can they not do to a greater extent?—A. I never saw a Chinaman who bought any real estate.

Q. It has been testified before this committee, and the cases given where they were buying by the hundred acres and buying high-priced, land. Why cannot that process go on until they get possession of all the valuable lands in the State? Is it a mere question of the demand of white men for their labor?—A. I know nothing about that. I never saw a Chinaman who owned real estate.

Q. Then there is an element in the calculation which you have not considered, whether we are liable to have out of these 400,000,000 Chinese the coast taken possession of by Chinamen?—A. If the Chinaman can beat the white man, I say they have a chance. We are democrats; we want to give everybody a show.

Q. And consequently we will give them a show to take California?—A. Why not, as well as to give Irishmen a chance?

Q. I do not know that I care to argue that matter. I have a better opinion of Irishmen than you have. I will not discuss that question with you; but would you consider it desirable that the Chinamen (not the Irishmen, but the Chinamen) should actually own the soil and have possession of California?—A. My real opinion is that we had better limit immigration from all countries, and we would be better off without any more foreigners. That is my opinion.

Q. As that never will be done, and is a mere abstraction, the question is whether it is desirable the Chinese shall own the soil; in other words, own California, and make an Asiatic province of it?—A. If we cannot limit all, then I think it is unreasonable to limit any particular nationality.

Q. Then if these 400,000,000 of people, like the hordes of Tamerlane,

should come in and get possession of the State, would you be willing for them to do that?—A. That is imaginary, and not a fact.

Q. I tried to give you the fact of farms being owned by Chinese.—A. That was mostly, I suppose, places where white men would not go.

Q. On the contrary, it has been shown that the land is worth from $25 to $50 an acre, and was bought by them at that price.—A. I conceive it to be right and proper that Chinamen should have the right to buy real estate. I do not think, however, that there is any danger of its being done to any great extent, because I think most of the Chinese come here to get some money and go back; that is my knowledge of the matter.

Q. This is shown to be a newly-developed feature in the Chinese invasion; that is to say, they are now for the first time buying up valuable agricultural lands of the State in the last year or two. Does that modify the question in your mind. Do you still say let them have it?—A. Of course; if Chinamen, or any other color, can beat me, I say let them do it.

Q. And you are willing there shall be no laws to protect your children or the children of others to prevent this State from becoming a Chinese province?—A. My opinion is that there is a great deal worse class of foreigners in our land who have all the rights of citizenship and everything else, and I do not see any reason why we should exclude Chinamen.

Q. I do not see fit to ask any question in regard to foreigners. I have not the prejudice against naturalized citizens that you seem to have.—A. I have not any prejudice; it is according to their character and morals that I judge.

Q. I do not care to go into that topic. I shall let it rest with your statement.—A. I should like to state to the committee what I know about the manners of the Chinese. They are a polite people. When I go out to the field the Chinamen bid me good morning in a very polite manner. They are not people easily excited at all; they are very equable in their temper of mind. I have never had any difficulty with Chinamen.

Q. Were not all those characteristics true of the slaves of the South while they were in slavery?—A. The Chinese are a cleanly people; they keep themselves neat and clean and nice; there is nothing offensive about them. Scarcely any of them ever swear; none of them that I have ever known drink whisky. I have never seen but one drunken Chinaman in my residence in California. I did see one man once with a bottle of whisky tied to each end of his pole, and he was reeling from one side to the other, and I said to myself that Chinaman is becoming Americanized. I have seen but that one drunken Chinaman. I have never had but one Chinamen come to my house and ask for anything to eat, or to ask if I had anything to give to him; just one individual case, and I suppose there are more than a hundred fed there of white men of other nationalities every year.

Q. Would you infer from that that the Chinaman gets employment as a rule, and has chances to buy food that other nationalities do not?—A. I infer from that that Chinamen do not spend their money for whisky as other nationalities do.

Q. Are those white men who are fed at your house intoxicated?—A. They are generally men who spend all their money for whisky and have nothing left.

Q. Are they intoxicated when they come to your house?—A. Some of them come drunk. They are generally just off a spree, at all events.

Q. That is the rule?—A. That is the rule.

Q. Do these men apply for work?—A. They apply for something to eat generally.

Q. Do they ever apply for work?—A. Often.

Q. Do you think they apply for work when they do not want it?—A. Sometimes people say they do.

Q. Why do you judge so harshly of whites and so leniently of Chinamen?—A. Because of their manners. The whites are begging, and the Chinamen are not; the Chinamen make their living by work, and the white men drink whisky, and do not make a living. I believe in doing all men of all nations justice. I think we can afford to do justice to Chinamen so far as all we know of them.

Q. Would you like to make them voters?—A. Really, when you come down to my private opinion on the subject, I never would have made the negro in the South a voter; I never would allow any foreigner in the United States to vote until he could read and write and pass an examination on the Constitution of the United States and the form of government we have. When a Chinaman could do that, I would make him a voter if he had not been here more than two weeks.

Q. Aside from this other theory which you have of other nationalities, of which I am not asking you, and of which you have clearly expressed an opinion, and I have no doubt the record will show it plainly, I merely ask you in reference to the average Chinaman as you see him, whether you would allow him to declare his intentions and become a citizen?—A. If I had my own way I would do just as I say.

Q. Would you make them voters?—A. I would make them voters if they could read and write and pass an examination on the Constitution of the United States.

Q. If they could read and write in their own language or in ours?—A. In our language.

Q. How many of them do you know who can read and write in our language?—A. I know quite a number, and I put them on the same footing with all other nations of the earth.

Q. And on the same footing with Americans?—A. On the same footing with all foreigners.

Q. Would you not be putting them on the same footing with Americans by making citizens of them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you would put them on the same footing as Americans?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are a clergyman by education and profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have left that profession?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are still a preacher?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And also engaged in fruit-raising?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which is your principal leading occupation?—A. I make my living by raising fruit, and I preach. I think my record will show what I have done in this State.

Q. I do not attempt to throw any slur on your occupation or services at all, but the idea I want to get at is whether your material interest of fruit-raising or your other profession of soul-saving controls your opinions in the testimony you have given here?—A. They both, I think, control my views.

Q. Independent entirely of any question of making money out of the Chinese, would you still entertain the same opinion in reference to them and still be in favor of their unrestricted immigration?—A. I think I should.

Q. Then the material interest, the money that we are making out of them, the convenience we are making from their labor, does not control you at all?—A. No more than it would if I did not make anything out of them, I think.

Q. If I understand your testimony you are willing to put the country and all its resources, our civilization in all its social aspects, the Government in all its political views, upon the same equality with reference to Chinese as to foreign white immigrants?—A. Provided they are all limited as I said.

Q. That is, you would make no distinction at all between the white European, family and the Asiatic either in politics or social or material considerations?—A. I cannot answer the question either way, because there is too much in it.

Q. Because there is too much in the question?—A. Divide your question and I will answer it.

Q. I do not care to go over the whole thing again. If I have understood you correctly you put the Chinese not only upon an equal footing with all foreign immigrants, but regard them in many respects as more desirable and superior?—A. I think that the Chinese immigration is more desirable than certain other immigration.

Q. Take the whole Chinese and the whole European immigration and make a common average, how would you compare them?—A. I should not like to see our country flooded with either. I think the country would have been injured by a flood of immigration from Germany or from France or from any other country.

Q. Do you think the great immigration we have had from Europe in the last sixty or seventy years, which amounts to very nearly half our population, has been injurious to the general interests of the whole broad nation?—A. I do not see but that our country has stood it all; but I think it has been a great trial to the stability of our institutions.

Q. Had there been an absence of that immigration altogether from Europe, and in its place the same number of immigrants from Asia, do you think the condition of the country would to-day be as happy as it is now?—A. I have no opinion on that subject. I have never thought upon it.

Q. If, then, you could choose between a hundred thousand German, Swedish, Italian, English, French, Irish, and Scotch immigrants in the same general proportion as they come to California now, and a hundred thousand Chinese from Hong-Kong, would you think there would be any difference?—A. I would prefer the other.

Q. You would prefer the foreign?—A. Yes.

Q. Why?—A. The reason why I would prefer the foreign would be that they would be more likely to remain here and become permanent citizens, and be more easily molded into our ideas and thoughts.

Q. The second generation, those who were born here, would improve somewhat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The third generation would be about as good as we are?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that the ultimate condition of our country under white foreign immigration would, in your opinion, be improved by the immigration of a hundred thousand adult male Chinamen who come here and go away?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think Christian civilization superior to Buddhism and heathenism?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what respect?—A. It is better.

Q. In what respect better?—A. It is purer; it is Christianity.

Q. Is it better in its effects upon the country and the people of the country?—A. Certainly.

Q. Then, from the religious and moral point of view, you think it is better to have foreign immigrants from Europe than to have foreign immigrants from Asia?—A. I do not know that I testified in respect to what would be better in the two, taking the general immigration.

Q. You favor the European immigrant?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Take the question of civilization, which embraces matrimony. You know that in China they have a double system, a polygamous system, of wives? You know that they buy their wives there?—A. Yes.

Q. You know that they sell their children for prostitution?—A. I have heard that.

Q. You know that prostitution is a legalized pursuit?—A. I believe that is the case in San Francisco with the Americans.

Q. Which of those civilizations, as tested by the practical influence and practical effects, do you think superior?—A. My opinion in respect to the presence of the Chinese in California and the immigration of people who make this their homes is that it is not the same thing at all. It is a different thing. I think the desirableness of the presence of Chinese here is that they are a temporary supply of labor and we could not get along without them.

Q. Then your whole argument comes down to the material interests that grow out of Chinese cheap labor?—A. No. Another thing in my mind is that I believe it is in the providence of God to enlighten and Christianize China through our people.

Q. If I understand the Bible, the gospel injunction is to go unto the heathen nations and preach the gospel to them. Do you think you can outwit the Divine Master by bringing the heathen here?—A. I think the Divine Master knows best.

Q. He tells you to go out to the heathen?—A. I think He would tell us to go out to Christianize them here instead of abusing them.

Q. If I understand you, you are in favor of cheap labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are an employer of labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If you were a laborer would you be in favor of cheap labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If earning your daily bread, would you rather get 90 cents or $1.20 a day?—A. If I thought it would enable me to make a living for my family and have greater prosperity, I should be willing to get 90 cents.

Q. Do you think it would be better prosperity for a family to get 90 cents than $1.20?—A. If I could get more with 90 cents than with $1.20, it would.

Q. Taking the countries where there is dear labor and where there is cheap labor, which are in the most prosperous and better condition, as the result of your observation and reading?—A. My observation in California is that when the people had high wages and got $6 a day they did not get as much real comfort as now at $1 a day,

Q. Do you not know in that early period, when as miners we got $16 a day, the foundation of great fortunes and comforts were laid all over the country? Do you think it hurt anybody to get $16 a day at that time?—A. When they paid it all out for something to eat, and wear, and drink?

Q. But when they did not pay it out in that way but hired teachers and preachers, was it better?—A. They did not pay preachers and schoolmasters as much then as now.

Q. When they went back to Indiana and Illinois and the Northwest with their earnings, was it better that they should take back their earnings at $16 a day or at $1 a day?—A. I suppose if they took it back the larger sum would be the better, but I am speaking of those who reside here. There were less fortunes made, fewer houses built, less comfort secured then than now.

Q. It was a new State then. If you were a laborer instead of an employer you would be in favor of cheap wages?—A. I would be in favor of whatever kind of wages the country could best prosper under, for that would be for my best interests as well as the interests of everybody else.

Q. Suppose instead of Chinamen coming here to take possession as laborers, they came here to establish fifty-acre orchards and raise apples, pears, peaches, and berries, would you be in favor of that? Would you think it desirable to have this immigration go on and increase?—A. O, yes. I would then quit.

Q. What would you do?—A. I would lend them my money and live on the proceeds.

Q. Suppose you had not any money?—A. Then I would be unfortunate.

Q. Suppose they did not want any money and had more than you?—A. Then I would be unfortunate.

Q. Would you prefer that the Chinese should have the same right and occupy the country and advance it in the future as the native American citizen has done in the past?—A. No; that is not in the question.

Q. Would you make any reservations in favor of American citizens?—A. Not at the present time, because I do not think there is any necessity.

Q. Then it is because you think there is no present fear of their immigration?—A. I am not such a friend of universal humanity as to want anything to occur in our land against the best interests of our own people.

Q. I do not understand your answer.—A. I want nothing to occur to injure our own people; but I do not believe that the immigration of Chinese is an injury to our own people, but, on the contrary, an advantage to them.

Q. You would not make any reservations in favor of the future?—A. I have also learned that evils are best to be coped with when we see them coming, and not to imagine and to make evils.

S. CLINTON HASTINGS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. Since the 18th of August, 1849.

Q. What was your profession?—A. I am engaged in general real-estate business in the city and county, cultivating farms, the reclamation of lands, the erection of edifices and buildings in the city.

Q. What was your profession?—A. I was a lawyer when I was in practice.

Q. Did you hold office in this city; and, if so, what?—A. I was chief-justice of the supreme court on the organization of the State. When my term expired as chief-justice, I then, having been reduced to poverty in that delightful occupation, took the office of attorney-general from the people. When my term expired, I retired from the business of the law entirely, and set up my own business, which I have just defined.

Q. You have resided during the whole period in the State?—A. It has been my permanent residence. I have been a resident of New York a good deal, and in foreign countries, but generally as a traveler and sight-seer; but I have been domiciled in California.

Q. Have you employed the Chinese and had anything to do with them?—A. I have had a great deal to do with them and a great deal not to do with them.

Q. What has been their influence upon the prosperity of this State?—A. I think their influence has been double. So far as its material interests are concerned their influence has been beneficial. The construction of the Central Pacific Railroad was the great desideratum for the prosperity of this country. In that their influence was beneficial, but in the construction of lateral roads through our different counties I think their influence has been detrimental. I do not think those roads are any benefit to the people, for they are on the whole detrimental to the farming interests of the State. In that and a moral point of view their influence has been highly detrimental. It has had a tendency to demoralize labor there greatly; and at the same time, I may add, I do not know what the effect would have been upon immigration from other States if the Chinese had not come here. We certainly have been under the necessity of employing Chinamen so far for all servile work.

Q. Does that necessity still continue?—A. I am in a great deal of doubt upon that point. I think the best interests of the people of California at the present moment are to continue the employment of Chinese for the work in which they are engaged for a year or two; after which, if they continue to employ Chinamen, or encourage their immigration, I think they will destroy the country, they will demoralize its people, and we will become I do not know what. It is not for me to prophesy. I think it would be very injurious unless the Chinamen can be driven from this country after a year or two. I think at the present moment we really need them in the business in which we employ them.

Q. Do you think there is need of legislation to restrict their coming?—A. I do think that we should have some legislation. If I am to speak of our relations with the Emperor of China we should exclude the Chinaman to the same extent that the Chinese government exclude American citizens. Their privileges in this country should certainly be no greater than the privileges of our people in China, if the treaty is to continue. I understand Americans have not the privilege of settling over China everywhere they please and engaging in avocations which they may choose, so that their privileges in China are limited to certain localities. I think, therefore, we have the right to limit the employment of Chinamen in the same manner.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Have you given this matter consideration, especially from any other stand-point than that of mere industrial and material interest?—A. Yes, sir. I have considered it very considerably, especially with regard to the effect that the presence of this kind of people will have upon the character of the American people.

Q. With a view to the question of their assimilation or civilization?—A. Yes, sir; I have studied that point with a great deal of care.

Q. Explain your views upon that point.—A. My opinion is, and I speak from the highest authority, first, that the Chinese are almost another species of the *genus homo*. I do not think that they are another species, but they are a very wide variety. They vary from the Aryan or European race; their divergence is very wide. I think they vary so

much that the offspring of the Chinamen, united with the American race, would be unfertile, or it would be imperfectly fertile. I speak from the highest authority. It has been established in modern times. The formula among all modern philosophers is, that where in organic life what is called a morphological species of the same class unites with a morphological species of the same class, which species vary very greatly, the offspring is, as laid down, unfertile, and if not unfertile, it is very imperfectly fertile. That is the formula. That is agreed now to be the truth by all ethnological philosophers of the present age. I do not say that the Chinaman is of another species, but he is a variety that, for a great many reasons, diverges from the American citizen so widely that the offspring of these two varieties, as I have said before, would be, I have no hesitation in saying, imperfectly fertile, if not mules.

Q. In other words, they would produce something like what we in ordinary language call a hybrid population?—A. It would be no population at all, I think. I think it would be destruction if miscegenation should be general.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. We would not propagate?—A. We would not propagate, because God has forbidden it, I suppose.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What, in your opinion, is the political question involved in the incoming of this race?—A. I know the Chinamen very well. I have employed a great many of them in works in the country. I think that the organism of a Chinaman is very different from that of our race; the surrounding circumstances for centuries upon centuries, his mode of life, his thoughts, everything, varies so widely from ours. I think there is no race of the Aryan or European races, whether it be an Irishman or a Russian serf, who is not infinitely superior to the Chinaman in a moral point of view as a human being.

Q. Then, is it or is it not your opinion that the introduction here of large numbers would be a menace to our future civilization and to our future welfare?—A. The effect, as I have found from experience, of the presence of so many Chinamen, is practically as I shall state. I frequently visit my old State of Iowa, and I have been once or twice in Kansas. I have endeavored for years to induce our white people to come to this country. They do sometimes come, but they return again. There is an irrepressible conflict between the white man and the Chinaman when they come in contact. They prefer to go back to Iowa and get $15 a month in greenbacks rather than work here with Chinamen at $20 a month in gold. I do not say that is entirely the cause of Iowa immigrants not coming to this country, because it is not. There are some other reasons which induce this aversion. One reason is, that they generally come here with high hopes, expecting to gather up a fortune suddenly, but they are disappointed.

Q. You think the presence of Chinese has a tendency to discourage white immigration?—A. I think it has a direct tendency to discourage white labor from coming to this country. I think it demoralizes, also, another branch of our people, that is, our boys and girls. I think if they were not brought in contact with Chinamen, our boys and girls would take more to labor than they do, and would become, perhaps, valuable citizens; whereas, when brought in contact with these people whom they so despise, they have an aversion to labor, and would rather go out on

the streets, and be what we call hoodlums, than go on farms and work in competition with these people. I think the Chinaman has been, so far as developing some of the resources of California is concerned, indispensably necessary, as in the reclamation of our submerged lands. I have employed them for a great many years, and am employing them now. I have spent more than fifty thousand dollars in the reclamation of these submerged lands. I have done it with Chinamen. I have found some Chinamen very reliable, and, perhaps, for steady employment in that low grade of labor, they are better than any other race. I presume they are.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Would you be in favor of excluding the Chinamen?—A. I think that we must come to this crisis some time or other, and I think now is the time. I think that we should go through this terrible process of excluding Chinamen, which will be very injurious to us for a year or two. We had better do it now before the disease advances any further in its malignity. Now is the time; that is, within the next two years we should take the steps to get rid of these Chinese, for they are simply a fungus upon the body-politic. They cannot assimilate with our races, never can miscegenate, and they do not desire to do so. That is another thing. They have no intention to become citizens, and you cannot make citizens of them. We can make citizens of Irishmen and Russian serfs, and valuable citizens out of their offspring; but these people would give us an offspring so detestable that of course it is not to be spoken, if they should unite with the American races.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is our population increasing or decreasing through immigration from the Eastern States?—A. Our population is increasing somewhat.

Q. To what extent?—A. I think it has been increasing perhaps up to as high (I saw an estimate in the Alta this morning,) as two hundred thousand in the last year or two.

Q. What proportion of those immigrants have gone back on account of the Chinese?—A. I do not know what proportion. I can only speak of what I call my own people from Iowa, people in whom I have very great interest. I have met those people returning on boats and trains; I ask "Why do you go back?" Some of them are going back because lands are so much in the hands of monopolists, and they do not like to be brought into contact with such a kind of labor as we have here.

Q. They are generally dissatisfied?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the price of labor in Iowa for a farm-hand?—A. From $15 to $20 a month the year round.

Q. What is the price here?—A. Thirty dollars a month for white labor. I think, myself, if there were no Chinamen in this country white labor would be reduced and command a less price. That is my opinion about it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Give us your reasons for that view.—A. I will give you my experience. I have been for the last twenty-five years erecting buildings in this city; my own buildings. I never dared, if I desired, to employ Chinamen in my work. I do not dare to do it for the reason that if I should employ Chinamen I would have no tenants for my buildings. The poor white people of this city would not rent a building of a man who will employ Chinamen to erect it, and therefore we dare not employ any but white labor, who charge their own prices, but yet we have to

employ them. In the country it is quite different. In the country we employ them for servile purposes, such labor as white men do not care about performing, and the result of which is very detrimental to this country I consider. This is one of the richest wheat-growing countries in the world. We do not have perennial rains here and consequently our soils weaken. I have been engaged in wheat-raising for the last twenty years and know the effects of it. So long as all the smaller or lower departments of labor are in the hands of the Chinese the white people of the country are apt to employ these people and lie back and do not perform the labor that white men generally do in wheat-growing countries. In other words I might say, and even do say, that there are very few real farmers in California. Our people have got to be simply men who go on and plunder the soil, cultivate crops a few years simply, by machinery, sow the wheat and by machinery gather it, and by machinery send it off on railroads; and thus they put money in their pockets and the balance of the year they lie around. If there were no Chinamen here the white men would have to do their work to sustain their families and 'tend to some other business besides simply going on and sowing wheat on our lands. The fact is that in some of our best wheat-lands the fertility of the soil has been so much reduced that about Vallejo, a very rich wheat-growing district that I have lived in for years, we used to produce from twenty to twenty-five sacks of wheat per acre, and the same land does not produce more than from seven to nine sacks now, which shows what we are coming to, and that we will soon get to that epoch here as a wheat-growing country when we will have no wheat. We have no fertilizing matter. I think the employment of Chinese labor in the smaller departments of labor has a tendency to encourage our people to cultivate larger tracts of land and waste our soils, whereas if they would cultivate less and perform the work by their own labor the soil would be better taken care of.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Did I understand you, judge, as saying that the prejudice against the Chinamen is such that white people will not rent a house and live in it which was constructed in part by Chinamen?—A. That is true.

Q. In this city?—A. In this city. Not only that, but the prejudice is so great that if there were incendiaries among our laboring classes I think it would be a very great incentive for them to fire our buildings. That is another reason that deters me and has done it for twenty-five years from employing the Chinese in the construction of any of my dwellings. Not only that, but an appeal is made to me by the white labor of this city to employ white labor for the construction of edifices, "because" they say "we are your tenants, we patronize your merchants, and we should occupy your buildings." The Chinese do nothing of the sort. The Chinaman patronizes our merchants, but he does not rent our buildings excepting of the lowest kind for laundry purposes.

Q. Do you think that the employment of Chinese labor tends to waste the land?—A. I think it has an indirect tendency to produce this process of waste that is going on now with regard to our lands.

Q. But for Chinese labor there would be small farms instead of larger ones?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the farmers would take care of the soil?—A. In the first place, they would do their own kitchen work among their own daughters and their wives, they would do their own washing and cook their own food, raise their own pigs, and milk their own cows. If you give that employment to the family it causes them to contract their agriculture within

a smaller area, and makes them cultivate less, making farmers such as we find in other States. I hardly know a farmer in California such as we have in Indiana or Iowa.

Q. I understood you to say that the progeny of the Chinese and of the whites could not procreate?—A. Yes, sir; my testimony is to that effect, and I speak from the highest authority. It is proved by modern philosophy that the offspring or the progeny of two species or of two varieties that vary very greatly, as greatly as the Chinaman, if he is of our species, varies from us—if not unfertile is imperfectly fertile. I think the latter is the truth, that is, it is imperfectly fertile. I say the offspring of the progeny of the union of these two divergent varieties would be so imperfect that perhaps in the majority of offsprings it would be no better than a mule. I think to a certain extent the same applies also to the negro race, but not to so great an extent, because the negro has been raised under similar conditions with us; he has eaten of the same food, his organization is somewhat physically and psychologically like ours, although his color is different. The negro has breathed the same atmosphere and he has been, more or less, accustomed to the same habits of life. Therefore, the offspring of negroes with whites probably would be more prolific, but I think it would be imperfect also.

Q. You think that the difference between the white man and the Chinaman is greater than that between the white man and the negro?—A. Yes; and for the plainest reasons in the world. All animals conform to the fauna and flora of the country in which they live. The Chinaman has been raised in a different climate, and above all things he has been raised in habits of life so different that his psychological and physical organism is very widely different from ours, or that of any of the Aryan or European races.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you think that the effect of the employment of Chinese in our grain-fields is similar to the employment of slave-labor in tobacco and cotton fields, &c.?—A. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe the present employment of Chinese labor in this country is as detrimental as slavery ever was in the Southern States. Undoubtedly it is, and for the same reason.

Q. How is it with reference to the creation of a labor caste and an employing caste, making castes in society? Do you think it has the same tendency that slavery had in creating a servile caste?—A. Yes, sir. Chinese labor is a servile caste. The Chinaman is in a state of peonage. Everybody knows that. I do not know why people should hesitate for a moment in defining their position in this country. I pronounce them, so far as the great body-politic is concerned, a fungus, a foreign substance, an unhealthy substance. They are in a state of peonage; they are not freemen; they have no desire to assimilate with us.

Q. Have they any desire to adapt themselves to our institutions?—A. Not at all. You cannot induce a Chinaman to become a citizen, their organization is so entirely different. When you bring them into a court of justice, it has been shown right before my eyes that they have no idea of the obligations of an oath. I have seen them swear up a case and swear down a case. It is only necessary for the head-man of them to issue his orders. In fact, when I was at the bar these six companies here were my clients for two years. I know that the educated Chinaman is very much of a gentleman, as a matter of course. He has his own philosophy and his own views of things. If one of the men, one of the peons, I please to call them, has murdered somebody, the head-

man will issue his orders, bring in witnesses, and prove anything. They have no idea of the obligation of an oath at all. As to christianizing these Chinamen, that is the most preposterous thing I ever heard of in my life. They have got a religion of their own, which philosophers say is quite as good as ours, and certainly they are very pious in their way. I am speaking now of the Buddhist religion.

Q. You think they are fully satisfied with their religion, and not disposed to change it?—A. They are not only satisfied, but I presume they are quite as anxious to convert us. I do not know that I can say what I was about to say. I was going to say perhaps they would be as anxious to convert us as we would be to convert them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about their being in a state of peonage. What do you mean by that?—A. A peon is a person who in all Spanish countries becomes indebted to his superior, and when so indebted he is obliged to serve him until he discharges that obligation. The Chinamen, I think, without any exception, all come here as peons, employed by contractors and these great six companies. They come here, and perform a certain service to pay for the expense of bringing them here, which is very considerable, and the expense of taking them home; and when they have done that, and amassed a few dollars—it does not take much—they go back to their homes where they came from.

Q. Do you mean by that anything more than that they contract a debt to bring them here, which they agree to pay by their labor?—A. That is peonage.

Q. Is that what you mean by it?—A. Yes, sir; it is. Peonage, of course, is personal service.

Q. The money is advanced to them, and they agree to repay it, with interest?—A. They agree to work until they pay it. That is peonage.

Q. Do they agree to pay the money back, with interest, or are they to work such a length of time for it?—A. They are to work until they compensate for the expense of transportation.

Q. I mean do they agree to pay the money back, with interest, or do they agree to work such a length of time without regard to the amount?—A. They have to pay, first, the commissions due to the persons who engage them, and then to the companies who take care of them. These companies are under obligations to see that they are taken care of and that they are returned to their own country, either dead or alive. Of course the people who undertake these duties have to be compensated, and the peon or Chinaman has to work personally until he discharges that obligation.

Q. Does he agree to work such a length of time, say six months or a year, or does he agree to pay the precise amount back, with interest?—A. I think he has to work until he pays the money back.

Q. In other words, he agrees to pay back a certain sum of money, which is advanced to him?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he may earn that just as quick as he can?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He has no term of service, but he has a debt to pay back?—A. Yes, sir. He belongs to the great companies until he does that. They order him to go here and there; they see that he is not starved; they see that he is fed, and that he is employed. It is a very elegant organization; it is really beautiful, and hence it is that you never hear of their people being beggars.

Q. Is that kind of business peculiar to Chinamen in this country?—A. Yes, sir; it is.

Q. I will ask you whether a great many white persons from the Eastern States, in the original settlement of California, did not come here under an arrangement similar to that?—A. I think very few, indeed; and I think nine-tenths of those who did violated their obligations.

Q. That was not to their honor particularly?—A. No, sir; I do not think it was. The Chinaman has the advantage of us in that respect; but the aversion of our people is so great to anything of the kind, that I presume they violated their obligations almost naturally.

Q. I will ask you whether at this time we have not to the Eastern States a large immigration from Europe who come upon money borrowed or advanced in some way, which they agree to pay out of labor done in this country?—A. I do not know that. I presume that that is rather the exception, so far as English labor is concerned. I have been a good deal in England of late. I think generally the English immigrants furnish their own money for transportation, and that very few come under contracts. I know there have been some such organizations in England. Some years ago one hundred or two hundred girls were brought to this country and distributed in Washington Territory. A few such philanthropic movements have taken place in England, but they are exceptional. The great mass of immigrants from Ireland and England come here as independent men and women, and are not under any such obligations. Nine-tenths of them are perfectly free. It is very seldom that they come in that way.

Q. I will ask you whether many immigrants from Europe do not borrow the money at home and come here upon an agreement to pay it out of their wages after they get here?—A. I think there are a great many such cases indeed.

Q. In what respect does that differ from the way the Chinese come here?—A. In the one case it is the privilege of the person who thus arranges to come to make the money. If he does not happen to make the money it is all right, and if he does make it he pays it back; that is, he is only under moral and legal obligations to return the money, and he is under no personal restraint by the man with whom he contracts. Here the Chinaman is under personal constraint. He is enslaved to these employers until he pays back the money advanced to him.

Q. In what way is he enslaved?—A. Because he leaves his own country under such a contract, and he is taught to believe that he belongs to the company which employs him until he pays that money back. He hardly dares violate his contract, because he does not understand our language. He knows nothing about the American people, nor does he desire to know anything about them. He looks to his employers, and in that respect, therefore, he is really in the condition of a slave. He feels that way, whether he is a slave or not.

Q. The slavery, then, consists in his fidelity to an agreement to make money and pay it back?—A. Yes; and his ignorance to do what he might do if he only knew it. He does not know that he could break away from bondage and become independent.

Q. In other words, he thinks he is bound by his contract?—A. He thinks he is bound by his contract. He thinks he cannot violate it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The distinction between the person who, in the other case, would borrow money of his friends to come here and then employ himself as he saw fit, and return the money when he was able, and the Chinese, is that, in addition to procuring this money in any way they may, the person who loans the money has the supervision of them and controls

their movements?—A. Yes, sir. In the other case the European immigrant has the liberty to say that he will be employed in this or in that way. It is not so with the Chinaman.

Q. Do you feel at liberty, so far as you have learned anything of the six companies in your capacity, to state anything about their control of the Chinamen—the amount of dues paid by coolies to them, &c.?—A. Only this: the Chinaman only knows the company which brings him here. He does not know what he could do. He looks to his company for the food he eats when he lands here; he is taken care of by them; he is sent to the country by them here and there in the reclamation of swamp and submerged lands.

Q. It has been testified here that the Chinese companies do not bring over any immigrants. Do you know whether the Chinese companies bring over any of their people or not?—A. I do not think they do; but they take control of them, certainly, when they come here, pay their pecuniary obligations, and settle their difficulties. It is an *imperium in imperio* undoubtedly.

Q. Do you know what dues the laborers pay the Chinese companies?—A. I do not know their compensation.

Q. You do not know whether they pay a monthly stipend?—A. No, sir; I do not.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you Chinese to work for you now?—A. Yes, sir; I always have them.

Q. Why do you employ this fungus when there are so many white people out of employment?—A. For the simple reason that they are here and I can get them cheaper.

Q. How do you know that these contracts are made in the manner which you describe, and that these men are consigned to the six companies? Did you ever see one of their contracts?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you speak the Chinese language?—A. No, sir.

Q. Where do you get your information?—A. I get my information from a knowledge of the Chinamen for the last twenty-five years.

Q. To whom do you pay the wages of your Chinamen?—A. I pay it to the Chinamen.

Q. What do they do with it?—A. I do not know, except to take it home to China after they discharge their obligations.

Q. They do not come right down here and pay it over to these bondmen you speak of, the Chinese six companies?—A. I have no hesitation in saying that they do. I think they are generally honest.

Q. Do you think they keep a contract better than white men?—A. I do not know what they would do if they knew enough. I will say fairly in answer to your question that I think they are more faithful than white men.

Q. Do you not know that the Chinese now vote in this country?—A. I have heard of such a monstrosity, but I never saw a Chinaman vote.

Q. Do you not know that Chinese voted at the last election in this city?—A. I have heard so.

Q. Have you met the leading merchants in business?—A. Not since 1854, when I was one of their attorneys. I have met them at a dinner party.

Q. You went to a dinner party given by the Chinese?—A. Our clients gave us a dinner party that equaled anything in splendor I ever knew.

Q. Did you not feel yourself degraded?—A. No, sir; no man feels degraded in associating with cultivated Chinmaen.

Q. Then there are some cultivated Chinamen?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. You said a moment ago that you considered them all a fungus?—A. I do consider them a fungus. I lay that down as a general rule. I say that there are a few good Chinamen. I speak of educated Chinamen, for they have education and philosophy in that country; and I say that those people are worthy of the association of any people on earth socially.

Q. What has brought them to that standard?—A. Their education.

Q. Do you suppose it ceases there?—A. How?

Q. Might other Chinese be educated to that point?—A. Of course there is a certain class. You know in China everything is in a state of class. There is a certain class of people highly educated, they have their philosophy and their religion entirely unlike ours; but, as I said before, the Chinaman is a foreign substance. The great mass of Chinamen do not belong to us and never will.

Q. From what plane did Confucius and Mencius rise?—A. I really do not know.

Q. You are not familiar with Chinese history?—A. I am not very familiar with Chinese philosophy nor with Chinese history. I must say that I am a little defective in Chinese matters.

Q. Are you familiar enough to give this information for the Congress of the United States?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you familiar enough from your knowledge of the Chinese to make a sweeping statement here that they are not capable of becoming educated gentlemen?—A. I do not think they are.

Q. You do not think they are?—A. No, sir; on account of their organism, on account of their habits of life; they are different beings from us.

Q. What is their civilization based upon?—A. I am a little defective again there, for I am not familiar enough with Chinese philosophy and Chinese institutions to answer the question. I know that their civilization is different from ours and that their religion is different from ours. That is all I do know. I never have read Confucius, and I must confess that I am a little ignorant of Chinese matters.

Q. Then you are not sufficiently conversant with Chinese civilization to state whether they could become good citizens or not?—A. Yes, sir; I am sufficiently familiar to state that the Chinese in this country, as a general rule, are entirely unfit to amalgamate with or become incorporated into the body of the American people. They cannot be made citizens of.

Q. The merchants you met were business men?—A. Yes, very fine business men, of the very first order.

Q. Where does the distinction arise? Where you meet a Chinese merchant of the finest order of intellect, you shut him right off there from assimilating or affiliating with the Anglo-Saxon race?—A. Yes, sir; right there. In the first place, he is as adverse to that as we are.

Q. How do you strike the line of demarkation between them? You assume that one has reached a height of civilization equal to our own.—A. Of his own kind.

Q. What do you mean by his own kind?—A. I say as a merchant he is equal to any merchant.

Q. What does a mercantile citizen consist of?—A. It consists of very highly cultivated honor, which the large merchants assume all over the world. The Chinaman has highly cultivated that quality. He is equal to any foreigner in the observance of his obligations.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Monetary obligations?—A. Monetary obligations, of course. He is perhaps superior to a great many in that respect. He is a very superior man also so far as the amenities of life go. For instance, in all the little specimens of high-toned civilization the Chinese merchant is equal to anybody; he is a prince.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you not know that the Chinese merchant springs from the lower class, the poorest Chinese?—A. Entirely; but he goes up on a different column. He diverges from us infinitely. He has his own civilization and his own religion. His own views of everything are very different from ours.

Q. I should like to ask you upon what civilization he reaches that pinnacle, but you have said two or three times that you do not know.—A. I simply state the fact.

Q. Then you simply state what you see as a fact existing. I ask you why it is that the whole nation cannot be brought up to that sphere. You say they cannot, I understand, because they are a fungus?—A. I say these high-toned Chinamen are unfit to amalgamate with the American race. They have their civilization; their habits of life; their psychology, if you please, and their physical organism, different from ours. They claim that they are superior to us; that we are a fungus; and when we go to China we find that we are.

Q. Is not their civilization superior to ours?—A. In some respects I believe it is.

Q. Then that claim is based upon a fact?—A. Perhaps so.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In what respect is their civilization superior to ours?—A. I do not know. I know it is so contended by optimists. I have my mind's eye on our old friend, Governor Seward, who was an optimist of the extremest kind, with whom I associated for a long time. I know he is one of the class of persons who believe that the Chinese civilization is superior to ours; and so these optimists generally insist upon these extreme views in regard to China. Such men as Governor Seward and other eminent ethnologists, both living and dead, who are optimists, believe that is the case, and therefore out of respect to these persons, I say they have some ground for their claim.

Q. But you are not testifying that in your belief it is a superior civilization?—A. Not by a long ways. I differ very widely from these gentlemen.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. It has been stated here that it is impossible to get white labor for house purposes in this country, and that those places have been filled by Chinamen. Have you kept house?—A. I have kept several houses in the last twenty-five years. I have now three or four ranch-houses.

Q. Can you get white household servants?—A. No, sir. The reason has been stated by the reverend gentleman (Mr. Brier) who testified a while ago, and the reason is a very good one. Catholic servant-girls do not desire to go to the country. The reverend gentleman spoke of Catholics alone, but then there are a great many other girls in this country, thousands and thousands of them, who would go to the country and would become servant-girls if it was made as honorable as it is in other countries. I know that servant-girls in the Northern States are treated comparatively with a great deal of respect; they are treated as members

of the family and treated kindly. Girls in Iowa will stay and work for eight and twelve dollars a month in preference to coming to California to be treated as Chinamen. They will not stand these things there. These are American girls I speak of. I do not know if that is the reason why all our girls do not take to employment for instance in washing or in cooking, but I think it is. I think if we had no Chinamen, and if we would make washing and cooking the honorable business that it ought to be made, as honorable as any other business in the world, our girls would take to that kind of employment in preference to wandering over our streets and falling into a vicious life.

Q. Do you think that Chinese labor has the same effect upon the respectability of white labor as slave-labor had in the South?—A. I think it has quite as bad an effect if anything; and I am just as much in favor of expelling the Chinamen from this country as I always was, in the formation of two States in my life-time—Iowa and this State—in favor of excluding slavery; not that I was opposed to slavery, individually, for I have always said that I should like to own slaves myself, but I have always voted against it. In the formation of these two States, in which I participated, I always resisted it, and apparently because I considered it a very great evil; I consider the presence of the Chinaman with us the same kind of an evil.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about expelling Chinamen. Do you refer to those who are here now or those coming in the future?—A. I do not think it would be wise to expel Chinamen who are here. I think we really need the Chinamen who are here for a year or two longer. I think after a couple of years it might be different. In other words, I do not think we ought to encourage any more immigration of Chinamen. Any further immigration of Chinamen ought to be stopped right now. If we are going to suffer by it we had better suffer now.

Q. Do you think they have been a benefit up to this time?—A. I think they have been a benefit in many respects; in fact they have been a necessity in carrying out certain branches of industry in the country. I do not know what the effect would have been if they had not been here. That is a point we cannot settle. We might have had a supply of white labor for our manufactories. I do not think that we could have constructed the great trunk-railroad at the time we did without the Chinamen.

Q. I understood you to say that you think these lateral railroads have been an injury to the country?—A. That is very plain to any gentleman.

Q. What roads do you refer to?—A. The California Pacific has almost destroyed the county of Solano. It has dispensed with the labor of hundreds and thousands of men and peons, and taken the profits of the farmer and vaquero and divided them among the corporation. It is almost making a desert of Napa County.

Q. You think the Napa Railroad is an injury, then?—A. It is an injury. I contributed myself foolishly to build it to a small extent, but I am confident that I was mistaken about the benefit to result from the enterprise.

Q. What other railroads do you think are injurious to the State?—A. I have spoken of those two railroads. I do not know that I can say the same of the Southern Pacific Railroad, because that, perhaps, may be considered more of a trunk-road, reaching a remote part of the country.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How about the Donohue Railroad reaching San Rafael?—A. I think that is an evil, too.

Q. How about the railroad that runs up to Redding?—A. I think they had better carry the products to the embarcadero and employ teams in doing it. We have been everywhere pushing out these lateral roads, and then the people are unemployed.

Q. What was land worth in Solano County before the California Pacific Road was completed?—A. I had about thirty or forty thousand acres in that county. Before that road was completed lands were worth as much, if not more, than they are now. I have never known a lower figure taken for lands in Solano County than this year.

Q. What were the lands worth an acre before the road was built?—A. From $10 up to $25 an acre. Some of the lands that I sold myself for $20 an acre before the road was constructed, I have now to take back. I would add, however, about the California Pacific, that it was a fraudulent road; there was hardly a dollar in it. It was an infamous fraud from its inception up to the time it went into the hands of the Central Pacific.

Q. It was not built by them?—A. No, sir; it was built by a certain class of gentlemen who were entirely impecunious, and who perpetrated a fraud upon the innocent capitalists of Europe, if they be innocent; I do not suppose they are. In other words, they robbed everybody to build that road. I have no hesitation in denouncing it in the severest language that I am able to employ.

Q. What are the lands worth?—A. They almost ruined the county. Our people were foolish enough to give them $300,000 of bonds for the construction of the road. In regard to Napa County——

Q. I should like to have you state in regard to Solano; what are the lands worth around Davisville to-day?—A. Forty or fifty dollars an acre.

Q. What are they worth around Elmira and Dixon?—A. About the same.

Q. What does it cost to get a ton of wheat from Dixon?—A. I do not know what it would cost; but I might as well add that a little south of that road, right adjoining, the lands are not worth half what they were worth a few years ago.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Would the argument against these lateral roads that you speak of, the Napa Road and the California Road, be a good argument against any railroads?—A. No, sir; I think not. The Southern Pacific and the Central Pacific are trunk-roads running a long distance, and they are bringing produce from a distance. When produce is raised at a long distance from navigable streams, then the railroad is a necessity, a very important thing; but through Napa and Solano Counties, where they have embarcaderos all along, the road is an injury, for the reason I have stated. The same remark applies also to Iowa and Kansas. The people of Kansas are impoverished; their country is destroyed by railroads; I mean by overbonding themselves. Every little village and every county in the State is bonded. Men tell me there a couple of years ago that they were taxed as high as 6 per cent. per annum to pay off these subsidies.

Q. I understood you to say that if it was not for the railroads the people would be employed in hauling grain themselves.—A. By hundreds; large teams.

Q. Suppose no railroad crossed the continent; would it not require a

great many persons to haul across and thus furnish employment to them?—A. I admit the transcontinental road has been of great importance to the nation, but not particularly to California. I think we would have been better off without it; but in a patriotic point of view it is a necessity.

Q. Do you think the road across the continent is an injury to the State of California?—A. It was an injury for a while, but it is now a great benefit to this country. The Los Angeles Road, reaching into Arizona, is a benefit undoubtedly to this country; but these little lateral roads that usurp the employment of teamsters and teams and all that sort of thing in the counties that I speak of are injuries. In Napa County they have absolutely thrown out of employment many people and left the lands unoccupied, and they have become sterile and do not command the price they did a few years ago.

Q. They throw people out of employment because they would have been occupied in hauling grain, &c.?—A. Yes, sir; the railroads do the hauling a little cheaper.

Q. If the farmers can get their grain to market cheaper by means of a railroad, does not that inure to the benefit of the farmers?—A. I hardly think it does. The farmer raises his grain. He may get it to the market a little cheaper by means of the railroad; but what he pays for transportation of course goes to Europe to pay the interest on the bonds. That is the ultimate destination of the money; whereas, if I employed teamsters and paid them a little more, what I paid to these teamsters would patronize our little country stores and our country hotels, and these are consumers of grain and help the farmer indirectly. I think it would be better for the farmer if he had to transport grain for miles by wheel instead of by rail.

Q. If it would be a good thing to do this for a few miles, why is it not good for many miles? Where does the argument stop?—A. It is a curious thing; but a railroad will transport grain, for instance, a long distance almost as cheaply as for a short distance. It is not so with teams. When you have a long road to haul over that is another affair, and then the railroad becomes a valuable institution, as a long trunk-road, which I admit; but these short roads cutting up our counties do us an injury.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Has Solano County retrograded since the road was built; has its assessed value and population gone back?—A. I think the assessed value of property there is about the same. I believe I am about the heaviest tax-payer in Solano County, and I think my taxes have remained pretty uniform generally.

Q. You spoke of Napa Valley and the destruction of the Conestoga road by the railroad. Is not Napa Valley called the garden spot of the State?—A. You would think so if you should ask the people up there about it.

Q. They do not know?—A. They do not know.

Q. How about Sonoma County; they have a road running up there?—A. I do not know about Sonoma County and the road there.

Q. I built that road. I think it used to cost seven dollars to get a ton of wheat from Hillsdale to the embarcadero. Now they transport it for a dollar and a half.—A. I wish it understood when you get a short distance from the embarcadero a railroad becomes profitable.

DAVID D. COLTON sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are connected with the Southern Pacific Railroad, I believe?—Answer. I am.

Q. Are you the vice-president or the president of the company?—A. At this time I am the vice-president.

Q. You are also connected with the Oriental and Occidental Steamship Company?—A. I am.

Q. You are concerned in the bringing of Chinese immigrants to this port?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you bring any Chinese women on your ships?—A. On the establishment of the line we gave absolute orders that none but families should be brought over; that is, that the females should be the wives or daughters of Chinamen coming.

Q. Do you enforce that regulation up to this time?—A. I believe it always has been enforced. I have heard nothing to the contrary. A telegram at one time came from China to the custom-house, stating that twenty or thirty had been smuggled aboard in male attire, but upon examination by the officers here it was found to be a false rumor.

Q. You constructed the Southern Pacific Railroad by Chinese labor, I believe?—A. Not altogether.

Q. I mean principally?—A. A portion of it. The heads of the construction department were white laborers.

Q. The construction of that road gave work to a great many white men?—A. Yes sir.

Q. You had no Government subsidy, I believe, to aid in construction of the Southern Pacific?—A. No, sir; except the land subsidy.

Q. What is the length of that road from Lathrop?—A. From Lathrop, or rather from Goshen, between four and five hundred miles of the Southern Pacific proper have been constructed.

Q. A good portion of that road is through a farming country?—A. A great portion of it.

Q. It has opened up that vast amount of country to settlement?—A. It has.

Q. What class of people are and have been settling there since the road was built?—A. What you might term an average class of the immigrants who settle up all over new Territories and States.

Q. White immigrants?—A. Pretty much all white; there are very few of any other kind. They are mostly from the Western States, some Europeans.

Q. Would you have constructed that road without Chinese labor?—A. I do not think it would have been done as quickly and with anything like the same amount of certainty as to what we were going to accomplish in a given length of time.

Q. You had several thousand laborers on the road?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you have obtained that number of white laborers?—A. I think not.

Q. Has it not been your experience since your connection with the Southern and Central Pacific Railroads that you could not obtain white labor?—A. We certainly could not in that number.

Q. By the construction of these various railways by your company you have opened a channel for a great many thousand white laborers, have you not?—A. I think so.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were you connected with the construction of the Central Pacific?—A. I was not at that time. I became an owner afterward.

Q. Do you know what kind of labor was employed in the construction of that road?—A. I think there was a good deal of Chinese labor; but Mr. Crocker, who had charge of the entire construction department of the Central, is in the city now and could give you the details more fully.

Q. What proportion of labor employed in the construction of the Southern Pacific was Chinese?—A. I should say about 75 or 80 per cent., at times more, and at other times less.

Q. How long have you been engaged in the construction of that road?—A. We have been engaged in active construction of it now for the last two years, making connection between here and Los Angeles.

Q. What is the character of these Chinese laborers for fidelity and industry?—A. I have not been in immediate contact with them while they were at work on the road, and I could only give such testimony as I get from the head of our construction department, which is very favorable to that class of labor. I have employed them in my house for many years. I have two, one that I have had seven years, and one that I have had five years. I find them reliable, industrious, and cleanly. I have never seen a Chinaman who could not read or write.

Q. What has been the effect of the construction of these railroads upon the settlement and building up of the country?—A. From my stand-point, I think it has done a great deal for this State and coast. It has been the means of opening up thousands of acres of land that would otherwise have lain idle for a long time to come.

Q. Have the settlements followed the roads?—A. Yes, sir, and constantly increasing. Our railroad construction is the reverse in this country from what it is in any other. They build railroads in other countries to take the people out. Here we build a railroad so that people may go into the wilderness and then they begin to settle it up.

Q. The railroad is the pioneer?—A. Yes, sir; many miles of road where it was twenty or thirty miles between each settlement and farm-house now are being settled up. As an illustration, take the San Joaquin Valley Road compared with three or four years ago. One car would then go up the valley. I have been on the train when there would be but two or three passengers for the last twenty-five or thirty miles of the road. Now it takes four cars to do that business.

Q. What has been the effect upon the prosperity of the State by the construction of lateral roads?—A. I think most favorable in every way. Lateral roads, of course, by themselves, so to speak, would not be paying property to railroad owners, but they would be a great advantage to the country that they would open up.

Q. Would they have the effect to reduce or increase the value of land?—A. I think, as a rule, they have advanced the value of lands from 200 to 1,000 per cent. Much of the land in the Salinas Valley, for instance, was offered to us at $2 an acre, for which they are charging now $25 and $35 an acre since the road was built through that country.

Q. How long have you lived in California?—A. Going on 27 years.

Q. What has been the effect of Chinese labor, taking it in the aggregate, upon the growth and prosperity of the State?—A. I think very beneficial.

Q. What is your opinion as to the propriety or the necessity of restricting Chinese immigration?—A. I think that the law of demand and supply will govern it entirely. Whenever there is no demand for

Chinamen they will not come here. If we had plenty of white labor here they would not come; but it is a choice between Chinese or no labor at all to open up this country. I have heard a great deal about white labor not having employment, but I have yet, in 27 odd years, to find any white man, who was honest in his purposes, to fail to get labor; if he will attend to business honestly and industriously, he will not only find plenty to do, but the first thing you know he will be managing 20 or 30 Chinamen; that, I think, is the result of these matters in this country.

Q. Do you think that there is any plethora of labor on this coast?—A. I do not think there is. I think the best thing that could happen to this coast would be if we could get here, within the next three years, 500,000 industrious laboring people.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Chinamen?—A. I would prefer white labor by all means. I would not say Chinamen by any means; but my judgment is if we could get 300,000 industrous American people to come here we would then have ample employment for not only those 300,000, but as many Chinamen, to open up this vast country that is now a wilderness.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. State whether, in your opinion, the presence of Chinamen here retards the settlement of the country with white people?—A. I do not think so; on the contrary, I think that it would have the reverse effect, if anything. They perform a class of labor that you cannot have done in any other way. It enables farmers to carry on their occupation in various ways, and without the employment of this labor I do not believe the land would have been cultivated anything like as prosperously as it has been.

Q. Do you think that the immigration from China is determined by the demand for labor here?—A. I think it is.

Q. Do you think if the labor market was fully supplied the immigration would diminish or cease?—A. I have no doubt but that it would cease. As I said, I have never seen a Chinaman who could not read and write. They are experts as accountants. They are a thinking people. They communicate with their people at home. I do not think, in the history of civilization, there was ever a nation that was so absolutely a stranger to the country they emigrated to and suffered as many disadvantages. They have been clubbed and beaten and stoned as they have come from the steamer up to their quarters, and they have patiently and quietly gone along and done their work and established themselves.

Q. You speak about their reading and writing. Do they correspond with their own countrymen; do they write letters to them?—A. O, yes; regularly.

Q. Is their correspondence a large one?—A. Reasonably so; as much so, I should suppose, as any nationality of that number in this country.

Q. What is your observation in regard to the intelligence of Chinamen in business?—A. I have never had any occasion to find fault with them. They have always been prompt, and faithfully carry out their engagements.

Q. What is their intellectual ability in the management of business?—A. I think very good. I think you can consider them an intellectual people, a thinking people. They are not a people to fly kites and make a great fuss, but they go along steadily and persistently, and they are industrious and frugal.

Q. How do Chinese merchants, in point of intelligence and ability in the management of their business, compare with other merchants?—A. I have not had sufficient dealing with them to give you that information. I can only judge by their general prosperity and the extension of their business here. I know these principal business houses have sprung up from very small beginnings compared with what you see them now.

Q. What is your information in regard to Chinamen coming here with capital? Do they sometimes come with capital, or do they accumulate it here?—A. I have not been in a channel to enable me to answer the question definitely. It would only be hearsay information. I think, outside of certain houses, there is not a great deal of capital brought here.

Q. Do you understand that some of them have brought capital here?—A. I understand they have, and a great many I know here have put what money they have earned into business here, into various means of adding to it.

Q. You say that some of these mercantile establishments have had small beginnings?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your observation in regard to the effect of the presence of Chinamen upon the morals and the industry of the white people?—A. I have never seen anything that would tend to interfere with the morals of our people. There is a sort of general alley or routine that all strangers and everybody is taken through here as one of the sights of Chinatown, where you are shown a great deal of misery and some prostitution; but I have never seen any of that except when I went there with one or two parties of eastern gentlemen, in company with policemen.

Q. In view of the industry and character of Chinamen, as you understand it, what is the origin or cause of the hostility to the Chinamen here?—A. I do not know that I could answer that any better than I did the other day in speaking with a gentleman. I told him they had been making war on the negroes until they had made them voters, and I thought they were going to do the same thing with the Chinamen; although I consider the Chinamen of San Francisco, taking them all together, from my knowledge of the negroes of the South—and I have been all through the South—infinitely better qualified to exercise the right of franchise. Understand me, I do not defend the right of Chinamen to vote, but I think them infinitely more intelligent and better qualified to exercise that right than the slaves of the South, who can neither read nor write.

Q. I do not know whether your answer quite meets my question.—A. I did not intend to avoid it.

Q. I understand it. My question is, what is the origin or the cause of the opposition to Chinamen, the hostility that evidently prevails among a great many of your people?—A. I have asked myself that question a good many times when I have been down at the steamer; and when these inoffensive people, in the legitimate pursuit of their business, were going up from the steamer to their lodging-houses I have seen twenty or thirty of what are termed hoodlums here throwing rocks at them. I have seen quiet, peaceful Chinamen going through the street when grown men would hit them in the face, knock off their hats, and do all those things which if done to an American in China the whole American nation would be in favor of a war; they would be in favor of wiping China from the face of the earth.

Q. If Americans in China were treated in the same way?—A. Yes, sir. It is a painful statement for an American to make, under our form of Government, but I think there is nobody in this room, who has lived here in the city, who will differ with me on that subject.

Q. How do the Chinese compare, in point of intellectual ability, capacity to understand, with Americans; do you notice any difference?—A. I look upon the American race as a very superior race. I would also rather undertake to get along with an American, probably, than with a Chinaman, but the Chinese are very apt; they learn quickly, they comprehend a thing, and they never drink. I never saw a drunken Chinamen in my life. They are always at themselves; they do not have any sprees. I have heard of this smoking of opium, but out of three or four thousand on the road there are no opium-smokers. There is no trouble with them; they are always on hand in the morning; they do a full day's work; and they are certainly the most cleanly laborers that we have.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. General, you were at one time, I believe, attorney of an interior county?—A. I was.

Q. What county?—A. Siskiyou.

Q. During what years?—A. From 1852 to 1856, I think; four years.

Q. Was the foreign miners' license-tax in operation at that time?—A. It was.

Q. Was that collected of all classes of foreigners who had not declared their intention of becoming citizens?—A. I think it was.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Were the Chinese allowed to declare their intentions?—A. I do not know that there was ever an application from them, so that the effect was to collect the tax out of the Chinese mainly. There were very few Chinese in my county. That is in the extreme northern portion of this State. I treated everybody who came under that law exactly alike.

Q. Do you know how it was in other parts of the State?—A. I do not know, more than from newspaper talk.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The law was passed applying to all, and you applied it to all?—A. To all in my county.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that law applicable to persons not naturalized?

Senator SARGENT. It was applied to all persons who were not citizens, or had not declared their intention to become such, the intention being to raise revenue; and the law was impartially administered.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If any foreigner should declare his intention, was he subject to the tax afterward?—A. No; upon showing his paper of declaration he was exempted.

Q. Any European could declare his intention at once on coming here?—A. I think he had to be here two years.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Was it ever considered in this State that a Chinaman could become a citizen?—A. That is a republican idea. I have that idea, but I cannot tell you why. I never heard of any of them trying to become citizens.

Q. At the beginning of the present Congress was not an attempt made on the part of several of them to become citizens or to declare their intentions?—A. I know nothing about that except newspaper reports, and I do not rely entirely upon them.

Q. What is the capacity of these men and their inclination to do hard work? The question has been raised as to their selection of light work,

and about their being unwilling to do hard work; how is that?—A. I never have placed them in any position where they did not, to use a common expression, fill the bill. I have seen them in mining; I had some large mining interests in Wyoming—coal-mining. We had all sorts of trouble, and finally put in Chinamen, and there are no better coal miners in the world now than these Chinamen.

Q. What character of work do they perform there?—A. All kinds of work; mining the coal and hoisting.

Q. Do they work underground?—A. Yes; they do everything about the mine.

Q. Did you see the work done on the Southern Pacific Railroad after it was completed?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what kind of men were employed there?—A. I have stated that 75 or 80 per cent. of our construction force were Chinamen.

Q. Were they engaged in tunnels?—A. Yes, sir. I think it is proper for me to say here, however, that, so far as my knowledge goes, there never was a white laborer who wanted work on the Southern Pacific Railroad who was refused. I would never refuse any of them, but would say, "All right; if you want work, go right on;" and I would pass them over the road during the whole of this time and give them work. Some of them would stay one month and get a little money and go off.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What wages did you pay them. The same as you paid the Chinamen?—A. No, sir; we paid them as a rule about twice as much as the Chinamen. Whenever a white man came and said he was poor and wanted work, I would say, "All right, go to work;" and send him right up the road.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You paid them twice as much. Did they do twice as much work?—A. No, sir; but they did teaming and certain classes of work. I have never seen a Chinaman who could drive a team much. They are not familiar at all with horses. That seems to be a branch of business that they have never taken to at all. Teamsters and all that department we give to white men; all our carpenters are white men. When we are building a bridge or trestle work, it is in the hands of white laborers, and all the labor done about it, outside of the carpenter work, such as handling timber and everything of that kind is given to white men. We would make a gang of white men as this class of men would come in, and then our teamsters are whites.

Q. Are any of them stone-masons?—A. They will do some work, as carrying stones and something of that kind, but all our masonry is done by white men. Almost all the bridge-building, the timbering for tunnels, the masonry, and those various departments are handled by white men. A whole gang of fifty or a hundred, or one hundred and fifty, as it may be, will be made up of white laborers. When there is a cut through a hill or a tunnel, we have a gang of Chinamen of one hundred with probably two or three white men as overseers over them. They all work in that way, so that we do not mix them up, the whites among them acting as foremen.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Is there any indisposition on the part of Chinese to do the heavy work, that is, the tunneling, the excavating?—A. No, we have always found them willing to do anything we set them to do.

Q. What is the comparative ability of whites and Chinamen on an

average in doing this heavy work? A. We have one or two very intelligent men who have been right with these Chinamen who know more about that subject. I have not given that subject my personal attention. The superintendents of construction could inform you on that subject better than I can.

Q. I suppose you have a report on that subject?—A. We get the report, but at the same time I am giving now more of things that come under my own eye. Mr. Strowbridge and Mr. Harris, who had charge of the construction work, and controlled a large number of Chinamen, can give you the details.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do the Chinese compare in point of muscular strength with white men?—A. They always do their work. I never see them wrestle or fight, but they do their work. They accomplish the purpose without any great show or fuss; at night there is so much work done, and no noise made about it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You spoke of the Rocky Mountain Coal Mines. I believe your company is interested in those mines?—A. No, sir; the company is not.

Q. You are a stockholder?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was it not a fact a few years ago that those mines were worked by white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were there not continual strikes there?—A. We could not carry on the mining with the white men we had there.

Q. They asked for such high wages that you could not transport the coal?—A. They were unreliable.

Q. And you had to substitute the Chinese for them?—A. Yes; we were driven to it by absolute necessity.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Were those the white men who happened to be along there at that time?—A. I think a good many of them were the men who helped build the Union Pacific Railroad.

Q. Was there any trouble in building the Union Pacific Railroad on account of the unreliability of their men?—A. I was not there during the construction of the road. I only know they hung a good many along there.

Q. Was that done by the men at work, or simply by the gamblers who followed on the track?—A. I do not know. A good many of the miners were men who had been at work on that road; that is all I know.

Q. They drove the road at a pretty good rate when they were building it, did they not; so that it was a race between the two companies as to which should get to Salt Lake first?—A. Yes; but they had a level plain all the way, and here the Central Pacific had to cross Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Q. They drove the Union Pacific pretty fast?—A. Yes.

Q. It must have been pretty good labor from somebody?—A. They had the material, and on the Central Pacific the material had to be sent around the Horn and across the Isthmus.

Q. I ask, not for comparison, but to know whether the Union Pacific did not build very fast for a railroad?—A. The Central Pacific could have been advanced much faster if the material had been here. It was the delay in getting the material that prevented their getting along on this end of the line as fast as they did on the other side.

Q. I know the Central drove very fast; but I want to know if the Union Pacific was not built very rapidly?—A. O, yes, of course.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Have you considered this Chinese question, in your testimony, entirely from the point of the material interests of the State; that is, you have not considered it in its effects upon the moral and political condition of the country?—A. I think the moral and political condition of the country is governed, to a certain extent, by the general prosperity of the State. I take it from all stand-points.

Q. After you have got through with your Chinese immigrants, as laborers upon public works, and the work has been done, which, in your opinion, would be the most desirable class of people to be left as laborers in the State, eastern people and foreign immigrants or Chinese?—A. If the eastern people were industrious, I would prefer them very much. If they were loafers and did not want to have anything to do, I would rather have the Chinamen.

Q. Take the average class of New England labor?—A. I should prefer it by far.

Q. Why would you prefer it to the Chinese?—A. That is, in regard to settling up the country. I do not speak of them in constructing the road; but if they were here they would open up the country with homes, churches, school-houses, improve the land, and all that.

Q. Then, looking to the ultimate future of the State, you say it would be better if we could have a fair class of eastern and European white labor than to have the country settled by Chinese?—A. I have said that I thought there was room for all of them, and I only wish that those New England people would come here. I do not think the Chinamen would interfere with them a particle. If there was any way of getting 300,000 families to this coast, I would walk barefoot from here to Chicago to accomplish it.

Q. That is very strong testimony, then, in favor of an ultimate immigration and settlement by white eastern and foreign people?—A. Undoubtedly; but when we cannot have them, I say I would rather have the Chinese than none.

Q. You are speaking now on the immediate necessity of this available labor for the purpose of the development of our materal interests?—A. I am speaking of it as we find it here to-day.

DONALD MCLENNAN sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are connected with the Mission Woolen Mills, I believe?—Answer. I am.

Q. How long have you been in that business?—A. Sixteen or seventeen years.

Q. How long have you been in this country?—A. About nineteen years.

Q. You established the woolen mills with Chinese labor?—A. I did.

Q. What success have you had in employing white labor, boys and girls?—A. We did not have very good success at first, but are somewhat more successful now.

Q. Why did you not have very good success at first?—A. For the reason that we could not get them.

Q. What goods do you make at your manufactory?—A. We make the full line of woolen goods, blankets, flannels, &c.

Q. Can you successfully compete with the eastern market?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you supply the Government, by contract and otherwise?—A. We do, very largely.

Q. You underbid eastern manufacturers in doing that?—A. We do.

Q. Could you substitute white labor to-day and do that?—A. Not at the present prices of white labor.

Q. How many operatives have you?—A. We have about 600 altogether, about 300 Chinamen and the rest white.

Q. What would be the effect upon your mills, and all other manufacturing business here, if we should drive the Chinamen out of the country?—A. I think the effect would be very detrimental to the material interests of the State; but I will qualify this remark. When I first started the Mission Mills I started with Chinese labor for the reason that I could not get white labor. I found them very intelligent, sober, and industrious, and ready to adapt themselves to anything and everything that turned up or whatever was required of them, so much so that I found they were equally as intelligent as the same type or class of labor of any other nationality. They would readily do the most intricate and complicated work, and in fact learned it in one-third less time than any other class of white labor. They are very imitative and ready, very apt, and can do almost anything you show them how to do. I think they do it more carefully than a white person.

Q. How do you look upon them for honesty?—A. I never found a case of theft among them. It is possible that such things might take place and we not know it; but still we have never discovered anything of the kind or noticed that anything was taken away.

Q. Your knowledge of the interests of this State is extensive; you come in contact with our farmers pretty extensively, do you not?—A. Somewhat.

Q. Is this Chinese labor beneficial to the small farmer as well as to the large?—A. I think not so much to the small farmer as to the large farmer, from the fact that the landed interests of the country are in so few hands it requires cheap labor to manage their seed-time and harvest. If the large farms were cut up into smaller farms; if a thousand acres were cut up into five parts, there would be five families in the place of one family; consequently there would be so many people of each family, and they would be able to do their own work at harvest and seed-time.

Q. Do you not look upon these large landed estates as a greater evil than the Chinese evil? Do they not keep out more immigrants than this so-called evil?—A. I think so, decidedly.

Q. Do you think the Chinese have materially added to the wealth and welfare of this coast?—A. I do.

Q. Largely so?—A. Very largely so.

Q. Have you ever received any threatening letters since you have employed Chinese?—A. I have received a great many, but I paid no attention to them.

Q. Letters threatening to destroy your property?—A. Yes, sir; to burn it down.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where is your property?—A. On the corner of Sixteenth and Folsom streets.

Q. In this city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You employ about three hundred laborers of each class?—A. Of each.

Q. Originally you employed Chinese entirely?—A. Yes, sir; I used to employ probably six or eight hundred of them.

Q. What has led to the substitution of white labor in part?—A. We found really a scarcity of Chinese labor, and then there was a desire on

our part to accommodate ourselves to the wishes of the public so far as employing white help. Furthermore, I think that we would employ a great many more white help than we are doing now if habits of industry were instilled into the minds of children in their homes, which is not the case here. Children are not taught any idea of industry at all. The consequence is, when they come into those establishments they are unruly; they will not obey any regulations we have in regard to how they shall conduct themselves or deport themselves in the business, and we are obliged to let them go; but I think they are beginning to understand somewhat better now and are doing better. I wish you to understand distinctly that it is not my wish at all ever to employ a Chinaman where a white man ought to be employed; but we must employ them as we have started in with them and we cannot get along without them; they are a necessity. They are a necessity in this way: If we had six hundred white persons we would not be sure on Monday morning whether one of them would come to work or not. If I wanted to borrow a hundred thousand dollars—and I often had to borrow from fifty to one hundred thousand dollars in starting my mill—and had an entire community of white help, the banker would tell me at once, "McClennan, I would readily grant you this sum of money, because I know your intentions are honest; that you are industrious, &c., but what security is there that you can repay me?" I would reply, "Here, I have got my business, and I have got my white labor running largely." But he would answer, "You do not know but that these people may strike upon you at any moment; and when your note becomes due you cannot meet it;" but with Chinese labor as a portion of the help, it is a check upon anything of that kind.

Q. The Chinese, therefore, you regard as steady and reliable?—A. Yes, sir; they are a very steady people. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman in my life.

Q. Do they ever strike for higher wages?—A. Never. I never knew them to do so.

Q. You say that they learn the more intricate kind of work very readily?—A. Very readily indeed; more readily than any others I have been conversant with. I spent all my life-time before coming here in New England. The very best class of farmers' daughters, well educated, bright, and intelligent, work there in the mills, and the Chinamen, I think, are more than their equal in adapting themselves to anything of that kind.

Q. What is the difference in the rate of wages that you pay to the two races?—A. We pay our white men from $1.75 to $6 a day, and we pay the Chinaman 90 cents a day.

Q. What is the difference in the amount of labor they perform?—A. The white help is more skilled labor, and the Chinaman does more medium work, such as attending machines, and working in lighter work.

Q. They are employed in a different kind of work?—A. Yes, sir. The white men are the foremen, the overseers, the carpenters, machinists, and engineers, and work in the dye-house and the several departments of work. As I said before, I wish it understood distinctly that it is not my wish, and never has been, to employ any of these people where white men should be; but, at the same time, I firmly believe to-day if the Chinese were driven from the State the State would be more than half bankrupt.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say one of the advantages of the Chinese is that they are a check upon white laborers?—A. That is, they are a check as to striking.

Q. Those strikes sometimes occur in the East?—A. Yes, sir; there are frequent strikes in the East.

Q. If one-half of the laborers in the eastern mills were Chinamen, do you think it would prevent any strikes there?—A. I do not know. I do not say that.

Q. Would not the same cause operate there?—A. It might not.

Q. What difference do you see?—A. There is a great difference—the interests are entirely different.

Q. The interests of the laborer in the East are different from the interests of the laborer here?—A. Yes, sir; and the surroundings are different.

Q. The laborers here are with their families?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they are there with their families?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the difference in their surroundings?—A. The difference in the surroundings is that there a whole community will be alike, and here we have a mixed cosmopolitan community.

Q. Then the advantage here of having the Chinese is to prevent strikes among the whites?—A. I do not say it is an advantage; but still it is one of the governing elements that enables us to carry on our business.

Q. It is a check upon the whites and prevents their striking?—A. Yes, sir; because it is a very reasonable inference to draw.

Q. These strikes generally rise on the part of whites because they think they are not getting wages enough?—A. Yes, sir; either too many hours of labor or too little wages.

Q. Do you know of any other protest or defense the laborer ever had against inadequate wages or too many hours of labor except by striking? Do you know of any other means that laborers ever had to enforce their right to reasonable compensation or reasonable hours of labor except by striking?—A. No, unless they saw the proprietors and petitioned them, and endeavored by quiet means of that kind to reach the object they tried to attain.

Q. Suppose the proprietors do not yield to quiet means, do you know of any other method ever designed by which labor could, in its judgment, right itself?—A. No, I do not.

Q. Then it deprives labor of the only means that it has found to compel what it thought, whether rightly or not, to be justice to it?—A. I do not so say.

Q. What other method is there?—A. I say it is one of the governing elements which prevents strikes.

Q. So that if the white man does not want to work for the wages that support a Chinaman the Chinaman steps in and does it, and the white man has no remedy?—A. It is on the same principle that General Colton has stated with regard to the Wyoming coal-mines; it was impossible for him to get along with white men, and he opened the way for the substitution of Chinese.

Q. How many white men and women do you employ in your factory?—A. Three or four hundred.

Q. Do you find them of the character that General Colton described the miners in Wyoming to be, wild, irresponsible people?—A. I do not.

Q. Then you are talking of a different class of people. Do you find these whites that you now employ industrious and steady, as a rule?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are gradually substituting them for the Chinese?—A. I am gradually substituting them.

Q. Do you find yourself able to compete after carrying on that substitution?—A. I do.

Q. You think the time may come when you will be able to make practically an entire substitution?—A. It may come, but it will be a good many years.

Q. How rapidly has this substitution been going on?—A. It has been going on for six or seven years, probably.

Q. You started with all Chinamen, and during that time you have employed how many whites?—A. At least half.

Q. In six years you gained one half?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why not gain the other half in another six years?—A. It is impossible to tell what a decade may do; there may be a revolution by that time.

Q. Judging from what you have seen, you are able to compete while putting on one-half Americans?—A. Yes, sir; there is a large floating population in large cities like this which you can always utilize, and which can be made to work if the proper inducements are held out to them, and if they are taught properly at their homes that they must work and must obey; but there is no thought of obedience or industry at all instilled into the minds of most of our working-class children, and the consequence is that they are neglected.

Q. Aside from the facilities that Chinese labor gives to manufacturers to carry on enterprises like yours, which certainly are very beneficial, aside from those material gains, what do you think of the desirability of the presence of the Chinese among us as to morals and the effect upon our political interests, their absence of home-life, their polygamous ideas, &c.?—A. I do not think they practice their polygamous ideas here very much.

Q. I ask if you think a community of that kind is as desirable as to have the presence of our own nationality, Americans and Germans?—A. Certainly not.

Q. You think it would be better for our State that this population, aside from some large manufactories, &c., should be of a race homogeneous with ourselves or our general ideas?—A. Certainly.

Q. Something was said to you about driving out the Chinese. Have you been testifying under the idea that the proposition is to expel by violence or any other method the Chinese who are now here?—A. Certainly.

Q. Then I should like to correct that impression in your mind.—A. I virtually think to-day if those people were driven out, the State would be more than half bankrupt.

Q. Suppose instead of driving them out we allow those to remain who are here (perhaps under the faith of treaties, or of custom, or of the policy of our laws as they exist up to the present time) and employ them, the question is whether there should be an unlimited influx of them?—A. I really do not believe they have materially gained in numbers within the last six years. I think as many go back dead and alive as there are coming.

Q. You are mistaken about that; suppose that their number is really rapidly increasing, and is liable to a very large increase, so that they will largely outnumber the whites after a while, what do you think the effect of that would be upon our race?—A. The effect might not be so favorable as it would be to have so many white people and Europeans among us.

Q. Have you noticed the growth of the Chinese quarter?—A. I have not been in Chinese quarters.

Q. I mean the extension of its boundaries. Are you not aware that during the last six years it has extended over additional blocks?—A. That is one great mistake that our city government has committed, and still persist in carrying out, in allowing those people to remain in the very heart of the city; if they were put in a district by themselves, separate from the white people, there would be no danger at all, and we would be away from all the immoral influences.

Q. Are you aware of any legal process by which, if a man buys a house and owns it, he can be prevented from living in it?—A. Not at all.

Q. How can the city government make such laws?—A. I think we might have laws to prevent anything detrimental to the morals or health of the community.

Q. Do you consider the Chinese quarters as coming under that category?—A. I mean to say that there may be a disturbing element in our midst so long as the people think, as the fire-marshal (Mr. Durkee) stated, that they had every element within themselves of causing fires and not being prudent and careful in the use of fire.

Q. These things unquestionably could be reached by ordinances, but how are you going to prevent the Chinese from occupying the Chinese quarters if they rent the buildings or own them?—A. I do not think you can.

Q. Then that is not a mistake of the municipal authorities?—A. I believe there is a law that prevents landlords from renting their houses to tenants that carry on prostitution, or do immoral acts of any kind; the same thing would be applicable.

Q. You were thinking there was no increase of Chinese, and I asked you if you had not noticed that the boundaries of the Chinese quarter had extended over additional blocks within the last six years?—A. That may be true, and still the Chinese may not increase; they may come from without and settle within, and spread out in that way.

Q. Have you visited the different towns of the State?—A. I have been all over the State.

Q. Lately?—A. I have traveled a good deal lately.

Q. In Sacramento, San José, Nevada City, Auburn, and other cities, have you noticed any diminution of Chinese?—A. I have not.

Q. Then they must come from some other source?—A. If a Chinaman finds he cannot do as well here as in Sacramento, he will go to Sacramento.

Q. Did you notice, about six months ago, when it was rather a source of surprise, that the number of Chinese arriving by vessels was largely increasing?—A. There was at that time, probably, quite a number of vessels that came in.

Q. As, for instance, in 1871 the number put down was 5,540; in 1872, 9,770; in 1873, 17,075; in 1874, 16,085; in 1875, 18,021. This year they have fallen off, I suppose, on account of so much attention being drawn to the subject. Would not that imply an increase during the last six years, when the amounts before run from 3,329 in 1855; in 1856, 4,807; in 1857, 5,924; in 1858, 5,427; in 1859, 3,175; in 1860, 7,341; and in 1866 getting down to 2,000? Do not those figures imply an increase in the immigration of Chinese?—A. I do not know what the average of that would be.

Q. The average of this, footed up, as I make it, is 8,500; whereas during the last four years that average has been doubled.—A. Very well.

Q. Then perhaps you are mistaken in supposing that so many of

them have not arrived?—A. It is possible the immigration might have doubled; but you do not make any allowance for those that have returned and die in the mean time.

Q. O, yes; I do not exclude that consideration at all; but if the immigration has doubled during the last five or six years, may it not double again during the next five or six years, and so on indefinitely?—A. I do not believe myself it would do any very great harm if it did double.

Q. Suppose it quadrupled?—A. I do not know then that there would be very much harm done.

Q. Suppose the Chinese quarter of this city should quadruple, do you think that would do any harm?—A. I suppose that would occur in proportion to the number of people in the city.

Q. Suppose that, instead of being bounded by Portsmouth Square, they come down Montgomery and through on California street, and occupied four times the space they now occupy, then do you think it would be an improvement to our interests or do us any harm?—A. It would depend on what ordinances the city should pass as to how they should put up and occupy those buildings.

Q. Do you think it would depend upon that?—A. They have a right to do those things.

Q. Do you think that the displacing of the white population which now occupies Montgomery, California, and all the surrounding streets, by Chinese, would not do any harm, even if they were more careful about fire?—A. I do not say that at all.

Q. You say you cannot see that the increase of the Chinese, or the quadrupling of them, would do any harm; I ask you about quadrupling the number of Chinese that there are in the Chinese quarter?—A. I think as the Chinese increase the white population increases also. With us we have a hundred white families, and we have 300 Chinese at work. At the last census we found among our people 108 families, and they average five and a half to a family. There were five or six hundred white people who were getting a living from the fact of our being able to employ so many Chinese as we were doing at that time. We could not carry on our business without the Chinese.

Q. Suppose we step outside of the manufacture of woolens and take cigars. Where is the advantage to the white labor, where the whole business is in the hands of the Chinese?—A. That is another thing. I confine myself to facts—to just what I know.

Q. It has been testified here that there are thousands of Chinese engaged in cigar-making, and that the whites are excluded from that business. Do you think the rule would hold good where they exclude all the whites? Suppose in such business as cigar and boot and shoe making, &c., that the number of Chinese should be quadrupled, where would it leave the whites? Would they apply to your mill, and could you employ them?—A. If I could get none others, better skilled, perhaps I would be obliged to employ them.

Q. Are the Chinese large consumers of the goods you manufacture?—A. They are.

Q. What line of goods?—A. They buy blankets and underclothing, as well as shirts and drawers, and things of that kind.

Q. Then you have a double interest in having the Chinese here?—A. No; I have the same interest that all business men have.

Q. You have the interest that you can keep down any protests on the part of white labor, in the way of this check you speak of, and you can get the labor of the Chinese cheaper than white men will work for,

and you have a running-account among the Chinese, for the Chinese take your goods?—A. I beg pardon; you do not understand me at all.

Q. Explain yourself.—A. I explain myself by stating to you, in the first place, that I never wanted a Chinaman where a white man should have the place; but we had the Chinamen long ago, and have them still. They have been a preventive against strikes, always, with us. We have had two or three strikes and we found we were obliged to employ Chinamen in place of those who did strike. The result has been that we have been able to go on carefully and fulfill contracts and meet engagements by employing these people, and employing white help when they come and conduct themselves properly, as they should do; but when they engage to work for so much per day, and kick against and strike against it, we have then a right to take just such measures as will best serve our interests.

Q. Do you employ white men in the same business in your mill that the Chinamen are engaged in? What are the Chinamen generally engaged in—tending looms?—A. Tending looms, and assorting, and doing the light work.

Q. Do you employ white men in tending looms and assorting wool?—A. No, sir; no white men at all; the white men are overseers of the looms.

Q. You do not employ three hundred white men in that capacity?—A. No; we employ the white help in the hosiery and knitting department, making shirts and stockings, &c.

Q. Cannot the Chinese do those things?—A. Yes, sir; but we prefer to employ the white people.

Q. Can the white help do the things that the Chinese do?—A. Not so well; we cannot get the white girls to do it. The work, in the first place, is too heavy for them; in the next place, it takes so long to teach them; and, in the third place, there are very few that you can teach.

Q. Those branches are carried on by the white girls in the East, are they not?—A. Yes, sir; but there are more white girls in the East than there are here.

Q. Do you think they are unteachable here?—A. No, sir; but they have not got the same aptness that the Chinaman has. Another thing, it takes them a long time to learn; and the experiment is too costly in a country like this to teach them.

Q. After all, does it not amount to this, that you find it to your interest to employ Chinamen, and, therefore, your mind suggests excuses for that employment, and leads you to depreciate white labor in comparison with it?—A. No, sir.

Q. If the white girls in the East are teachable, why should not the same class be teachable here?—A. We have quite a number of white girls who come here from the East already taught; we employ those in preference to Chinamen, when they turn up, but they do not often present themselves.

Q. You do not want to teach the girls here; you do not want to take the trouble?—A. We do want to teach them, but, in the first place, we cannot afford to do it.

Q. And the girls go untaught?—A. They go untaught.

Q. But you would have to teach them if the Chinamen were not here?—A. Very likely.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. When you started here originally with your enterprise, you started with Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who taught them? Did they bring their skill from China?—A. We taught them ourselves.

Q. Who is "we?"—A. The foreman of the department and myself.

Q. And you had to induct them all into the business—they were raw hands?—A. They were raw hands.

Q. So that really you educated the Chinese to fill these places of employment?—A. Yes; there were none others here.

Q. In the earlier part of your testimony you spoke about the division of lands in large estates into smaller farms, and your view was if there were no Chinamen here there would be more families here, and the farms would be cut up.—A. No, sir; I said if those tracts of land were not held in such large quantities or numbers of acres, they would be cut up. For instance, take a farm of a thousand acres and cut it up into five farms of two hundred acres each. Each two hundred acres would have a household upon it, and there would be a man, his wife, and his children to conduct that farm. In 10,000 farms there would be, say, 500 families, which would make a large community.

Q. And that would have a tendency to make them cultivate their lands without Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has not Chinese labor had a tendency to retain these tracts in their entirety?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. Independent of the profit that is made on the various industries, and looking to these people in reference to their social and moral habits and civilization, their aptitude as citizens and all that sort of thing, which do you think the most desirable as the ultimate population of California, Chinese or Europeans?—A. I have not thought about it at all. You know very readily my feelings and wishes. I think the European or the New England or western man is preferred to the Chinaman.

Q. It would be a more desirable element of immigration?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why so?—A. Because they more readily assimilate with our ways of living, our ways of thinking, and with our religious views, and in all our moral aspects they are like we are.

Q. Then if I get your idea correctly, you would regard the use of Chinese cheap labor as a temporary expedient to bridge over the present difficulty?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And ultimately it would be desirable, if I follow your logic, to restrict the immigration, except as it exists, so far as we can do so?—A. That is my wish. I stated most emphatically, and I wish you to understand it, that it is not my wish at all to see a Chinaman where a white man should be; but there are situations that you cannot get white people to fill, or they will not fill them. The consequence is, as the business of the country must go on, you must employ such labor as you can get or whatever is most available.

Q. That difficulty arises from our isolated position, our distance from industrial centers, does it not?—A. In a measure it does.

Q. In other words, we are pretty near China and we are not very near a working population to be produced from Europe or the East?—A. Yes, sir; but my impression is if there were more Chinamen here there would be more white people.

Q. You think it would give a larger field of employment?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is there much cotton raised in California?—A. There is not so much this year as in former years.

Q. Why is that?—A. It has not been so remunerative as they expected; and another thing, they do not have the available labor, there were not so many Chinamen to work in these cotton-fields.

Q. Is the cotton raised here as good as the eastern cotton?—A. It is better and stronger cotton, but coarser.

Q. Do you use much California cotton in your mill?—A. We use all we can get. We get about eighty thousand pounds a year now; but there was not that much raised this year.

Q. Does it make a stronger fabric?—A. Yes, sir; it is a stronger fabric.

Q. Can you afford to pay more for it?—A. We have paid the same price for it in gold that we would pay for a similar style of eastern cotton in currency.

Q. It is profitable for you to pay that on account of the superiority of the goods?—A. Yes, sir; it assimilates much more readily with wool than a finer cotton. Probably before two years there will be an immense cotton-mill in this city, which will probably employ from twelve to fifteen hundred or two thousand people of this city.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you think you can raise cotton in California by free white labor?—A. No, sir; I do not believe we can. I do not believe we can raise fruit in California with free white labor. If you were going to narrow the thing down to limits of that kind you would find that none could eat fruit but the rich; the poor man could not afford to buy it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not observe in going through the interior of the State, the mountain regions, &c., that thousands of tons of fruit are rotting on the ground?—A. That is very true; but if they would employ enough Chinese labor they could collect all that fruit and dry it and prepare it for market.

Q. I think in the interior counties they do not use Chinese labor for that purpose?—A. I think they do.

Senator SARGENT. There are thousands of baskets shipped to our eastern cities that Chinamen never touch.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you regard this State as adapted to the production of cotton?—A. Yes, sir; cotton can be raised here very well.

Q. What is the reason it is not raised in large quantities?—A. Because the price of labor is too high.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have they the improved machinery for picking cotton here that they have in the Southern States?—A. Yes, sir; every improved and approved implement and machine.

Q. Does it require much labor to raise cotton?—A. No, sir; not as much as to raise corn.

Q. Does the mere labor element enter into it so largely?—A. I do not know. The picking of it is a good deal.

Q. Is not that done by machinery?—A. No; picking in the field is not done by machinery. It is picked by a gin; that is, by a picker. It separates the staple from the sheaf.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You say you can raise cotton here cheaper than corn?—A. I do not say so.

Q. Do you say it is done with less labor?—A. It does not take any more labor to raise cotton than to raise corn, except the picking and gathering.

Q. Then I am astonished that you do not raise it.—A. We can raise it here; we can raise it as high up as Merced, up to the foot-hills.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. There is not much demand for it at present?—A. O, yes; I could use more than half a million pounds if I could get it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long has it been since your mills were established?—A. They have been established seventeen years.

Q. What is the extent of the capital employed?—A. About a million dollars. We started with about four hundred and twenty thousand dollars.

Q. What dividends do you pay?—A. I cannot tell you.

HENRY C. BEALS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are connected with the Commercial Herald of this city?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. For how long?—A. From its beginning.

Q. You are familiar with the commercial business of this coast?—A. I have been for the last twenty-six years or more.

Q. (Producing newspapers.) These are copies of your paper, the Commercial Herald?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Anything that you wish to refer to there in reference to the commerce of this country and China, and the Chinese question, the commission will hear.—A. When I was spoken to a week or two ago about appearing before the committee, I was informed that I would be posted in regard to the questions that would be propounded to me in time to get the statistics. I do not carry statistics in my head. I would have been very glad to have furnished everything that was desired in regard to the commerce of the port, the statistics of the imports, the arrivals and departures, but the questions were not given me. I received the summons to come here yesterday, which was the first intimation I had. No questions were furnished me, but knowing the object of this commission I picked out these papers, (producing,) selecting from the files of the paper for the last year a series of editorial articles which we published bearing particularly upon the Chinese question. In these half-dozen copies or so that I have here I have marked such editorial articles on that subject as bear particularly upon the matter before you. I do not propose to read them, but as they are points that are vital to the subject, as I judge from having listened to the testimony to-day, and as they cover the ground very closely, I brought them up and thought possibly the gentlemen of the commission would like to ask me any questions in regard to them. (See Appendix .O)

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are these articles written by yourself?—A. I would not say that they are written by myself, but being the editor of the paper, I indorse them and know the truth of everything therein contained. In regard to the commerce of the port, in regard to the manufacture of boots and shoes, or cigars, or cordage, or other things that have been tried here, I am familiar, and also with the commerce, the ways and means of doing business upon 'change, the merchants, &c., and I would be glad to answer any questions.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I will ask you, then, in reference to cordage, what condition is that industry in in this State, and the amount of the manufacture?—A. I could not give you exactly the amount of the manufacture. Yes, I can, too, by referring to the papers which I have in my pocket. In regard to that, I would say that about a year ago, at the invitation of Mr. Tubbs, who was the president and leading holder of the San Francisco cordage-factory, I went out there and visited the establishment with him. I went all through it and saw the working of the establishment. I am also familiar with it in other ways. About a week or so ago I met Mr. Hiram Tubbs on California street and spoke to him in regard to the cordage-factory, and asked him if he did not feel disposed to come before the commission and give some evidence. He said he would be glad to come if he was summoned. He took occasion then to tell me what I knew before, that they employ exclusively Chinese labor there. This was only a fortnight ago. He told me it was utterly impossible for him to manufacture cordage without Chinese labor; that they had tried white labor and were convinced that the employment of white people to manufacture cordage was a matter entirely beyond their control. Heretofore, until the establishment of this cordage-factory, we imported all of our cordage almost entirely from New Bedford. Since the establishment of this factory, owing to the encouragement they had, there has been another establishment started across the bay at Alameda, which also manufactures cordage, and they also employ Chinese labor. The result has been that now almost the entire amount of cordage that is used here is manufactured by ourselves. The eastern men, the New Bedford company, endeavored to compete with us for a time, and the result was that our people here consigned cordage to New York; but they finally buried the hatchet and made an agreement between our cordage-factories here and those of New Bedford, Mass., that they would not trespass upon each other's limits, and that the California establishments should have the Pacific slope as their field of operations and the New Bedford or eastern manufacturers should come only so far, perhaps to the Rocky Mountains. The result is now that we manufacture nearly all the cordage that we have on the Pacific slope.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Could they compete with New York?—A. No.

Q. They sent it there and sold it at a loss?—A. They sent it there and bucked against them, as they say.

Q. So as to get the monopoly here?—A. We do receive a little cordage from Manila, but not much. Of course, we import the hemp in a raw state and manufacture here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Both of these factories employ Chinese?—A. As to the one at Potrero I am not so sure, but I am quite confident the other one does. You asked me the quantity of cordage made here last year. I think I have it here.

Q. Have you the imports for a year or two past?—A. The imports are here for a series of years, but the increased consumption would probably explain it. The imports are here for five years past.

Q. Read them, please.—A. The imports of cordage in 1871 were 12,741 coils, 1,930 packages; in 1872, 11,337 coils and 2,535 packages; in 1873, 7,370 coils and 1,766 packages; in 1874, 5,288 coils and 485 packages; in 1875, 7,238 coils and 874 packages; which show a very

large falling off. I think I have here in pounds the amount that each factory made here last year. The Pacific Cordage Factory report an outturn for 1875 of 2,500,000 pounds of manufactured cordage in their works in Alameda; that is across the bay. The San Francisco Cordage Company, of which Tubbs & Co. are the agents and manufacturers, I believe, on recollection, have refused to furnish me the amount they made this year, but they gave me the price, and I have some remarks in regard to it. The consumption of cordage on this coast approximates six million and a half pounds per annum. Now, nearly all of that six million and a half pounds is manufactured here from Manila hemp imported here in a rough state, mostly sent from Manila to Hong-Kong and brought from there in the steamers.

Q. How as to boots and shoes?—A. Formerly boots and shoes were brought here entirely and exclusively from Philadelphia and Massachusetts. Of course they came from New York, more or less; but since the establishment of Chinese factories here the quantity brought from there has diminished very materially. It was not until the establishment of these Chinese boot and shoe factories that other people were drawn into the business. My impression is that of late a good many of the Chinese have been compelled to give up the manufacture of boots and shoes on account of eastern or white labor forcing them out of it, perhaps. The total importations, &c., it would be difficult to give, because the size of packages, &c., is very conflicting, and there is no way and manner of obtaining the number of dozens that are in a case.

Q. How is it as to the commerce of this port?—A. There is one matter that I wish to speak of, and that is cigars.

Q. I was going to ask you afterward. Is the exportation of flour a growing trade between this port and China at present?—A. Yes, sir; the Chinese are very large buyers of flour; perhaps they are buying more flour here in this city than any other commodity. They handle a great deal of ginseng, which is produced, however, in Ohio. There is very little of that article sold here. There is a great deal of it that is sent over, but the market is not made for it. It is a very valuable commodity, but we do not raise it here.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Can we not raise that article?—A. It is a question whether we can raise ginseng here or not. I was asked about flour. In 1875 we exported 445,143 barrels of flour, and of this China took 145,555 barrels, a little over one-third.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you any data for this year?—A. I have not got any data with me for this year, but it would be probably a larger quantity; it has increased.

Q. The trade is increasing?—A. It is steadily increasing.

Q. How is it as to cigars?—A. Within a few years the trade in cigars has entirely changed. I could not tell the date, but within the last eight years the business has changed very greatly. Up to that time most of the cigars which were used here on this coast were either imported from Havana or Manila, or what we call American cigars, coming from New York; but now probably two-thirds of all the cigars that are consumed on this coast are made in this city. We not only use California tobacco, raised below here, but we receive from the East an immense quantity of Connecticut and Kentucky seed-leaf tobacco, which is sent here in hogheads and old dry-goods boxes. It is bought up to a

very great extent by the Chinese, and made into cigars to the extent of millions of dollars a year. I do not smoke myself, but I have no doubt that two-thirds of all the cigars consumed in this city are made here. They use some Havana tobacco, but comparatively little. There is an establishment down here on Washington street, opposite the post-office, where they use some very high-cost Russian or Turkish tobacco, I may say, but they are close-mouthed there; they will not give the information or even state the value per pound of that tobacco, yet they consume considerable. Most of the cigars made here are from Connecticut leaf-tobacco. We use some Ohio and some Kentucky tobacco, but it is mostly Connecticut leaf-tobacco that we use.

Q. Our commerce with China bids fair to make huge proportions?—A. Yes, sir; it is increasing every day, and very rapidly. The China steamers go out twice a month. Mr. Williams, the agent of the Pacific Mail Company, told me the other day that every steamer went out crowded to overflowing with goods and merchandise; that they were obliged to limit one side. The Chinese buy and handle more quicksilver, probably, than any other class of people here; they handle immense quantities. Hong-Kong is our great market for quicksilver.

Q. It would be bad policy, then, in your commercial knowledge, to abrogate treaties, or any portion of treaties, which would tend to retard and cut off this trade?—A. Yes, sir; it would be irreparable. I do not think it would be otherwise than a great injury to the vast commerce of this port. The amount of business we do with Hong-Kong and Chinese ports here is in vast proportions. We have a score or more of Chinese merchants who themselves do a vast amount of trading and buying and selling of our own products, such as flour and wheat. Recently they have increased their demand, and are drawing very heavily on our local mills here for barley—early barley—and it is getting to be a trade of very considerable importance. The assortment of goods they take from us is very steadily and rapidly increasing.

Q. And in variety also?—A. In variety; yes, sir.

Q. You meet these merchants on 'change daily?—A. Yes, sir; there are, on an average, twenty Chinese merchants on 'change every day.

Q. What is their deportment there?—A. They are very gentlemanly in all their intercourse with white people; none more so. They are treated with the same respect and attention as any other merchant visiting the exchange, and they are by many courted very extensively. So far as their credit is concerned, it is unsurpassed by any mercantile houses in the city. Their credit is A 1.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Assuming the number of arrivals of Chinese over departures to be 125,000 during the period from 1852 to 1876, what number do you think should be deducted from that amount for deaths?—A. That I could not say. I never looked at that matter. My own impression in regard to the arrival and departure of Chinese immigration here is, that there is an ebb and flow of the tide. Every spring, immediately after the China new year, they come here in great numbers. The steamers bring five hundred or a thousand, or as many as the law will permit; but toward the close of summer-time, as now, just before their new year, they go back. The steamer that sailed the other day carried six hundred. The ebb and flow of Chinese is periodical. I do not think, from my own knowledge, there has been any very visible increase of the population here. In the city proper, probably, there has been, for the reason that the railroads do not employ as many Chinamen at present. Conse-

quently they have come down here to the city; and if they do not find work, they will go off on the first steamer. The steamers have not, in all cases, been able to carry all the passengers that were offered. In some instances, sailing-vessels have been put up, which carried them away at a very low price. Some indigent persons being willing to go at the time this persecution came up, Macondray & Co. took a vessel and put the price down to about half the rate, in order to accommodate those who wished to return to their country. They took away several hundred. Two vessels, I believe, went off in that way.

Q. The extent of the quarter occupied by the Chinese residents has been spoken of. How does that compare with the increase of the portion occupied by other people?—A. I do not think it increases in the same proportion by any manner of means. The city is extending with wonderful rapidity, and covers an immense area of ground. Those who are not in the habit of going on the hills and looking around can form no idea of the extent and the growth of the city.

Q. Its ratio of increase has not exceeded the ratio of increase of the city?—A. Not by any means has it been as great.

Q. Since the Chinese began to settle there has there been any change in the center of the business of the city?—A. No, sir; I do not think there has.

Q. What portion of the city was the center in early times here, from 1846 to 1850?—A. It has always been within a stone's throw of Portsmouth square, east.

Q. Where is the center of business now?—A. I should say on California street three or four blocks, circulating from California street around, extending from the post-office up. It is rather coming this way all the time.

Q. Rather extending southward?—A. Yes, sir; Market street is, perhaps, the extreme southern boundary.

Q. Has business extended toward the north during the last ten or fifteen years?—A. No; business has not extended north. There are very many reasons for that. The harbor, the wharves are extending south, and of course business follows that. Another great reason for it is the depot of the Central Pacific Railroad. Everything that comes here now, all the freight, is landed down in the extreme southern part of the city, and the houses rather go that way, because everything has to be carted backwards and forth. All the products that come here from the East have to be carted across the town twice.

Q. How far is the new city hall from the Chinese quarter?—A. About a mile, I should say.

Q. What do you say of Chinese industry in connection with fruit-culture and wine-culture?—A. Of my own personal knowledge I could not say anything; but from my intercourse with fruit-merchants and others they inform me that they could not get along without the Chinese; that they employ them mostly to pick their berries. They handle them more carefully than white people, I am informed.

Q. Was there at one time a great deal of fruit which went to waste?—A. There is now.

Q. Has it changed in any respect?—A. The quantity of fruit grown here is immense, and at times the waste is very considerable; but then I think there has been less fruit wasted than ever before; because we have a great many drying-machines and labor-saving machines, and among others I class Chinese as one of the labor-saving machines of this country. They utilize Chinese in drying fruit.

Q. They are employed in this business?—A. They are to a great extent.

Q. What, in your opinion, is the influence of Chinese labor upon the financial interests of California?—A. It has been good.

Q. What influence, if any, has it it had upon the moral condition?—A. There is a certain class of Chinese, that is the female portion, which is objectionable. That I think could be controlled entirely by the laws of the city here, if they were enforced the same as against any foreign female prostitutes that come here. The same laws that apply to one ought to be applied to the other. We should not abstain from making complaint of one and complain of the other as is the case now, and has been for years past.

Q. Which class of prostitutes do you consider the most detrimental to the morals of the city?—A. I should say the French, from what I hear; they are very bold.

Q. Which has the most detrimental influence upon the female population?—A. I cannot speak from my own knowledge, but from what I have heard persons say. I never go to such places, but I have seen of course in passing through the streets the operation of all this kind of thing. I should say that those they call French, and I presume they are French, are more bold; but the Chinese girls or women, whatever you please to call them, I think have had a bad influence upon boys, what we call hoodlums, the lower class of boys, a greater influence than probably any other class of prostitutes.

Q. Do they have any influence upon white girls?—A. I do not think they have the slightest.

Q. Where do you meet with these white prostitutes?—A. They can be seen through Waverly Place and Dupont street, more particularly the French.

Q. I do not mean where they reside, but where do you meet them?—A. I do not meet them anywhere. I stay at home of evenings.

Q. Do you not see them on Kearny street?—A. I do not go on that street; I live out of town.

Q. What is the condition of the Chinese?—A. Leaving out the women here, I should say good.

Q. What is their character as laborers?—A. Good; first rate.

Q. How does their employment affect white labor?—A. In regard to household servants I will give you my experience in a few words: When I left New York in the spring of 1850 I had employed a nurse girl who had lived with me ten years, and I paid her $6 a month. After being out here two months or so, I sent for my family and this nurse girl came out here. I paid her passage, you might say twice over to get her here. She was not exactly shipwrecked, but I had to pay her passage twice over, and I agreed to pay her $50 a month after she arrived here. I continued to pay her $50 a month for several years. To-day a servant-girl in that capacity receives from $20 to $25 a month wages. At that time, in 1850, I paid a cook in New York $10 a month. Like service here would cost $30 a month now. That is the regular wages of white cook-girls. Chamber-maids, or what they call second girls here, generally get about $25 a month.

Q. For how many years past have those rates continued?—A. For some years past, six or eight years. I will say that since the agitation of this Chinese question here within the last six months it has been a very difficult matter for any one to hire white help, more so than it ever was before. What the actual cause or reason of it is, I do not know; but my own impression is that if it were not for the Chinese boys, as they

are called, the Chinese servants that we have in our houses, instead of paying an Irish woman, a good cook, &c., $25 and $30, we would have to pay what we did when I first came here, from $40 to $50 a month. I speak now of my own knowledge. A good Chinese servant will do twice the work of any white servant woman you can have here. He will do house work better in every way and do a great deal more. So far as my observation goes, Chinese servants here are not high servants. They do not work by the hour, eight hours a day, but they work at all times, and are willing. That is my experience. I have a Chinaman in mind now who was employed two years in my daughter's family, until very recently, and he did the work of two servants. I consider that he is worth his weight in gold as a servant.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is his weight?—A. About a hundred pounds.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know whether any American-born girls are acting in the capacity of house-servants?—A. I do not think that an American-born girl would work out in California for any wages.

Q. Do you see a good many Chinese boys doing all the work of a family?—A. Yes, sir; I think our friend Pixley employs them.

Q. Do you think good white girls who will do the whole work of a family are to be found?—A. No; it is impossible to get them, American-born girls, be they of Irish parentage or otherwise, as a general thing, will not go out to service. Two weeks ago I was in Crosett's establishment on Clay street waiting to employ a servant, and while sitting there two persons came in and wished servant-girls to go into the country. Crosett replied, "There is no use to say anything to any of them"—there were thirty or forty in the room—"you cannot hire a white girl to go into the country."

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean by the country?—A. I mean the interior.

Q. Do you mean to say that there are not a great many good white girls in the interior?—A. I only tell you the reply Crosett made to those two gentlemen. He said, "It is no use; you cannot hire a servant-girl to go into the country and work."

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you traveled about the State?—A. I have.

Q. Did you ever see a white servant-girl in any isolated farm-house away from town?—A. I never have.

Q. By the interior you mean away from villages, where there are churches?—A. This party wanted servants to go to Chicot, which is quite a large town; but they would not go there. Of course they will go to Sacramento and Stockton, and some of the interior cities, but outside of any large place you cannot induce them to go; their faces are set against it. That is an admitted fact, I believe.

Q. What effect has the immigration of Chinese upon the white laboring class here?—A. I do not think it has had any material effect upon them. Of course the Chinese are hated by many of the white people. They are abused in a variety of ways, and they are, you might say, trampled upon; but I do not believe it interferes materially with all honest labor. That is, we have a great many idle people here in San Francisco, who have been brought up as masons, carpenters, and all that sort of thing, who much prefer to go on California street, and

buy stocks, &c., than to do an honest day's labor. If these two hundred or five hundred men who flood California street all the time would go into the labor ranks we would not be under the necessity of employing so many Chinese; but they are loud-mouthed politicians, and they go there to spend the day operating in stocks, making or losing a few dollars, and prefer that rather than to go to work, in order to make an honest living.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. As the result of all this, do I understand you to prefer the immigration of Chinese to that of eastern people or Europeans?—A. I do not.

Q. If you could have your way would you have this country settled with white people, or Asiatics?—A. I would have it settled with white people, most assuredly.

Q. Why?—A. They assimilate more to our ways of doing business. It is more pleasant to associate with a white person than with the Chinese, a person who in education and everything is entirely different from us.

Q. Is our race more desirable to have?—A. I prefer a white person.

Q. How is it about our civilization as compared with theirs generally?—A. I prefer our Government to that of any other. I think American people are superior to any other class of people in the world.

Q. Do you know whether or not in New England they employ American white girls for servants?—A. I presume they do.

Q. Do they not employ white servant-girls in all the Northern States?—A. No, I think they are mostly foreigners.

Q. White?—A. Yes, I think they do employ white.

Q. In going to New York from San Francisco, do you not find white girls employed at hotels after you leave Ogden?—A. I came over in 1850, and I have never been east since, and cannot state in regard to that.

Q. As there are no Chinese in New England and the East, they have white servants and good servants, do they not?—A. I believe so.

Q. If there were not Chinese in California, is it not fair to suppose that we would be able to get white servants here?—A. It costs a good deal of money for that class of people to come here, and unless money is sent to them or loaned to them, they will not come. It is a great distance from their home. Undoubtedly there are a great many Germans, Irish, and other nationalities, who come to New York by hundreds. Every ship that comes brings them, and they bring them across the Atlantic for $10. To come to California costs $100. In the case I refer to, it cost me nearly $500 to pay the passage of this nurse-girl.

Q. Do you not think one of the causes why American and white girls will not take employment, is because of the presence of the Chinese here?—A. No, sir; I think American or white girls as a whole are above the business of going out. They prefer to be educated. They all want to be ladies; they want to be considered as such.

Q. I say the American people as a whole. Direct your remarks to New England and to the Northwest.—A. Yes, sir; I spoke of the whole.

Q. You say that American women will not work?—A. I say they do not like to go out to work. They do not like to be called servants.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are they not servants in New England and the Northwest?—A. I was going to remark that Judge Hastings, in his testimony this after-

noon, spoke about Iowa and some of the great Western States, where they treated women-servants as one of the family. They do so in Indiana and Iowa. If they have a bright servant-girl they allow her to go to the table and sit down with the family; but you do not see that here in California; the servant eats her meals in the kitchen or anywhere else.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Have you any views as to whether we should encourage an unlimited immigration of Chinese to this country, or whether it would be wise to restrict them by proper legislation?—A. I have no fear that we will be ever overrun by Chinese in this country. They are very acute, very smart people, and these agents of the companies that have been spoken of here watch the labor-barometer very closely. If they think we have a supply of labor they telegraph to Hong-Kong to their people right off; and if the Central Pacific Railroad Company, or any other company, is employing a great many hands, and wants three hundred or five hundred more and they are not here, they telegraph and they are sent immediately; and if we have a surplus here they are sent over.

Q. If there was likely to be a surplus or a possibility of their coming in great numbers, you think it best to limit them by restricting immigration?—A. I do not see any necessity for limiting the number.

Q. If I understand your argument or apology for Chinese immigration, it is that they contribute to the comfort and convenience of the people and the advancement of the material interests of the country?—A. There is no question about it.

Q. Upon the other question of civilization—the welfare of the country and the general social and moral condition of our people—you should like to have the whites take their places?—A. I would.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 14, 1876.

JACOB B. SHERK sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Where do you reside?—A. In Alameda County.

Q. What is your business?—A. Hop-raising is my principal business.

Q. Will you make a statement in regard to that business to the commission, as to how you have progressed with it; how many acres have you in hops?—A. We have fifty acres in hops.

Q. What kind of labor do you use?—A. Chinese labor.

Q. Do you raise your hops for this market alone?—A. We sell our hops here in this market. Of course we are not able to ship our hops, but they are shipped to all parts of the world. Our first car-load this year was shipped to Frankfort, Germany.

Q. Alameda hops, which you raised?—A. Yes, sir. Last year some of our hops were shipped to England and some to Australia. Last year we had a very good crop, something over 70,000 pounds. This year our crop was short, but nevertheless we employed about from 140 to 180 Chinamen. We have had as high as 200 picking at a time. We have leased our ground for four years more, but if I thought that they were going to drive the Chinamen out of the country we would not have any use for it. I pay $20 an acre rent, and if the Chinamen were to be taken away I do not think I could raise hops there at all.

Q. It is quite recently that we have raised sufficient hops to supply our own local demand, is it not?—A. Yes, it is not many years. Of course there has been one trouble about the business. The eastern hops have taken the lead here always. No longer than a few days ago I sold some hops to a brewer who stated then that he had been in the habit of using two-thirds eastern hops, but he wanted to try ours, as his brother was using our California hops altogether and thinks he can make as good beer from them as he could with the eastern hops. Of course, as long as they use the eastern hops and think they cannot make beer without them, that brings eastern hops here; but nevertheless in the East our hops have a better demand than theirs; they are always quoted higher in the papers than the eastern hops. So far as trying to raise hops with the white labor here, I think it is impossible at the present time.

Q. And compete with the eastern market?—A. And compete with the eastern market. I see by the papers that it is claimed before this commission that the money which Chinamen earn all goes to China. My principal business is hop-raising. If my hops go to Germany the money comes here and I live out of it. That part of it the Chinamen do not take to China; that is very evident.

Q. Does it retain that amount of capital here in exchange for the hops?—A. It retains that amount of capital here. A great many claim, of course, that I might raise hops with white labor, but I am positive that I could not, and that if it were not for Chinese labor I would have to quit my business.

Q. What is the sentiment of your neighbors, all classes, foreign and American, about you, in reference to this question of Chinese labor?—A. Of course I hear people talk against the Chinamen; that they do this and that; that they steal and do all such things, but the majority of people there, I think, are in favor of Chinamen. I should judge so from appearances. All their grain is bound by Chinamen. Even the Portuguese farmers that we have there have their grain all bound by Chinamen. I have seen but very few other people in the field binding grain. The nearest neighbor I have is a Portuguese. His corn is harvested by Chinamen; and he told me himself that his own people were very anxious to get the work; but, he says, "I know just how it is; corn is cheap. I cannot make much, if I can make anything, out of my crop. These people tell me they will work for the same money that the Chinamen work. I know if I hire them they will growl and complain that they cannot make anything, and I will have trouble. If I get the Chinamen they will do it for a stated price, whether they make anything or not, and I will have no further trouble."

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What county do you live in?—A. Alameda County.

Q. That is the county Oakland is in?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many acres do you cultivate in hops?—A. Fifty acres. At the present time I have fifty one acres. I expect to put in some more this winter.

Q. Do you rent the land?—A. The fifty acres we rent. I have bought a place.

Q. How much rent do you pay per acre?—A. Twenty dollars an acre. We have fifty-eight acres, and we pay $1,160 a year rent in gold.

Q. How many hands do you employ?—A. In picking time we employ from 140 to 200. We have had as high as 200. This year we had only 180, because our crop was short.

Q. What number do you employ at other seasons of the year?—A. I have five now.

Q. Do you employ Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What wages do you pay them for picking hops?—A. For picking I pay this year $1.20 per hundred pounds.

Q. What do you have to pay white labor?—A. I cannot tell; it would be impossible to get white labor.

Q. Have you any trouble in managing the Chinese?—A. No, sir; none whatever. Suppose that I employed 180 white men as I could pick them up. They are probably not as good in our country as they are in yours. Those who are raising fruit around me would complain considerably, I think. I never hear any complaints about the Chinamen at all; nobody complains of them. If they want a box of apples or fruit they go and buy it; they do not expect to get it otherwise.

Q. When you speak of the fruit-raisers complaining, do you mean that they would be more or less depredated upon?—A. I mean that there would be more or less thieving, if I should employ 180 white men, such as I could pick up at a time. When our work commences it has got to be done in a short time. Suppose I should go and pick them up, I would probably have to have half as many policemen as workmen there to keep them straight. I have been here in California twenty-two years. It is true I have labored all the time myself, which many do not have to do.

Q. What is this land worth that rents for $20 an acre? What does it sell for?—A. That is a question I could scarcely answer, because there is none sold.

Q. Is there no price for such lands in that county?—A. I do not know of any that is selling in fact, at all. I presume some of it, probably, might be bought for about $300 an acre.

Q. How far are you from Oakland?—A. Twenty-two or twenty-three miles.

Q. Is the land around you of the same value generally?—A. Not generally. I am on Alameda Creek. There is a strip of land on Alameda Creek, on both sides, that is as fine land as the world produces. There is no doubt about that. It will produce anything.

Q. There is no large body of such land as you describe?—A. No; there are many creeks, of course, with good land along them.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Whom do you hire these Chinese from?—A. I will tell you. I have a man to work for me who brings all the Chinamen who have picked my hops for the last two years. He hires the men.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is he a Chinaman?—A. Yes, sir; he is a Chinaman. When he hires by the day I pay him a dollar a day. At present they are doing piece-work. I pay them so much per hundred.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You do not hire so many to get the Chinamen?—A. I have five, but this one sees to getting the Chinamen. I tell him how many I want and he gets them.

Q. Are white men here in this country generally thieves, in your opinion?—A. Is that a proper question?

Q. Certainly; you intimated that they are thieves.—A. Were you ever on a farm?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Were you ever a boy?

Q. Yes.—A. Did you ever see an apple that was tempting?

Q. I am not going to be questioned, but I ask you if the white men here generally are thieves?—A. A Yankee generally answers a question by asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

The WITNESS. I have higher aspirations than to claim that any set of people, generally speaking, are thieves.

Q (By Mr. PIPER) You just now said that generally they are thieves.—A. No; I did not; I beg leave to differ with you.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You said if you hired 180 white men they would require half that number of policemen.—A. I meant such men as I could pick up. If I could hire such men as I see before me it would not require so many policemen.

Q. I think the scandal is quite as great upon the ordinary laborers as it is upon the audience in this room, because you do not know of a farm in this State where a policeman has been required.—A. That may be.

Q. Did you hire this land you speak of after it was made into a hop-ground, or was it the naked ground?—A. It was the naked ground.

Q. You pay $20 for a term of years for naked unoccupied ground, upon which you put a hop-yard?—A. We pay $20 per acre per year.

Q. And you began to pay that sum, and made a contract before there were any hops grown upon it?—A. Yes, sir; I was not interested in it at that time.

Q. Did you, or those who took the land, pay that sum for it at that time?—A. We rented the ground at $20 an acre. We have had it six years. The first lease was for six years.

Q. At the beginning of that term were there hop-vines or hop-poles upon the land?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then you mean to say that you pay $20 per acre for land on Alameda Creek per year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where else do they raise hops?—A. They raise hops on Russian River.

Q. Largely, do they not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the value of land on Russian River?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Is it worth $60 an acre?—A. You cannot buy it for $60 an acre.

Q. I own land there, and know it is not so.—A. As you have gone so far, let me make a statement to you. I know positively that there is land on Russian River that you could not buy for $100 an acre. You seem to doubt my paying $20 an acre.

Q. O, no.—A. You intimated as much.

Q. What I am getting at is this: Is it not the high rent you pay rather than the high price of white labor that prevents you from making a profit by white labor?—A. I do not know that that has anything to do with it.

Q. In other words, is it not the demand of the land-owner who exacts from you $20 an acre that renders it impossible for you to make a profit without hiring Chinese?—A. It is a hard question to answer, for the very simple reason that the Chinese have been here all along. We started into this business with the Chinamen here. If they were taken away, would it not be altogether different?

Q. Why would it be different?—A. For the simple reason that I have stated, that you cannot get white labor.

Q. How do you know?—A. The farmers there cannot get it to bind their grain.

Q. That is not what I am talking about. Have you tried to get white labor in your hop-fields?—A. No; we have never tried.

Q. Have you ever offered any inducement for white boys or white girls, or women, to pick hops?—A. No; we have not. I must say that we have not tried it.

Q. Do you know where and how hops are raised in the Eastern States?—A. I have some idea.

Q. Do you know that Central New York is a large hop growing country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what land is worth there?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know what labor is worth there?—A. As near as I can learn, common labor there is from $25 to $30 a month.

Q. What is common labor worth here?—A. The plowmen generally get from $25 to $30 a month.

Q. About the same price?—A. I think so.

Q. Land is about the same price there as here?—A. I do not know about that.

Q. They raise hops in that country without Chinese labor, do they not?—A. They do.

Q. State, if you please, why you cannot raise hops in this country without Chinese labor.—A. Because we cannot get this other help.

Q. Have you tried?—A. No; we have not tried; but then it is very evident. You can see that yourself.

Q. You say the Portuguese hire Chinese in your neighborhood?—A. Yes; they do.

Q. You spoke of a Portuguese who was your neighbor hiring Chinese labor and refusing to hire Portuguese labor, because Portuguese labor was troublesome.—A. That is the statement he made to me.

Q. They would work for the same price?—A. He said that Portuguese offered to gather his corn for the same price, but he said there would be more or less trouble about it, and he did not employ them.

Q. What is your opinion of the character of Portuguese labor in this State generally, as you have observed it?—A. It is about an even thing with the rest of the labor we can get.

Q. Is not the Portuguese among the best of our labor?—A. It is very good labor, I suppose.

Q. It ranks among the best?—A. For such work as they do.

Q. They do all kinds of farming work?—A. They do, I presume.

Q. Then the difference between hiring Portuguese labor and hiring Chinese labor is the ease with which one is managed and the difficulty with which the other is managed?—A. Yes; if you have a certain amount of them. As long as you have one or two, or three or four men, you can get along very well, of course.

Q. How long have you lived on this coast?—A. Some twenty-two or twenty-three years. I landed in San Francisco on the 18th of May, 1854.

Q. You have been here continuously since that time?—A. Yes, sir; but not in San Francisco continuously.

Q. Are you in favor of cheap labor?—A. Yes, sir; I am in favor of cheap labor so long as we have to compete with foreign markets. If we will compete with foreign markets we must have cheap labor. I do not consider Chinese at a dollar a day extraordinarily cheap labor.

Q. If you were a laborer yourself would you be in favor of cheap labor?—A. Yes, sir. Now I will give you a statement of this matter. Eleven or twelve years ago, I am not positive which, I went into a neighborhood where they employed Chinese. The hue and cry then

was the same as you hear it now. I was then what we call in California down to the bed-rock. I had to work; I had a family to support. They told me, "You cannot do anything here, because all the labor is given to Chinamen." Said I, "Never mind; I will hire Chinamen some of these days to work for me." That was the answer I made to their remark.

Q. Now answer my question: If you were a laborer, would you be in favor of cheap labor?—A. I am a laborer. It may be a disgrace, but I have to work. I work every day myself.

Q. If you had a family to support, as a laborer, would you prefer to have cheap wages rather than to have dear wages?—A. It is not the high wages. I do not look at it in that light.

Q. Answer the question, yes or no.—A. There is quite a different construction to be placed upon a question of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness should be allowed to answer in his own way, whatever the answer may be.

The WITNESS. The answer to that question would be this: When wages are high, generally other things are high in proportion. If commodities are low in proportion, it is not to be supposed that you can get very high wages.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) Does cheap labor in this State influence the price of wheat or flour, in your opinion? In other words, is the market-price of flour established in Liverpool or in California?—A. It is established in Liverpool.

Q. Then the price of labor here does not affect the price of flour?—A. Yes; it affects the raising of the flour. When you send your grain to Liverpool you compete with cheap labor there, and consequently you must have cheap labor here if you want to compete with them.

Q. The amount of grain we consume here does not affect the price of wheat in Liverpool?—A. I do not think it does.

Q. Then it does not interfere with the price of flour here to any proportional degree?—A. No; I do not think it does.

Q. How is it with meat?—A. It affects the price of meat, of course, because we do not ship meat to Europe.

Q. How is it with the price of sugar?—A. If that is produced here——

Q. We do not produce it here?—A. What are those sugar-mills for?

Q. They refine it; they do not produce it?—A. The very reason I am paying $20 an acre for land is because there was a sugar-mill put up there.

Q. How is it about the price of rice, coffee—any of the productions which enter into the common ordinary consumption of any family, not affected or governed by the price of labor here?—A. I cannot say as to that.

Q. Which do you regard as the most desirable class of immigration to this State, regarding the future of the State, foreign immigrants, and immigrants from New England and the East; that is, white immigrants or Chinese?—A. I would prefer immigrants from the East, of course.

Q. Why?—A. I would rather pay my money to a white man than pay it to a Chinaman.

Q. Why?—A. Because I like white men better.

Q. Why would you prefer the immigration of the State to be mainly from the East, and of the white race, rather than from China?—A. I claim that the immigrants who come from the Eastern States are more intelligent generally.

Q. They make better citizens?—A. They make better citizens.
Q. A higher civilization?—A. I think so.
Q. They have better morals?—A. I think so.
Q. They come here to make homes?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And develop the country?—A. Yes.
Q. They marry wives and raise children?—A. I think so.
Q. Is that the line of your reflection?—A. Yes, sir.
Q. And in all those respects they are better than Chinese immigrants?—A. I think so.
Q. Then, with the exception of immediate convenience and benefit of Chinese labor, you would prefer whites?—A. I do not think that the Chinese keep away white immigrants from here.
Q. I am speaking now of the future, whether you would prefer the State, for its ultimate future, for its citizenship, not for its material prosperity, to be settled by whites or Chinese?—A. I would prefer whites to Chinese, of course; that is natural.
Q. Then, if you suppose that it is possible, if an exigency should occur, famine, civil war, foreign invasion, China, with its four hundred millions of people, might come here in excessive numbers, would you be in favor of having legislation that might restrain them in such a contingency?—A. Yes, sir; if there is such a contingency, I would prefer it, certainly.
Q. You recognize the fact that China has four hundred millions of people?—A. Yes, sir; from my reading I am told so.
Q. Then, if I understand you, you are not in favor of what is an unrestricted immigration of Chinese?—A. No, sir; I am not.
Q. You are in favor of treating those who are here properly?—A. I am in favor of treating every human being as he should be treated. That is what should be done.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you think the circumstances of the State, the industry of the State, at the present time call for any legislation to restrict Chinese immigration?—A. I am at a loss how to answer that question. As I am not a legislator, and never have aspired to that position, I cannot answer.
Q. Do you consider the Chinese immigration of the State up to the present time beneficial or injurious?—A. I think they have been a great benefit to our country up to the present time, and I do not see the dark day that a great many claim to be before us.
Q. The question I asked you is whether, up to this time, there are any circumstances that call for any restriction or limitation upon the immigration?—A. I presume there might be in case of their flocking here in great numbers on every steamer. I presume, if they were coming here by the thousands, as it is claimed they will come, it would be necessary.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you think there are too many Chinese here now?—A. No; at the present time I do not think there are too many here.
Q. Do you think there is more labor on this coast, white and colored, than is necessary, or more than can receive employment?—A. I do not. I think that every man can get employment if he searches for it.
Q. Do you think that the Chinese stand in the way of the employment of the whites at this time?—A. I do not.
Q. Have they at any time?—A. No, sir; I think not. My own experience teaches me that there is plenty of work for all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How about those Portuguese? The Chinese stood in the way of their employment by their own countrymen. How do you make that consistent with your statement?—A. They seemed to be employed. I did not see them idle.

Q. Did you employ them?—A. I had some of those same Portuguese employed when I was drying hops. I have a certain amount of labor that I do with Chinamen, and then I have a certain amount of labor for other people.

Q. This man turned away the Portuguese who applied to him for work.—A. No, sir; he did not turn them away.

Q. He refused to employ them?—A. He refused to employ them because he concluded that he could have the work done cheaper by Chinamen.

Q. Then did not the Chinamen interfere with the labor of those men?—A. I do not know that they did.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. If it had not been for the Chinamen he would have wished these men to work for him?—A. That is true; but suppose the Portuguese had not been there, he would have come to San Francisco for help.

By Senator SARGENT:

We are speaking about whether it interfered with the employment of the Portuguese?—A. I do not think it did, because they seemed to be employed. I contend that every man can get employment if he wants it.

Q. You mentioned an instance where Portuguese applied to their own countryman, and he refused to employ them because he could get Chinese cheaper, and in view of that circumstance you still say that the presence of the Chinese does not interfere with the employment of others?—A. The presence of the Chinese interfered with the employment of Portuguese in that particular instance; but I did not see these men idle. I saw them at work gathering corn and picking potatoes all the time.

Q. Did they apply to him when they had a job and were at work, or did they apply when they had no job?—A. That I cannot tell you.

Q. This instance came under your observation. How do you not know that such instances are occurring all over the State?—A. That may be.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do the Portuguese over there employ Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; they employ Chinese.

Rev. FREDERIC E. SHEARER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Whom do you represent?—Answer. I represent an association of Presbyterian ministers of San Francisco and vicinity. I am the stated clerk of the Presbytery of San Francisco, and the Synod of the Pacific.

Q. Have you a statement there which you wish to present to the commission?—A. I have.

Mr. BEE. Please read it.

Mr. PIXLEY. I think the commission decided in one case that the examinations should be conducted by question and answer.

Q. (By Mr. BEE.) How many Chinese are there in this country?—A. The number of this people now in America is about 100,000. The arrivals and departures, as found at the custom-house in this city, from January, 1852, to April 1st, 1876, duly authenticated, and the total arrivals and departures at Astoria, Oregon, also official, are submitted herewith.

The total arrivals at San Francisco were 214,226, and the departures 90,078; and the total arrivals at Astoria 6,786, and the total departures 1,158.

These figures, so far as they relate to San Francisco, agree also with those published by the Journal of Commerce.

Supposing now that 10,000 may have come before records were kept by the United States authorities, and the deaths to have been only three per cent. of the minimum number for each year—a rate not exceeding that of the most vigorous and healthful races having the best remedial measures and most careful nursing for their sick—and supposing that 1,000 have been born of the few women here, the total number cannot exceed 98,329.

It is worthy of note that our estimate gives 10,000 for arrivals prior to 1852, and the San Francisco Chronicle of April 2, 1876, says: "Previous to and including the year 1851, between 3,000 and 4,000 had arrived in this port, and the United States census shows the total population of California in 1850 to have been but 92,597. For the year 1857, December 31, our estimates give 40,995 Chinese, while the estimate of W. Hanley, Chinese agent, gives for the same year, as published in the California State Register, (page 119,) 38,687. For the year 1860, December 31st, our estimates show 45,826 Chinese, but the United States census only 34,933; and for the year 1870, our estimates show 67,351, and the United States census 63,199. Our estimates being for December 31st of the several years, are for a season when this population would be less than any other time of the year, for the great influx is in months of March, April, May, and June, and the corresponding efflux in our fall and winter months. It is worthy of note that our estimates are nearest in accord with the census of 1870, when the State had better facilities for obtaining an accurate count than at any previous time; but our estimates are always in excess of any other reliable and accurate statistics.

Q. What is their religion, and what progress have the missionaries made in their conversion of the Chinese to Christianity?—A. They are Buddhists, Tauists, and Confucianists; about one-third Buddhists.

In 1852, the first year after the United States authorities took account of this immigration, the church with which we are connected commenced its missionary operations in this city. On November 6th, 1853, a church was organized of Chinese only.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of inducing a heathen people to renounce idolatry and ancestral worship, and to give up friends and worldly prospects, to gain nothing but peace of conscience here and heaven hereafter; and notwithstanding the fact that the cruel and even brutal treatment they sometimes receive from an idle, vicious, and prejudiced class of our own citizens, has a tendency to make them despise Christianity, because they erroneously attribute these wrongs to a Christian people, the progress of our mission work has been eminently encouraging—encouraging, both as to the number of converts, their integrity and piety, and as to the increase in the means and agencies employed, and the sympathy manifested by the churches of our denomination.

We have now an organized church of Chinese only, into which 187 have been received. In the place of worship two Sabbath-schools are held, and an average of 150 receive instruction every Sunday. There are 59 more Chinese communicants connected with various American churches in our denomination alone. Five of these were recently received into the church at San Leandro, and eight into the church at Los Angeles. Our mission work has grown until we have been obliged to appoint for it three Americans, all speaking the Chinese language; and to establish branch missions in Sacramento, San José, and Los Angeles. Connected with these missions are seven other Americans and several native teachers. We have also found it necessary to erect a home for reclaiming and sheltering the fallen women and instructing them in household arts. During the last year more than $2,400 was contributed—all from this coast—and mostly in small sums, and eighteen women received into this home. Several have made Christian profession, married, and are now leading commendable lives.

Connected with seventeen of our American churches we have schools in which nearly 1,200 are receiving instruction in the English language and Christian religion. Hundreds of these have renounced idolatry and become interested students of Christianity. Some of them are connected with an undenominational Chinese Young Men's Christian Association in this city, which now numbers about 1,000 members, and in which only those who formally renounce idolatry can become or remain members.

The character of the Chinese church-members for piety, sobriety, honesty, and integrity, compares favorably with the character of our church-members in our own or any other race. Concerning one of them, Bishop Whittaker, of Nevada, writes: "I like Ah For very much; I have full confidence in his Christian character." Concerning Kum Lum, another of these Chinese Christians, Rev. Dr. Lindsley, of Portland, writes: "I hear good accounts of Kum Lum, residing in Boisé City. He possesses great influence and is known as a Christian."

Another of these, Chen Chung, returned some money in 1873 to the secretary of the American Tract Society, which had been placed to his credit by mistake, when he could have had no expectation that the mistake would be discovered before his sailing for China. And many like instances of faithfulness, uprightness, and sincerity in their Christian professions might be cited.

In the Sabbath and other schools established for them by our churches, the testimony of superintendents and teachers shows that they are unexceptionable in personal habits and deportment, and their intellectual activity is the occasion of much astonishment and remark.

Our efforts to enlighten and benefit them have been so encouraging that the number of churches and persons taking part therein is constantly increasing. Year by year it has gained in the confidence of the ministers and churches. At our various ecclesiastical assemblies it has received careful supervision and scrutiny, and then the most hearty and unanimous indorsement.

In 1873, the Presbytery of San Francisco, at its semi-annual session, adopted the following language, to wit: "Some of the fruits of this (Chinese) mission may be seen in the native preacher and half a dozen colporteurs; in the consistent lives and peaceful deaths of its church-members; and in the large and promising bands of young men who have been trained in the schools."

In the same year the Synod of the Pacific adopted the following, to wit: "That the Synod realizes and desires to impress upon the church

the vast significance of the coming of the Chinese to our land as one of the great means in God's hands for the evangelizing of China, and that we will encourage and aid in the work of teaching them.

"The synod earnestly hopes that there may be provided on this coast an efficient department for the education in their own language, as well as in English, of young Christian Chinese men for the ministry, who may be prepared to return to China."

In 1874 the Synod noted a most encouraging report of the year's labor among the Chinese, and the reception of twenty-one into the church.

And so from year to year the increased confidence of the church in the possibility of enlightening and saving this nation has been manifested. Much encouragement in this has been derived also from the success of our work in China, where we had, at the beginning of the present year, ten stations and several out-stations, 40 American and native ministers, and 1,157 church members, and where the ratio of conversions is rapidly increasing. For example, the native Christians of all Protestant churches in China numbered only 351 in 1853, while the work was begun by Dr. Morrison in 1807. In 1863 the number was 1,974; in 1868, 5,743, and, in 1875, nearly 12,000. And the influence of our own Presbyterian missionaries has been felt not only in the narrow sphere of the local churches, but in the empire at large, and throughout all nations. We need only recall the names of S. Wells Williams, LL. D., and Wm. A. P. Martin, D. D.

In conclusion, we may express the conviction that we have no fears as to the ultimate conflict between the truths of our Christianity and the teachings of their classics or their idolatrous rites, no matter whether in the providence of God the number in our land be increased or diminished.

Our prayer is that prophetic one of John Witherspoon, D. D.: "God grant that in America true religion and civil liberty may be inseparable, and that the unjust attempts to destroy the one may in the issue tend to the support and establishment of the other."

This paper which I have been reading is signed by A. S. Fiske and Frederic E. Shearer, committee.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is your position?—A. I am secretary of the American Tract Society for the States of the Pacific Coast; and in my denomination I am the stated clerk of the synod of the Pacific, and also of the Presbytery of San Francisco, that being the only permanent office connected with these two organizations.

Q. Are you a minister?—A. I am a minister. I come here as a representative of the association of Presbyterian ministers of San Francisco and vicinity, in connection with Mr. Fiske, whose name is also signed to the statement which I have read.

Q. How long have you lived here?—A. I have lived here six and a half years.

Q. Have you been connected with this work ever since you came here?—A. I have been a minister ever since I came here.

Q. Engaged in the missionary work?—A. I am not connected with any missionary work. I have been with the tract society ever since I came here; the publishing and missionary society.

Q. I want to ask you whether there is or is not a fear here among intelligent people that the country will be overrun by Chinamen, that there will be such an influx as to make them an unsafe population?—A.

Some people of general intelligence seem to have that fear. I have no such fear. I do not think such fear is shared by those whom I represent.

Q. Do you believe that a limitation upon the number of Chinamen that might come here, by limiting the number that might come on a vessel or otherwise, would tend to allay this fear and quiet public sentiment on the subject?—A. I think it would excite fears of an opposite nature, that would be far more dangerous. I believe that immediately upon such limitation all capitalists would fear that the Chinese in the country would be insufficient to meet the demands of labor upon them, and that a panic would result. I believe that the Chinamen themselves at any such time would be likely to demand higher rates for their wages, and that such a limitation would paralyze many of our industries.

Q. Do you know of any sentiment among the Chinese themselves, who are residents here, in favor of limiting the immigration?—A. I know of none, either in favor of it or against it.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are not the Chinese themselves who are here indifferent on this question?—A. So far as I know, they are indifferent. I have never heard of any fear or any apprehension on their part concerning it.

Q. Do they appear to take any interest in this discussion of the question?—A. They appear to be interested as to the treatment they are to receive here, and whether they are to be allowed to remain.

Q. Whether those who are here are to be allowed to remain?—A. Those who are here.

Q. Do they evince any desire to have more come?—A. Not so far as I know.

Q. Do you mingle with these people much; do you come much in personal contact with them?—A. I come considerably in contact with them, because I am a great part of my time in different portions of the State.

Q. What is their moral and physical condition?—A. Their habits of life are entirely different from ours. Compared with the laboring classes, their moral and physical condition is better than some others and worse than some others.

Q. Aside from our difference in religious belief, and their worship of what we do not consider proper to be worshiped, as to their performance of the duties toward men, how do they compare with those of other nationalities, other immigrants here?—A. Their general reputation is favorable for their faithful performance of what they undertake to do.

Q. How is it in regard to peacefulness and obedience to the laws?—A. I have never been a witness of any act of disobedience to the laws on the part of Chinamen which caused their arrest. I have seen them on occasions and frequently maltreated, and they have manifested a very peaceful disposition under it. But a few days ago, as a train of cars was under the shed of the Oakland wharf, where it was somewhat dark, while a number of Chinese were passing into the baggage-car to get their baskets, which they carry, swung on a pole, an employé of the Pacific Transfer Company, standing on the platform, pushed and abused every one that passed from the platform of one car into another car, and he seemed to delight greatly in it, while the Chinamen took it very patiently. I might speak of many occurrences, but this was a very recent one.

Q. Are they generally treated the same as other foreigners?—A. By some people they are, but by the majority of the laboring classes I do not think they are so treated.

Q. With whom does the antagonism rest?—A. I think it rests mainly

with an uneducated and a superstitious class of people, although it is not confined by any means to them. A great many of our intelligent, thinking people have apprehensions, or seem to have apprehensions, on the subject, I may say.

Q. Have you an opinion on which side the majority are on this question? Have you been able to form an opinion?—A. They differ so much that I can hardly say whether the majority are on the one side or the other upon all the separate questions that are embraced in the one complex question.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are you speaking of the Presbyterian clergymen, or the people at large?—A. The people at large.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Their opinions hinge off into each other?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Upon the question whether they have been a pecuniary benefit to the State, the vote would be different?—A. I think that an expression upon that subject by the ballot would show two-thirds, perhaps three-fourths, saying they have been a great pecuniary benefit.

Q. And how upon the question whether they will continue to be a pecuniary benefit to the State under present circumstances?—A. For the immediate future, and for perhaps many years, I think more than half would say that they would be a great pecuniary benefit.

Q. If the question were upon their moral condition, so far as their relations with men are concerned, what would be the opinion of the people?—A. Do you include in that question their honesty and integrity?

Q. Yes, sir; their dealings with men.—A. I think they would have a favorable opinion in that respect.

Q. Is there a general partiality among white people in favor of white people?—A. I think, other things being equal, we all give the preference to white people. I do.

Q. Have you, in your intercourse with the Chinese, seen any evidence which leads you to think that these people are under bond to any other?—A. In my observations I have been led to think otherwise. At one time, when I had sickness in my family, and when a domestic in my service left, and it was impossible to secure new help immediately, at almost a moment's notice I retained a Chinaman for two or three days, and at the end of that time placed him, at the request of a lady, in her family. I am fully confident that he made his own contract with her.

Q. Is that the rule, so far as you are acquainted with this matter?—A. I think that, as a rule, they employ intelligence-offices in the way of a broker.

Q. Are there offices here kept exclusively for that kind of business?—A. So far as I know, there are.

Q. Chinese-employment offices?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By whom and what class of people are they kept?—A. They are kept usually by Chinamen.

Q. Usually?—A. I think entirely.

Q. Do you know of any kept by white men?—A. I recall none.

Q. Do you know the intelligence-house in Clay street, kept by a white man, where they deal exclusively in Chinese labor?—A. I do not know anything about that office.

Q. The committee have asked for what purpose these people come here, and whether they come with the intention of remaining and making this their home or returning to China after getting a competence?—A. I suppose they come as Californians came in the early days of our

State, to make money, but that many of them, not a large percentage of the whole, however, abandon the idea of returning to China permanently. Some are content to die here. Others return to China and then come back again to the United States. One of these whom I named has been twice to China since I came to California.

Q. If these people were equal before the law and treated by the people here as other immigrants are treated, and if their rights were the same as other immigrants, do you think many of these Chinamen would remain here and make this their home, marry and settle down like other people?—A. I think many of them would.

Q. Do you not think a good deal of the active prejudice against these people is in consequence of their habits of sleeping by themselves and dressing in an outlandish costume?—A. Undoubtedly much of it arises from that source, and also from the fact that the barrier between their language and our own is great. They are obliged to converse with themselves in their own language, and learn ours with considerable difficulty as compared with one who speaks a language having grammatical idioms somewhat like ours.

Q. Have any Chinese come under your observation who have abandoned their peculiar dress, who dress like Americans and speak the American language?—A. Yes, sir; quite a number.

Q. What has been the treatment of these?—A. They have received much better treatment. A gentleman in Baker County, Oregon, a postmaster in a little town, the name of which I do not immediately recall, who, if I remember rightly, announced himself in his letter as a spiritualist, wrote me some years ago concerning a Chinaman of this class. He spoke of the great influence this Chinaman had with the American people and the confidence they reposed in him.

Q. Do you know whether these people are capable of understanding the Constitution and laws of this country and appreciating their spirit?—A. They have intellectual capacity to that extent.

Q. Do any of them become attached to our institutions?—A. I have heard some of them say that they would prefer to remain in America always; that they liked American ways and American people better than their Chinese ways and their Chinese people, yet perhaps not more than three or four; although I have not pressed this question upon them in my intercourse.

Q. If all restrictions were removed and they were put upon an equality with all other people, what proportion of them do you think would become American citizens?—A. I am hardly able to say.

Q. Can you give us any idea of the number who would become attached in that way?—A. I think in that case not more than one-tenth, for a lapse of several years.

Q. You think there would be no danger of their swamping us in that line?—A. I think there could be no possible danger of that. In Hong-Kong, for example, a British province, as I am informed, with a population of one hundred and sixty thousand Chinese and only four thousand white people, the white people have no difficulty in enforcing their laws.

Q. Do you think there is any danger of an immediate great influx of Chinese to this State?—A. I think there is no danger of any immediate great influx, because I regard that supply is regulated by the demands of capital and the necessity of labor.

Q. Do they use the post, the mail, a good deal?—A. They use our mails to a considerable extent. I was going to say that I regard the danger of a great influx as very little, because it would be a long time before the Chinamen would come to us, I think, from any other quarter

of China than the province of Kwang Tung, where there are only about twenty millions, the people in other parts of China speaking, essentially, a different language.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In making your estimate of the probable number of Chinese here, did you direct your attention at all to the number of women?—A. The number of women is included.

Q. What is the number of Chinese women?—A. The whole number of women upon the coast I am unable to give you.

Q. Give the approximate number.—A. It can be obtained from the custom-house. The statistics as they furnished them to me were statistics including males and females. The statistics from the custom-house at Astoria include females, and show one hundred and thirty arrivals.

Q. Give your general knowledge.—A. I have no general knowledge in the absence of statistics.

Q. From the result of your observation, from what you have seen, would you be surprised that there were four thousand Chinese women in this State?—A. I think three thousand would be a more probable estimate.

Q. About half of them in this city?—A. About half.

Q. What is their vocation?—A. Nearly all of them are abandoned women; they are prostitutes.

Q. Did you make any investigation regarding the number of gamblers and men belonging to the criminal classes of the male adult Chinese? A. There is a considerable number of gamblers, both Chinese and white; and there are both Chinese and white prostitutes.

Q. I am confining my interrogatories to the Chinese.—A. There are Chinese gamblers in towns in the interior to which I suppose white gambling does not extend in the same degree.

Q. One of the provinces within the scope of your humanitarian efforts, as I understand, is the reclamation of prostitutes?—A. I stated that there is a society of women for that purpose.

Q. Do you know the result of their efforts?—A. About a hundred in the last year have been instructed in industrial arts; eighteen in the last year were received into their Home for Fallen Women; several of them have married and are leading very commendable lives, and it is believed virtuous lives, with their husbands.

Q. That is, a part of the eighteen have been what you consider reclaimed, or on the way to reclamation?—A. Reclaimed; and the rest I believe are all or nearly all in the home.

Q. Do you know how many they have in the home now?—A. I think they have only six now in the home.

Q. Have they ever had any more than that number at any one time? A. They have had as high as thirteen.

Q. Out of the three or four thousand prostitutes in this State there are eighteen that you think are on the way to a hopeful reclamation, and a part of that number have been married?—A. In this home, under the control of the one religious denomination, which I represent. I think there are a number of other religious denominations having a like missionary effort, and there may be a number on the way to reclamation without being identified or connected with any one of these religious societies or under their control in any way.

Q. You have no part or interest in the institution presided over by the Rev. Mr. Gibson?—A. None whatever.

Q. Nor in the institution presided over by Mr. Loomis.—A. Mr. Loomis belongs to the same church with which I am connected; that is, he is a minister in the same church, but I have no interest with him.

Q. How many Chinese do you understand have been converted on this coast by missionary and Christian effort?—A. I stated that one hundred and eighty-seven had been received into one Presbyterian church for Chinese alone.

Q. What church is that?—A. The mission church. We call it the Chinese church in our official records. I also stated that there are fifty-nine other Chinamen connected with our various churches.

Q. Fifty-nine and one hundred and eighty seven?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think that two hundred and forty-six in the whole number have been placed on the way to a better belief?—A. Two hundred and forty-six have been received into our Presbyterian churches.

Q. You also take in the Baptists and Methodists?—A. No. sir.

Q. Taking the whole, how many?—A. I am unable to give you any statistics. I keep only the statistics of our own denomination upon the coast.

Q. You think that those converted heathen represent about a fair average of the ordinary Presbyterian Christians in the community?—A. And other Christians; all Christians.

Q. Protestant Christians?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think they illustrate in their works and in their lives a thorough knowledge of and practical conversion to the Christian religion?—A. So the one hundred Presbyterian ministers or more upon the Pacific coast think.

Q. I am not asking what they think?—A. I speak as their representative.

Q. You cannot do that under oath in sworn testimony to go into a record?—A. I bring here the records of the Synod of the Pacific.

Q. You are the secretary of the American Tract Society?—A. The American Tract Society.

Q. Do you print in Chinese?—A. We print in Chinese at Shanghai, China.

Q. But not for circulation here?—A. For circulation all over the world to Chinamen.

Q. You mean to say that you do all your printing there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the tracts are distributed wherever there are Chinese?—A. Wherever there are Chinese.

Q. Do you know what is the entire total of all the Chinese who have come to California since 1849, embracing all who have returned, all who have died, and all who are here—the sum total of all who have arrived?—A. Only by estimate, because the records of the custom-house are not full.

Q. Give a general idea, within 10,000 or 20,000?—A. I cannot answer the question in that form, but I can give an approximate answer.

Q. That is all I ask.—A. There have come to California directly 214,226, less 6,786, according to the custom-house returns, and I suppose that about 10,000 more have come.

Q. Then in round numbers over 200,000 have come?—A. Over 200,000 came.

Q. Have you any observation or knowledge of the moral effects upon the boys and youth of this town from coming in contact with Chinese prostitutes? Have you any knowledge, first, upon that subject?—A. I have no direct knowledge.

Q. Have you ever read the testimony of Dr. Toland and Dr. Shorb in respect to that matter?—A. I have read their testimony.

Q. Assuming their testimony to be true, will you state to the commission, in your opinion, considering the number you have converted, 246, and the number converted by other Christian denominations, taking the balance of good or evil as the account will be kept by whoever is the book-keeper, which do you think has greater evil or good resulted from the incoming of that class of people?—A. Not having access to those books to which you refer, I cannot answer the question.

Q. And probably you never will. Then you have no opinion to form?—A. I have an opinion.

Q. Will you give it?—A. My opinion is that the greater boldness and the much larger number of white prostitutes in the city is more damaging to the boys.

Q. I do not ask you that question. I ask you, assuming that the statements of Dr. Shorb, Dr. Toland, and other physicans are true with reference to the diseases and influences upon our boys by Chinese prostitution, whether, in your opinion, that has been counterbalanced by the moral good and Christian good that has been accomplished by the effort of Christian gentlemen here for the conversion of Chinese?—A. I think we hold that we are not called upon to answer such questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question as nearly as you can. If you cannot answer it, you can say so.

The WITNESS. Senator, I am unable to answer it.

Q. (By Mr. Pixley.) Then I will put it a little wider. Taking the influence upon our boys, the rising generation, in their morals, by Chinese prostitution, by Chinese gamblers, Chinese tan and lottery people and opium-eaters, in your opinion has the good counterbalanced the evil from our boys' contact with all those classes?—A. I know of no one to strike such balances.

Q. There are three denominations in China, I think you have stated, Buddhists, Tauists, and the followers of Confucius. Do they all conform to the same general customs of life in outward observance?—A. They have many of the same customs. The every-day life is the same.

Q. Do they dress in the same general way?—A. They dress in the same general way, except their priests.

Q. Is it their rule to wear the queue?—A. I may be mistaken, but I think that some priests of one class do not wear the queue; the people in general wear the queue.

Q. What is that queue? Is it a symbol of anything?—A. It is not a symbol of anything religious. It is a national symbol. It is what our Star-Spangled Banner is.

Q. Is it a symbol connected at all with their superstitions?—A. I think not.

Q. Does it affect their status in society to lose it, as you understand?—A. They are looked upon as having renounced their nationality.

Q. If they cut it off?—A. I think so.

Q. Then it is rather a badge of respectability?—A. It is a badge of respectability. Originally, six hundred years ago, when it was first imposed upon them by the Tartar dynasty, it was a badge of subjection and disgrace; but when it was found that in all political matters those who wore the queue received the greatest favor, it came to be looked upon with much respect.

Q. Do you not know from the writings of Mr. Loomis, Mr. Butter-

field, and others who have written upon Chinese matters, that there is connected with the queue a superstitious belief that if deprived of it at the time of their death they do not reach the celestial kingdom?—A. I do not know it. It may be so.

Q. And that it is as well a badge of nationality and respectability as a badge of their religion, connected incidentally with their religious belief? You have read Mr. Loomis's work?—A. I have never read Mr. Loomis's translation of the Chinese classics.

Q. Of the two hundred and forty-six Chinese who have been admitted to the communion of the Presbyterian Church and the other Christian denominations, did you ever know one of them to cut off his queue?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many?—A. Only one that I now recall.

Q. Only one out of two hundred and forty-six?—A. I recall another.

Q. That is two. Then you recall two Chinese of your converts who have been willing to sacrifice this badge?—A. It has not been required of them. We have taught them that it is not necessary.

Q. If it had been required of them do you think they would have done it?—A. I suppose that every one would have cut it off in that case.

Q. You gave an opinion as to the effect of the inhibition of Chinese immigration here upon the capital of the country. Are you in a position to be an expert and a good judge of the influence of Chinese labor upon the capital of our State?—A. Only as I come in contact with capitalists and others in traveling over the State, and in my daily intercourse.

Q. You are engaged in no other industry than the industry of religion, are you? You are not engaged in any material industry?—A. I trust that religion extends through all my industries, and I am engaged in a variety of things.

Q. I will ask whether your testimony here has not been colored, properly so, by your idea of the superior importance of availing yourself of this opportunity to Christianize the Chinese? Is not that a controlling element of your opinion and judgment?—A. I think it is not controlled any more in that way than a politician's opinion would be controlled by an opportunity to gain favor with some by taking a certain position.

Q. Is it as much, do you think?—A. I hope not as much as I think a politician's opinion would be controlled by such a motive.

Q. I hope I do not misunderstand you. Do you say that you do not take more interest in the saving of the souls of the heathen than the politicians take in getting their votes?—A. I think that we regard the saving of souls as the work in which men ought to be interested above all others.

Q. And you are interested in it above all other things?—A. I hope so.

Q. Then the importance of the Chinese question from that stand-point of observation controls your judgment in reference to all these lesser and more unimportant questions, such as the material progress of the State?—A. Not that I know of, only as such things rather unconsciously control, if opinions are so controlled.

Q. Which do you regard as the superior religion, that represented by the Chinese, or that represented by the gospel-teachings of Christ?—A. The latter.

Q. And why?—A. I believe it elevates man more and is the only saving religion.

Q. Which do you think the superior civilization, that of China, or that of our race?—A. Christian civilization; that of our race.

Q. Then which, do you think, is best for the future welfare of the country, that it should be settled by an immigration from Asia, or by an immigration from New England, from the East, and from Europe?—A. An immigration from New England would be already assimilated in part, both religiously and politically, and therefore it would be superior in the immediate future to an immigration from Asia.

Q. Do you think the Chinese can become assimilated to our people in time, in point of all other civilizations, religion, language, manners, customs, and habits of thought?—A. I think they will assimilate as readily as some of the elements now undergoing assimilation.

Q. What elements do you refer to?—A. I refer to an element in the midst of which I was about ten days ago in a belt of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, extending from the Mariposa Big Trees southward some miles. It is a belt of territory some forty miles long by twenty wide, in which a very large proportion of the white men are living with Digger squaws, and by those squaws they have a large number of children.

Q. That is about the way you think that they will assimilate with our country?—A. I think that they will assimilate better.

Q. You think that is about the kind of civilization they represent?—A. I think the first generation of the virtuous Chinese women would probably be superior largely to that, on account of the superior intellectual capacity of the Chinese over the Indian.

Q. Do you bring that particular incident, a class of people living there, as you say, in connection with squaws, as representing a fair average of our eastern immigration to this country?—A. That does not come from immigration. Those people are already here.

Q. I understand that, but do they represent in their standard of morals any other class of whites that comes to California?—A. I think not.

Q. Then in looking to the future and what you know of the ability of the Chinese to assimilate and become homogeneous with us, and acquire a knowledge of our government, and their adaptations of our manners and assimilation of our mode and form of thought, which do you think is a desirable immigration for California, Asiatic or Eastern?—A. If California could have such immigration as we need for the development of our resources, if that immigration could be confined to the New England States; or if we could pick not only from classes, but pick out of the classes of European immigrants, I think we could obtain a better immigration from that source.

Q. Suppose we could have no immigration from any place in the world except China, would you still favor Chinese immigration to this coast in unrestricted numbers?—A. I would, in unrestricted numbers, because I do not believe they could come to us in such vast numbers.

Q. Then if we could not get immigration from anywhere else would you give up this coast to the Chinese?—A. If there was immigration from any other source I would also favor Chinese immigration.

Q. That is, you are in favor of unrestricted immigration?—A. I am in favor of unrestricted immigration at present.

Q. If you could convert none of these Chinese, would you still be in favor of their being brought here?—A. I do not think that is a possible supposition.

Q. But if it should so happen?—A. I do not think it could so happen.

Q. Do you think the age of miracles has passed? They might have their hearts hardened like Pharaoh's heart.—A. I think this is a dispensation of the Spirit when Chinamen like other people may be converted.

Q. You saw a Chinaman abused by a railroad official?—A. Not by a railroad official, but by an employé of the Pacific Transfer Company.

ARTHUR B. STOUT sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I am a physician.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?—A. Since February, 1849.

Q. Have you practiced your profession from that time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you held any office under the State connected with that profession?—A. Yes, sir; I am now a member of the State board of health. I have had no other official appointment, although I have been in the public hospitals as physician.

Q. Where have you resided?—A. In San Francisco, constantly.

Q. In what part of the city?—A. A great portion of the time in Washington street. I first resided on Pacific street, where I had the first hospital, I think, that could be called a hospital, a private hospital, in the city. Since then I have lived on Howard street, and now my residence is No. 808 Pioneer Hall, Montgomery street.

Q. How near was your office and residence to what is known as the Chinese quarter?—A. Right in the midst of it.

Q. You built there before the Chinese came to that quarter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you continued to reside there after they came?—A. Yes, sir; I was among the last to leave.

Q. What opportunity have you had to observe their manners, customs, and habits?—A. I have had a number of them as patients. I have seen them constantly around me. My property is now leased by them, and consequently I come in contact with them as landlord and tenant, as physician and patient, and as a general observer of people as I meet them.

Q. What is their moral and physical condition?—A. I will endeavor to speak first of their physical condition; probably I understand it better. As men they are of small stature and not muscular, but the muscle that they have is very vigorous. They are witty, quick, and strong for their development. They are what we would call light-weight men, and consequently, as light-weight men, they are capable of great industry and have a capacity for labor which is remarkable. Their health, as a general thing among similar classes in similar conditions, is better than that of the whites, because the frugality of their lives exposes them less to diseases than parties who are subjected to various excesses.

Q. When did you move away from that quarter?—A. I left that quarter rather contrary to my wish. I had repaired it and put it in order, supposing that I should continually reside in the same place. I was one day accosted by a broker who asked me to sell and to sell to the Chinese. I declined. I told him I did not wish to leave, and that I was rather averse to selling.

Q. I merely want to get at the date you left that quarter.—A. About six years ago.

Q. Up to that time you were in close proximity to the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Previous to that time what number of buildings had been destroyed in those six blocks by fire?—A. Previous to that time, with the exception of a small portion on Stockton street, you know that it was all destroyed in the general fire of 1849.

Q. That was a general conflagration of the city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What fires originating in that quarter have destroyed buildings?—A. None. There have been no fires of any consequence there.

Q. Is it possible, in your opinion, for fire to get under much headway in that quarter?—A. It is possible.

Q. Is it probable? Is it very likely?—A. It is not probable. Although they are accused of great carelessness in the use of fire, and sometimes place their culinary fires in what looks to be a very careless and dirty manner, this is guarded by the fact that they are excessively economical with their fuel. They rather make smoke than fire, and they watch it incessantly in order to save what little balance of fuel may be left after their culinary operations are finished. I think they take more care of their fire in fact than those who have better opportunities—stoves, grates, and such other apparatus.

Q. As a matter of fact, then, you know of no fire originating in that quarter which has destroyed any buildings?—A. I do not think at the moment of any.

Q. You have lived right in their immediate proximity?—A. Yes, sir. There was a fire in my own building not six months ago, but it was immediately stopped.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How do the number and the destructiveness of fires in the Chinese quarter compare with the rest of the city?—A. I think less than in other parts of the city. I think there have been very few fires that originated in the Chinese quarter.

Mr. PIXLEY. I think that is true. I think such a multitude of people there prevents the fire from spreading.

Mr. BROOKS. The fire cannot get under headway because there are so many people there to put out the fire.

The WITNESS. The testimony of Mr. Durkee was positively defective.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. During your residence there have you known of any disease, any pestilence originating and spreading in there, or spreading from there?—A. No, sir; none.

Q. The Chinese live in that quarter very closely, do they not?—A. Quite closely, sometimes.

Q. How is it that you account for the fact that under those circumstances they are apparently so healthy?—A. Their frugal life gives them more immunity from disease. They eat only what is necessary to live upon. They eat to live and do not live to eat. They are clean in their habits, and they drink no whisky. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman in my life. They consequently obtain a better resisting power to the attack of disease.

Q. What is their habit in regard to ablutions?—A. They constantly wash themselves.

Q. The whole person, or only the face and hands?—A. My observation of the men is that they keep themselves clean. Their clothes are clean. As mechanics or as workmen they keep themselves very clean.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak of their persons?—A. Yes, sir. It is not my object here to make any comparisons with others. I am speaking of Chinese and not of other nationalities at all.

Q. What are their habits in making their ablutions? Do they wash the whole person or only the hands and face?—A. That I cannot state positively, but I know that they use a great deal of water for ablutions, a great deal more for ablutions than for cooking purposes perhaps; I have seen a good deal of that matter. The women are generally cleaner than the same kind of women of other localities and of other races.

Q. What is the comparative mortality among the Chinese and the whites of this city, the death-rate?—A. The death-rate is greater among the whites than among the Chinese.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Excluding infants, is the death-rate greater among white adults?—A. I have made no close estimate, but we cannot exclude them. I take it just as it happens here without regard to whether they are male or female, child or adult. The number of Chinese children here is very small comparatively, but the children are healthy. I have not seen a cash of diphtheria nor a case of typhoid fever among their children. I have seen typhoid fever among adults.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the comparative mortality among adult Chinamen and adult white people?—A. The amount is greater with adult white people.

Q. Have they had epidemics in the Chinese quarter?—A. No, sir; The small-pox has been among them, as it has been among others, but I think there has been less small-pox among them—I mean the ratio of population allowed—than with the whites. When you come to take up the question of small-pox, I think I can exonerate the Chinese from the charges alleged against them of having introduced it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Give the commission your views upon that subject now.—A. The general cry has been, and it is believed by a great many, that we owe the small-pox here to the Chinese. It is true that a few cases occurred even previous to the arrival of the Colorado. I have even been told that there were no cases on the Colorado. The true source of small-pox is threefold. One source is from Southern California, where it has prevailed to a very great extent, and has swept northward, going through San Francisco and other portions of the State. Then, I say a small ratio, and least of all, has come from China; but the small-pox prevailed to a very serious extent long before any Chinamen came here. In the very early years I recollect sending vaccine to Washington Territory to the Indian agent there to vaccinate a tribe of Indians about being destroyed by the small-pox. In our own city the small-pox is very much a disease emanating from effluvias and corrupting circumstances of the atmosphere, epidemic influences, if you like, of a peculiar kind, of which we are the authors ourselves. We manufacture it, if I may use such a word; we make our own small-pox. It is engendered here; it arrives from Southern California; and last and least it has come with vessels from China.

Q. What has been your experience in reference to the Chinese lep-

rosy?—A. I think that the hue and cry made about it is a farce. Leprosy is a disease of very ancient origin. It had its existence under certain peculiar circumstances of eastern and East European nations. It has come from Europe when it has come here, and that is exceedingly rare, if at all. It is a disease that is rather passing away. It is a disease of a past epoch, which can never return again, owing to the different changes of civilization and of life that have occurred. Leprosy will probably never exist again. It exists in the Sandwich Islands, where it does not extend, partly because it is quarantined. It is considered an incurable disease. I consider it a curable disease under the improved modes of cure that we possess. I have no idea of its contagiousness by quick contagion, as, for instance, if you were to manipulate a person covered with leprosy, you would not take the leprosy; although if you manipulated a person with small-pox you might take the small-pox. It is communicable, we may say, by slow degrees. If you were to sleep with a man for six months or a year, be in close contact, get the scurf from the skin upon you, and breathe his breath for a long time, very likely then you might catch the leprosy; but it is one of those chronic diseases which, although in that way contagious, need excite no fear; and it is not near as horrible as other diseases of the skin that we have, such as psoriasis and phthosis, two diseases which are certainly more disgusting and disagreeable than the leprosy. I have seen the leprosy in the north of Italy. If you exclude a people because a few cases of leprosy have occurred among them, you would exclude the Italians, because in Lombardy it is a recognized disease, which prevails there all the time.

Q. Is there not a colony of lepers in Canada, or some of the British dominions?—A. That I do not recollect. Consequently, I say that the cry against the Chinese, as being lepers, is an utter farce, an exaggeration. Other nations have the leprosy.

Q. Did not the medical faculty here, officially or otherwise, two years ago, investigate the leprosy question, and decide that it was not leprosy?—A. They never have solemnly said that it was not leprosy. I did not investigate it. It was investigated a good deal at that time.

Q. You are familiar with the Chinese hospitals here?—A. I have been once or twice called in a hospital upon Clay street, which I think does not now exist. Their mode of living being different, it makes their hospitals appear very different from ours. They have no beds; they lay the sick on mats on the floor. The floors are kept clean, and the mats are changed and kept clean. In some cases they are not changed; they are liable to gross negligence, the same as often occurs in our own hospitals. The European hospitals, only a few years ago, were just as much places of carelessness and reckless inhumanity as are theirs. I visited the hospital last Sunday. I was taken there by a Chinaman who speaks English well. I find it is the hospital now, the land for which was donated by the city to the Chinese before, I think, we had any hospital of our own. Really, I think, singular as it may appear, the Chinese hospital was among the first founded here. The city donated the land to a Chinaman, who was considered a man of influence. I think he belonged to the Hong-Wo society. They gave him the choice of a lot, and he selected one upon Union street. That place is now in a pitiable condition; it is very disgusting; because the Hong-Wo society have carried their Joss temple to Pine street. I found five sick there; no cases of small-pox. In the upper part of the building I found a large ward having no furniture, as I say is their custom, but a very white clean floor. If they have no bed, they need no table; if they have no table, they

need no chairs; consequently the economy of all furniture among them is very great. The room was large and was perfectly well ventilated, and there was one sick man in it, while there were four below. I asked them why they did not bring the other men up to that room, and take them out of the smoke and uncomfortable condition they were in below. The reply was, "We do not dare to do that, for the boys pelt the room; they throw stones through the windows, so that it is not safe; and our Chinese doctor does not like to go up more staircases than he can help." Yet it was a fine large clean ward, well ventilated.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Have the Chinese a system of medicine of their own?—A. Yes, sir; they have. They use remedies of their own.

Q. They have professional physicians, men who make that their business?—A. Yes, sir; men who devote themselves to that business, Chinese physicians.

Q. Are they educated in anatomy and physiology?—A. I think but very little. In fact I saw one man there who had received a fractured ankle, and certainly, under the treatment he was undergoing, the man was doomed either to lose his leg or his life.

Q. Have they any knowledge of surgery?—A. Very little. The Chinese resist surgery. They dislike surgical operations, and would almost rather die than undergo them.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Amputation?—A. Surgical operations of any kind. I have performed a number of surgical operations upon them; but they always recoil before it to a greater degree than other people.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are these hospitals that you speak of established by the Chinese?—A. I think this is the only one they have now. They applied to me some months ago to inquire if I could not obtain for them a lot from the city to build a hospital upon. They desired very much to establish a general hospital and also a small-pox hospital for their own people, the same as the French and the Germans have their hospitals. I have been solicitous to carry out the plan; but up to the present time I have not been able to do so. I am sure they desire it, and are willing to pay liberally and freely to establish a hospital and have it partly under our care and partly under the care of their own physicians.

Q. Do they treat small-pox successfully or not?—A. I cannot say. I have not seen cases of their treatment.

Q. With what degree of tenderness do they treat their sick? How are they distinguished in that respect?—A. That is very variable. In the first place the societies always receive the immigrants who are destitute upon the arrival of vessels. For a week or a couple of weeks they are put into some house, usually the Joss-house. They receive quite a number in this way; for instance, on Pine street, where there are very clean rooms, and they have a large kitchen there to cook for them until they can be provided for. The tenderness of those who know one another is not to be surpassed by any people. They would give the utmost care; but as up there, if some of the friends will come and pay, they will get pretty good care, or else they will be very much neglected. That is a good deal, I think, as it is with other people; some get more care than they need and others get no care at all. I think they are humane. I presume that will cover the question.

Q. Do they differ from white people in their care of the sick?—A. I think they desire to take care of their sick to the best of their ability.

Q. Do you know of instances of Chinamen having been put out on the street by Chinamen to die?—A. I have never seen such an instance. I have heard of them. In one of my tenements where I live on Washington street a man was laid in the cottage to die; nothing was to be done for him. I was told he was there, and I was anxious to try and serve him. I found him laid on a pallet, with water, oranges, &c., around him, but nothing more. They would come toward night and, perhaps, renew those things, but that was all they would do. But he was clean, neat, and so far as that goes respect was shown him.

Q. You spoke about leasing them your property?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is their character as tenants?—A. Excellent. They are better than those I have had to deal with otherwise. Before I leased my property to the Chinese, in consequence of the locality I could get only very inferior tenants, many of whom would cheat me out of my rent, and others would abuse the property, and others would be incessantly requiring change and alterations. The present tenants have paid a better price punctually, and very much more to my satisfaction. There has been no swearing, no noise, no trouble, no riotous conduct about the premises. Since the mayoralty now has assailed them so severely in regard to the cubic-air law, and in regard to prostitution, my house has become nearly empty. The conduct of the police was very severe upon them, and in some cases exceedingly unjust. It compelled me, however, to alter my building at an expense of two or three thousand dollars, and although my tenant is a lessee for a long time and could not rent his rooms, he goes on and pays his rent, and he says "A better day will come. I am sure it will be all right."

Q. They pay their rents promptly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How does the squalor and filth of the Chinese quarter compare with other parts of the city, or, in other words, is the filth and squalor of the Chinese quarter greater than that of some other parts of the city?—A. The squalor of the Chinese quarter is not much greater than that which exists in other parts of the city from other people. Of course their quarter is disagreeable, because it is perhaps more densely populated, but there is less care taken of it. If ample care were given by the city authorities toward the drainage and the cleaning, I do not think they would be much inferior to the squalor, for instance, such as I saw nearly at the summit of Telegraph Hill a day or two ago. I was called to see a sick child up there, and the filth and stench from want of cleanliness was terrible. I can take you down to the lower part of the city, below Montgomery street, and show you much more squalor in the form of neglect, want of drainage, and want of proper care, than you would find in the Chinese quarter. There has been a great exaggeration in all those charges against the Chinese. At the same time I do not pretend to say that that quarter might not be cleaner. They would be clean if they were forced to be so, and if the city authorities did their duty. If Senator Sargent would permit me, without thinking that I would offend him, (certainly I hold him in the highest respect for his genius,) he has surely been misinformed in regard to some parts of the drainage-system of the Chinese quarter. In his speech in Congress he declared that the stench of certain quarters through which he was conducted was intolerable. Undoubtedly it was, but that was the fault of the sewer system and of the city's drainage more than the fault of the Chinese.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. For instance, doctor, I referred in that speech to cases of vaults overflowing the alleys that I had passed through. In a number of cases the stench was very overwhelming?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I thought that a people who could live comfortably among such surroundings were very dirty in their habits. What criticism is there in that view? How does that apply to your criticism?—A. What I considered that you referred to was rather in the under-ground or basement region of the quarter which you visited.

Q. Let me say, in regard to that, I went down one, and I think two stories, if my recollection serves me, under-ground, where the Chinamen were living, and where one man would be cooking over a little brazier, two or three would be lying upon bunks smoking opium, I suppose. I had to stoop, my head striking the top of the room, and on the floor were some loose boards with the ooze coming up between the boards. I inferred from that circumstance, which was not a single case, but a number of them, that a people were not very cleanly in their habits or a desirable population who could be contented in such places. What criticism is there upon that?—A. There might be some of them who are very unclean, and that may have taken place, but that was chiefly owing to a want of authority either from the health officer or the city authorities, because they could easily have been made to clean the place and forced to ventilate it. They would have complied cheerfully, and that quarter would have been redeemed.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the care bestowed upon the Chinese quarter by the city authorities? Is that treated as carefully and as fully as other parts of the city?—A. I have been under the impression for a long time that it was, but I have since been informed that most of the garbage-carts, and the sweeping of the streets is done at the expense of the Chinese, and not at the expense of the city; that they are left to take care of themselves.

Q. That was testified to here. Do the city authorities employ such carts in other parts of the city?—A. The city authorities undertake to clean the city in other parts, and very likely they may extend their care occasionally through that quarter. I see a great deal of cleaning through the Chinese quarter. I see carts going through there, and except early in the morning, when they are required to throw out garbage, the streets are quite clean, such as Pacific street and Jackson street. If you go through there in the morning it is disgusting, because the garbage is thrown out in the street and it is very foul.

Q. You have lived in the Chinese quarter a good deal. What are their habits in regard to quietness and keeping the peace? How does that quarter of the city compare with other parts of the city?—A. Occasionally the Chinese have a fight or riot among themselves, and they fight very fiercely when they do fight; but excepting those cases, I never heard of any trouble there.

Q. Are those outbreaks common or seldom?—A. They are very rare.

Q. Do they ever attack the white people?—A. I never knew them to attack the white people. They may occasionally attack them when they are offended or insulted.

Q. I mean are they the aggressors in troubles with white people?—A. I have never seen a case in which a Chinaman was the aggressor.

Q. On the other hand are they sometimes assaulted by the whites?—A. They are much more sinned against than sinning. They receive a

great deal of crimination, and yet the occasions of recrimination are exceedingly rare; yet it is not because they lack the courage; it is because they are overawed and prefer peace. They wish to live here and make their money in peace. If they were not so maltreated, I think they would feel a great regard for the American people.

Q. When they are assaulted or cast upon, do they generally resist?—A. They occasionally resist, but they generally make the best of it and get off.

Q. What do you mean by "make the bestof it"—that they submit to it?—A. They submit to it and leave. I have seen a great many cases of assaults upon Chinese. I saw a couple of Chinamen looking in a window on Kearny street not long ago. They were perfectly clean, perfectly quiet, well dressed men, simply looking into a window, and a man some 18 or 19 years old, perfectly well dressed, dressed like a gentleman, stepped up and gave one of them a tremendous blow in the face and ran away.

Q. This occurred on the outside on the street?—A. Yes, sir. A few days ago a Chinaman was carrying a load of shoes across Montgomery street. A lot of boys, and there were some men among them, hooted him and tried to cut the string. They succeeded in knocking off a shoe. The Chinaman looked back, saw his shoe, but preferred not to return for it. I picked up the shoe and walked toward him extending the shoe to him, but he did not dare to come back. Some persons called out to me to let the shoe alone. Presently when the Chinaman took courage, came back, and got his shoe, and certainly you would not from an educated French gentleman see more courtesy and thankfulness displayed. He smiled and took off his hat saying: "I thank you, I thank you," showing by that that he had a high degree of politeness in his nature, whether he was a Chinaman or not.

Q. Was the Chinaman carrying new shoes?—A. Yes, sir. The boys evidently tried to destroy the cordage of the shoes and scatter them about, and of course the Chinaman would have lost them. This happened right in Montgomery street.

Q. In the day-time?—A. Yes, sir; in the middle of the day. I beg to finish what I was about to say in regard to the hospital. This was a neglected place, and at present it is very dirty. They could not put their sick up in this good room because the hoodlums from the neighborhood were constantly bombarding it with stones. The Chinese told me I would do them a great favor if I would get some one to go and suppress a woman who lived next door to the hospital, who kept a hoodlum boy, a son, and a dog, and whenever a Chinaman was coming up to this hospital, which is in the alley, they would be attacked. One of the patients got up and showed me where the calf of his leg had been bitten by the dog. The Chinaman who conducted me through the hospital who knew the place, on hearing that, was unwilling to go out of the hospital by the way he came in and preferred to go out by another way. Such a terrorism exists over them there that they dislike to go in and out their own establishment. That hospital is now in decay, because the society has a better house, a temple, on Pine street. The stones laid all over the building, and these hoodlums had broken the windows, and it really showed a state of aggression which was terrible, and that, too, upon a hospital.

Q. What is the protection or the care extended by the police to the Chinamen? Do you consider that they do their duty in protecting the Chinamen or not?—A. I have never seen a policeman actually refuse to

do his duty. I have seen them occasionally use the Chinamen roughly unnecessarily. I think that the police do their duty.

Q. In protecting the Chinamen from the attacks of hoodlums?—A. I think they do their duty, though it is under their oath of office and as a duty, and not because they are anxious to favor the Chinamen at all. I do not think the police as a body are favorable to the Chinese, but they perform their duty according to their oath of office.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In regard to syphilis much has been said in connection with the Chinese. Can you throw any light upon this subject?—A. They have the disease like other races. Wherever masses of population are crowded together in a large city, of course there is a great deal of disease. I do not think it is any more, nor do I think it is worse, among the Chinese than that which originates with other people. I certainly have seen worse cases of it among the whites in New York, in Europe, and here than any cases I have seen of syphilis among the Chinese; and I have seen a number of cases with them. The disease in some parts of Europe is fatal in three days. In one place that I visited I saw a case which went through its course and was fatal in four days.

Q. The testimony of Dr. Toland taken before the State senate committee has been referred to. What sort of establishment did he keep? Was his practice that of an ordinary family physician in this city?—A. He was a physician in the hospitals, a surgeon. His own office is like any other physician's, a place where the sick congregate during his office-hours.

Q. Did he not have a free dispensary there?—A. I do not think the doctor ever had a free dispensary.

Q. I mean did he not have a place there where he gave advice free to these people?—A. Not that I know of, to the Chinese; he may have done so.

Q. No; not to the Chinese, but to anybody who chose to come to his office.—A. No; I do not think he ever kept a free dispensary.

Q. I do not know that I use a proper term. I mean a place where he received patients, consulted with them and advised them, without charge.—A. No doubt that was his office on Merchant street. Of course, like any other physician, he would advise the poor gratuitously, but the doctor always had his own pharmacy and dispensed medicines. I do not think he dispensed for nothing except in cases of great poverty.

Q. No; he charged for medicines but did not charge anything for his advice. Was that it?—A. I think he did as others do in that respect. He graduated his scales to the exigency of the case and the purse of the patient.

Q. I only wanted to know whether his experience would be a fair illustration of the experience of family-physicians in San Francisco.—A. I think it would.

Q. Do you think that every family-physician has the same number of syphilitic patients that he speaks of having?—A. I do not know how many he spoke of having. There are specialists of that disease who probably have more than he.

Q. Have you ever in your practice met with any case of that kind among respectable people, boys having the syphilis?—A. Yes, sir; I think so.

Q. Where from?—A. Where did they get it?

Q. Yes. Dr. Toland spoke of the boys getting it from the Chinese prostitutes.—A. In order to have you understand the subject I had bet-

ter make a general statement in regard to Chinese prostitutes. We see them on the street very frequently with their hair beautifully dressed and showing great care; and I think they are as cleanly with the other parts of the body as they are with their hair. It is their interest and their necessity to be so. Now, I will speak to you as a physiologist on that question. That is one of the strongest points that is alleged against the Chinese. I am afraid I shall be considered as an engaged advocate for them, but I am speaking entirely independent of any solicitation from any parties whatever, from any quarter whatever. I am entirely independent in my views, and I will give them to you as a physiologist upon the question of prostitution. If you have 90,000 Chinamen, if you permit them to be here, if they exist, they must have their women. That physiological necessity of man must be satisfied or crime must ensue. It is amazing, it is astonishing, such a population of Chinese being in our country, and there being so few women to satisfy that necessity of nature, that so little crime results from it. It has been stated here that there are 4,000 Chinese prostitutes in the State. There are certainly not as many as that here. It is also stated that there are about a thousand Chinese prostitutes in San Francisco. That number is too little. There should be more. If they could be kept under proper restraint and proper cleanliness, an increase of their number would be an advantage to the Chinese population in keeping them in the bounds of decency. It is in vain with any people, white, yellow, or black, when populations crowd into cities, that there shall be no prostitution. It is irrepressible; it is a necessity. If there is a certain supply of women of that character, the family is much more sacred and much more pure. The statement about the disease propagated among the boys by Chinese women is nonsense.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You refer now to Dr. Toland's statement?—A. I am giving my own views.

Q. You say the statement about it is nonsense. Do you refer to Dr. Toland's statement?—A. I am not referring to Dr. Toland's statement at all. I forget what he said upon that subject. I am giving my own view. I am not spokesman for Dr. Toland or anybody else. The hoodlums—the boys—go among them, and the white men—sometimes sailors, sometimes the wanderers of the coast—and the Spaniards go among them, and they go more to molest, to annoy, to disturb them, than to use them; and when they use them they do not get more malady than by going to other houses. When boys go among them and contract disease, they are of that class and of that vicious habit that they would go there or somewhere else. They will be in mischief and they will go where the mischief is worst in order to get the more gratification in their dissipation; and if they contract their first baptism of blood there, it is perhaps better than if they should contract it somewhere else. They deserve what they get, and if they get it cheaper, perhaps it is better on that account. The statement that the morality of our white boys is influenced by going among the Chinese is a gross exaggeration. Very few, anyhow, go among them for that purpose. They can go farther and fare better. They go to molest, to annoy them.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Which is it, the white prostitutes or the Chinese prostitutes, who inflict the most evil, morally, upon our population?—A. I do not like to make comparisons. The number of white prostitutes, of course, outnumbers the Chinese very greatly, and the Chinese portion is but very

little seen by the white population. There is immorality of course when an excess is committed. I think that the whites rather excel the Chinese; for I think that a bad woman is worse than a bad man.

Q. I speak of their influence upon virtuous people.—A. I do not think the Chinese exercise any influence among the white virtuous people, because they do not go among them.

Q. How is it with the white prostitutes?—A. They exercise a very degenerating influence upon them as a matter of course. But it is inevitable in large cities. Where men are unable to be men of families, they are nevertheless subject to the law of nature, and they must go among the prostitutes.

Q. Do not the white prostitutes frequent our most fashionable thoroughfares; do they not promenade in rich and luxurious attire; and are they not more likely to have a bad effect upon poor white girls than any Chinese prostitutes can have?—A. I think so, if there is a comparison to be made at all.

Q. And with the virtuous white young men, which class is it that seduces them from virtue and allegiance and sends them off as defaulters, running away with a woman?—A. As far as their depravity is owing to female influences, it is, of course, the white prostitute more than it is the Chinese in this city; but I will say this for our city, that for a city of its population as compared with cities of the same population in Europe and the East, I believe that we have more immunity from diseases of that class and from prostitution than any of them.

Q. And from those occurrences?—A. And from those occurrences, although we are a seaport town.

Q. As to young men in trusty positions becoming defaulters and running off with women, that sort of thing, you think, occurs less here in proportion than in eastern cities?—A. I do. I think we have a better city in that respect than Boston, Paris, London, or Rome itself.

Q. And a more quiet city generally, do we not?—A. I think so.

Q. Better police, better government, better regulated?—A. No, sir; I do not admire our police; I do not think it is strong enough; I think our police force is very defective, and I will tell you candidly why: any person now whose vocation keeps him away from his home after 12 o'clock in the center of the city, and who is required after that hour to walk home, if he should live at some distance, is not secure of his life. General Leonard was garroted a short time ago. I have been the subject of it myself on Montgomery street. I say that for the want of police strength a man scarcely dares to go to his own home late at night if it is some distance from his place of business.

Q. Garroting, highway robberies, riots, the rolling in drunks, the drinking in saloons on the water-front—are the Chinese here ever guilty of those classes of crimes?—A. Not to my knowledge. I never knew anything of that kind among the Chinese.

Q. Such classes as I have enumerated are very common?—A. They are very common.

Q. Roping in unsophisticated strangers?—A. That is very common. I think the Chinese have a great advantage over us in that respect.

Q. Who has the advantage on the score of drunkenness?—A. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman. They drink some whisky, but moderately. Their dissipation is rather in opium. They use that; but the cases in which they become maniacal from opium and lose their health are less frequent.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You mean in reference to the police, that we have not enough of them? That is your idea?—A. I mean that we have an insufficient police.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You mean that it is good as far as it goes?—A. I do not complain of it as far as it goes.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you think your testimony is colored any by your interest in reference to your property?—A. I am open to that allegation, but perhaps I may show vanity if I express my thought, that if it would benefit my country to destroy my property, the country is welcome to the property. It has not colored in the slightest my views of the Chinese question.

Q. The place named Stout's alley is named from your property?—A. The name is Ross street. It was once called "Murderers' alley," because at that time the property was occupied more by white prostitutes than by Chinese; and there were murders committed there.

Q. Is it now occupied by Chinese prostitutes?—A. It is not now.

Q. Has it before been so occupied?—A. Quite extensively.

Q. Why not now?—A. Because the police have raided them out; but they have gone from there to light again somewhere else, the same as if you drive a fly from one place it must alight somewhere else.

Q. Is your property occupied by Chinese tenants?—A. By Chinese tenants, and the basements were occupied by Chinese prostitutes.

Q. Do you know whether or not at one time there were some eighteen tenements of prostitution there?—A. I do not know the number of them.

Q. The statement of the number does not surprise you?—A. No, sir. Nearly all those buildings through that street were occupied by women.

Q. What extent of property have you there?—A. My lot is 64 feet 6 inches by 137 feet deep. One-third of it is improved by buildings.

Q. A three story brick building?—A. Brick buildings.

Q. What rent do you get for the whole of that property per month?—A. I do not think it is necessary; and I did not come here to expose my financial affairs. I only came to give information.

Q. Do you get large rents?—A. I get much better rent from them, and it is more promptly paid, than from white tenants. I never hear riotous conduct among them, and never hear them swear.

Q. Have you property in other portions of the town?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then all you have is invested in the Chinese quarter, from which you get handsome rents?—A. That is all the real estate I have in the city.

Q. Are you a member of the State board of health?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you hear or read the testimony of Dr. Meares, health-officer of this city?—A. I am a member of the State board of health, and he is of this city.

Q. Did you hear his statement?—A. I read his statement.

Q. Do you concur with him?—A. No; I think the doctor is under the influence of prejudice against the Chinese. While I consider him a man of veracity and probity to the highest degree, I yet think he has exaggerated his dislike to the Chinese. I dare say he fumigated my house, and it was done immediately after the house had been thoroughly repaired, and the drainage corrected, and put in excellent condition. Having had prostitutes in the house, I determined, inasmuch as the police had raided them out, not to have them any more, because I am

no more an advocate of any impropriety than any other man. I had the lower part of the building converted into stores. The terror or fear of Chinese that they are going to be punished is such that it prevents my lessee from even letting the stores, with the exception of two or three. Seven stores are still unlet, in consequence of the fear the Chinese are under of being punished.

Q. Then this agitation of the Chinese question is somewhat prejudicial to your interest as a landlord in the Chinese quarter?—A. It injures me very much. I was about to say that I had not objected to the fumigation, nor would I object to any act which is considered a police act of the city. I would rather assist them, to my own disadvantage, than not. I hope he did fumigate the premises; but it was utterly unnecessary, inasmuch as the house was built for white people, and is full and amply ventilated in every respect. If you will permit me to continue one moment, I will state what belongs to the question in regard to the five hundred feet of cubic air law. Perhaps more atrocity has been perpetrated upon the Chinese through the misconstruction of that law than can be imagined. Certainly, if the outrages had been perpetrated upon an Englishman or upon any other nation having power, we would have had a war, we would have had a fleet here to demand redress. The intention of the cubic-air law has been misapplied. That provides for San Francisco an area of five hundred cubic feet of air. In England I think it is about six hundred. In France it is rather less. It is intended to guide architects and to guide builders in regard to the area that is necessary to build upon according to the number of patients or the number of persons who are to enter into the building. If I wish to build a pavilion hospital, one story, for a thousand patients, my architect will multiply the thousand by five hundred cubic feet in a proper manner, in order to distribute the building. He will take half the area, if the building is two stories, and one-third the area if three stories. If proper ventilation is given, an area of five hundred feet is unnecessary. If there is no ventilation, a thousand feet are not enough. If you will confine a man with a gas-light twenty-four hours in five hundred cubic feet of air, he will probably die; but if you put in ample ventilation, and consequently change the air, twenty men might live for a week in it. You may place a man in a close box, in his coffin if you like, and if you drive, with a bellows, sufficient air through it, he may live for a long time. The cubic air law has been applied simply and entirely to molest and drive out the Chinese. They have been taken at midnight, without regard to their clothing, without regard to the weather, and taken from their sleep, perhaps, from their close manner, their bodies in full perspiration, and driven down to the station-house at the city-hall, where they have been packed into closer rooms than they were taken from. I will venture to say if you will look at Dr. Stifer's hospital under the city-hall at midnight, and apply to it the five hundred cubic feet law, you would have all his patients removed to some other place; and if you would apply the five hundred cubic feet law in other parts of the city, even in the houses of the rich, you would very often have to arrest some person and place him in closer quarters, either in the city jail or under the city-hall.

Q. You speak of prostitution here, and you think there is an insufficient number of Chinese women engaged in prostitution, not more than is required for the general health of the Chinese?—A. No, sir. I think that if you look at it in a hygienic view, and according to principles of political economy, and not as a question of morality, they have not their adequate supply.

Q. Then if the Rev. Dr. Gibson is withdrawing Chinese prostitutes from their vocation, and devoting them to other business, he is interfering with the hygienic and political welfare of the community of the Chinese?—A. You are trying to lead me into a contradiction with myself, but I think you will not do it.

Q. Not at all.—A. My view is this: I would never deny reformation to a prostitute. I would not approve of any woman in special being a prostitute. I would, on the contrary, do all in my power to avert the evil. That would be my duty; but, it being an established thing, and populations requiring them, irresistibly, what can I do further? It is the function of Mr. Gibson, as a clergyman, to act upon their souls, their religious feelings, and their principles, and restore them, if not to a commendable place in society here, at least to their salvation in heaven.

Q. But as you do not entertain those views, entertaining perhaps exactly different views, how do you reconcile them?—A. I hope the gentleman will understand that I speak in reference to Chinese prostitution in this city only, and in a philanthropic view as regards the necessity of prostitutes to man, as a physiologist and as a physician.

Q. In carrying out that philanthropy, if the Rev. Dr. Gibson should withdraw eighteen prostitutes from their vocation, you would supply them with eighteen more from some other source?—A. I would not go into the business at all, but if they came, I should not think they were doing any harm.

Q. You would favor their introduction and rent them buildings?—A. I will tell you more. I think they should be allowed to come with the same facility that any other immigrants come, and I do think that if twenty thousand reputable Chinese females, virtuous women, could be brought into this city, and accepted into the family, it would be a great advantage. Of course, you understand what I mean by the family; I speak in a general sense. I mean the human family as it is constructed, the social family.

Q. That is, respectable females would be an advantage to the Chinese?—A. Of course. You heard what I said.

Q. Do you not think also it would be an advantage to introduce a reasonable number of Chinese prostitutes to ply their vocation in the absence of the other class?—A. As they came, I should not expel them; I should not wage war upon them as a special class; I should not encourage the idea that the immorality of the city is going to be exceedingly purified by their being driven from tenement to tenement until they are finally perhaps driven into the poor-house or back to their native country.

Q. Then, so far as your opinion and advice would go, you think this war by the mayoralty and the city authorities upon the Chinese prostitutes is an unwise one?—A. I think that the municipality should use legitimate means and proper sumptuary laws to guard the morality of the city. I do not object to sumptuary laws; but I do not believe that the entire expulsion of these women would do good. I believe in limiting that as in limiting every other misfortune of the human family to the smallest amount.

Q. You have spoken somewhat upon ethnological questions. How do you think the Chinese race can assimilate with our people?—A. Directly, not well. No two races have been known to assimilate well. The black and the white assimilate and the quadroon and the octoroon become quite a different people. There is no fear of it; but suppose that the immense horde of Chinese that is talked about should, like a tidal

wave, come over here. They would not assimilate except in rather rare cases. The assimilation would set in after a time, when the Chinamen had learned to adopt our customs, had learned our language, had obtained our views of social life. Then they would intermarry. There have been intermarriages already in this city.

Q. Then what would be the result of that intermarriage? What is the kind or character of progeny that it would produce as compared with our people? Would it elevate them?—A. I think if a first-class Chinese woman and a first-class white man would marry, it would be a very much better cross than the white man on the negro or than the white man on the Indian.

Q. Would that race be perfectly fertile as it went on by that miscegenation?—A. Undoubtedly it would, I think.

Q. We had some testimony here yesterday of a scientific character showing that they would be imperfectly fertile.—A. I disagree with that view.

Q. Do you believe that this race could become homogeneous with ours?—A. Infinitely more so than the negro or Indian, and to far better advantage.

Q. I am not making that comparison, because they cannot become homogeneous I think.—A. Races by a mental instinct avoid each other. I will explain why I give preference to the Chinaman. The Chinaman comes from a country which has an established nationality and an established civilization; he is already sharp and highly cultivated. We may say not highly cultivated. We have nothing to do with their peculiarities, but they are a highly cultivated race in their way. The negro has nothing to fall back upon. Your Africans fall back into the barbarous races of men. Consequently the effect would be different if they were to come and flood us as an immigration; and I do not know why they have not as much right to emigrate from Africa if they come as freemen into the Eastern States as the Chinamen to immigrate to this coast. There is no objection made to the immigration of the negro.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Because it does not exist.—A. It could exist very easily. If any one saw fit to send agents to contract for labor in Africa, I presume that they could colonize with the blacks as well as they could colonize with Germans, with Irish, or other colonists.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you express your opinion that the intercommunication of the two races, the white and the Asiatic, would be as desirable in its effect as the interchange between the European races and ours, for instance the Irish and German?—A. I have only to call the gentleman's mind to the fact that we believe the human race emanated from Asia, and that the European races are extracts of Asiatic origin.

Q. Do you understand that the European comes from an Asiatic root, a Tartar root, and from the same source as the Chinese?—A. Tartary is only one country of Asia. Tartary is the extreme eastern confine of China.

Q. What is the distinction between the Aryan race and the Chinese?—A. There is a difference.

Q. Our root is the Indo-Germanic, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. It is quite distinct from theirs?—A. Ours is white, theirs is yellow, Africa is black, America is red. Those are distinct families of the human race. They have become distinct; but their origin is from the high plateaus of Eastern Asia.

Q. Take the race that has been produced in Mexico by the intermarriage, we will say, of the Aztec and the Spaniard. What sort of people do they produce, good or bad, inferior or superior?—A. The old Aztec and Toltec races, you know, have disappeared, and a Central American population exists. I think there has been a degeneration of the Spaniard on the races which they found existing when they came there. I think it has been rather the result of subsequent want of proper cultivation.

Q. What was the result of the crossing of the French, the early people, we will say, who went to Mackinaw and Canada, crossing with the American Indian? Was the result of that to deteriorate or otherwise?—A. The result was an improvement.

Q. An improvement on the Indian or an improvement on the Frenchman?—A. An improvement on the Indian. Yet if you take the time to analyze it closely, where the progeny lost some good qualities, it gained other good qualities, and *vice versa*.

Q. You believe in the general possibility of the amalgamation of all races without injury to either?—A. I think, under the circumstances of education, all nations can amalgamate.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is it not stated by writers on these subjects that at those places where different races of men meet and commingle, the population produced contains the vices of each of the parent stock and less of their virtues?—A. I think that the result of miscegenation is degeneration. I think the more the pure races keep together the better for the race; but in many cases very brilliant results take place where you would rather expect to find great degeneracy.

Q. That is, individual instances seem to differ from the rule?—A. Yes, sir. Again, the circumstances of life may make the virtuous portion of the man's character prominent and never call forth the vicious.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In your observation of this Chinese question, from what source does this opposition to the Chinese arise, from what class?—A. I think it arises from a misconceived view of the competition of the Chinese against the other class. It is jealousy and ignorance combined.

Q. From what class of the inhabitants of San Francisco are the men who are going on these Chinese excitements periodically? What class do they belong to, socially, politically, and otherwise?—A. They belong chiefly to the laboring classes. They are mechanics and laborers. Then they are prompted on.

Q. By whom?—A. By the youth. They are prompted on to molest them.

Q. Does politics cut any figure in it, to be plain?—A. I cannot prove that it does, but I think that the Chinese question has been used as a political lever to a very great extent. It has been my impression that the Chinese have received more mercy after an election was over.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. From what class of people does the support of the Chinese come, their advocates? In other words, does it not come from the people who are making money out of them?—A. You ask me a question, and then invite the answer. I do not think the money-making out of them has prompted any class. You combine the two questions into one. The more intelligent and the more highly cultivated class of our population is that which most strongly advocates the Chinese. Again, that class

advocates the Chinese which constitutes the house-keeping, the family, of our city. That class is rendered happy by the presence of the Chinese. Life at home was becoming almost intolerable, and in consequence of that you have found family after family, again and again, in all classes, breaking up and going into tenement-houses.

Q. You assume that the families who hire Chinese all approve Chinese immigration?—A. I do not assume anything.

Q. Do you know of a single instance among the circle of your acquaintance, and if so name it, of a respectable gentleman who favors the increase of immigration of Chinese to this State, in unlimited numbers, unless he is interested pecuniarily in their coming?—A. You are getting too deep for me.

Q. Not at all. You are a member of the clubs and associations, an old resident, with a large social circle. I ask you to name one such gentleman who is in favor of Chinese immigration.

Mr. BROOKS. I favor them.

Mr. PIXLEY. I am asking the witness to name one. One of the questions propounded by the commission is what is disinterested public popular opinion in regard to the immigration of Chinese. I ask you from your position, social standing, membership of clubs, and personal acquaintance, to name one disinterested intelligent gentleman who is in favor of Chinese immigration who does not make money out of them.

The WITNESS. The philosophy of the *ego* controls your view. You expect a man to be entirely disinterested, and to act without any self-interest at all. I presume that we are all, that there is not a man in the State who is not making money out of the Chinese.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) Then you cannot name any such person?—A. I will name yourself. You probably do not make money out of them.

Q. I am not of the class who favor their coming. I am opposed to their coming. Perhaps you had better name Mr. Brooks?—A. I would as lief name Mr. Brooks as any other gentleman.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You were about to make some explanation in reference to the operation of the cubic air ordinance?—A. I had got so far as to say that if it were applied to all classes, nearly every block in the city would be found defective. In view of that, I have drawn this parallelogram to represent a block, [exhibiting.] The houses, of course, are built around the block. Each house has its privy here. We will divide somewhat the houses into two sections. The most of the houses have a front for the ornamental room, the social room. The rear rooms are for the bed-rooms, the servants, and for the children. In most part, the houses will be occupied at night, especially more in the rear than in the front. The air coming up from all these places [illustrating] passes into the windows, and infects the rear rooms more than the others. If you could make an investigation, you would find that, in a great many cases, these rear rooms are occupied by more people than the cubic air law allows. That is the view in a general way.

Q. You are speaking of rooms occupied by white people?—A. Yes, sir, white people.

Q. Then you mean to say that the cubic air law is violated by whites as well as by Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; it is misapplied in its intent.

Q. Is it enforced against whites as well as against Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you mean to say that it is enforced only against Chinese?—A.

There may be occasionally a case where it is enforced for appearance' sake against whites; but it is enforced against the Chinese. It has been used as a lever to molest them. There is no doubt about that in my mind.

Q. Who is responsible for this partiality in the administration of the law?—A. I think that the head of the government is greatly responsible for it, because it is in his power to see to the equal application of the law.

Q. Who do you mean by the head of the government?—A. I mean the mayor, the chief of police, the board of supervisors. I should like to make this remark as to my opinion of the Chinese: if one-half of the aggressions that have been made upon the Chinese in this town had been made upon white men of any other nation, we would have war. The time may come, and I fear it, when the Chinese government will have a right to reclaim damages for the injuries upon their people.. I think the queue ordinance is applied entirely to molest and injure them. It is a most illegal and monstrous mutilation of a man without sufficient cause; and if there should be a demand made for damages, or a reprisal, the State would lose immensely. Cut off tea, taking just that one article, and what is the family to do for its tea-table? The injury in the one article of tea alone would be irreparable, if the Emperor of China should suppress commerce in tea by war, or by way of revenge.

Q. Are Chinese servants employed in this city to any considerable number?—A. I think they are at present to a very considerable extent.

Q. What proportion of the people who employ servants here employ Chinese in their houses?—A. I could hardly strike the proportion.

Q. I mean to say, are there many of those employed?—A. A great many; and the number is increasing greatly, to the satisfaction of those who employ them, as far as my experience goes.

Q. Does it run up to thousands?—A. O, yes, sir. I think that all classes employ them. I think those who are their opponents employ them.

Q. I want to ask you what degree of trust is reposed in these Chinese servants as a general thing by housekeepers?—A. I think the same that is accorded to the servants that are employed of other races, black or white.

Q. Are houses left in their charge as frequently as they are left in the charge of other servants?—A. I do not think that the family requires some of its members to stay at home and keep the house when they have a Chinaman any more than they would feel the obligation in having other employed help.

WILLIAM M. DYE sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Insurance-solicitor, principally among the Chinese.

Q. How long have you been in this city?—A. Eighteen years.

Q. How long have you been engaged in your present business?—A. About twelve years.

Q. What branch is it, marine and fire insurance?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Both?—A. Both.

Q. Do you charge any greater per cent. to insure in the Chinese quarter than in other parts of the city?—A. No, sir; there is no difference whatever.

Q. Are your employers desirous of obtaining business of that kind among the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; they are very desirous; they are offering a premium for it even.

Q. Is that usual in other cases?—A. I think not. I think that the profit has been so great by insurers of Chinese property that a premium is offered for that particular insurance over that of white people.

Q. Why do you say that it is so much more profitable?—A. There are less losses. There may not be fewer, but they are smaller in amount generally.

Q. How do fires in the Chinese quarter compare in number with fires in other portions of the city; less or more?—A. Less. There are more fires on an average from the kitchens, of course. Where there are fires kept in any house, there is more danger than in a part of the house where there is no fire; and there are more fires in proportion to the number of houses among white people than among Chinese.

Q. In the same proportion of houses?—A. Yes, sir; taking the same proportion of houses.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Durkee's testimony yesterday?—A. I did.

Q. Durkee states that there have been more fires in that region within the last six years than elsewhere in proportion. Will you give us your experience. Has there been any serious burning of a house in that district in the last five or six years?—A. I am certain that for fifteen years there has not been a single building entirely destroyed in the Chinese quarter. My attention has been called to that matter particularly. There have been two or three shanties, certainly not more than three, that have been utterly destroyed; but they were of no great value at all. Probably the value of these wooden structures which were burned entirely was not more than from two hundred to five hundred dollars apiece.

Q. In the settlement of losses, where you have had a payment of insurance, how do the Chinese compare with other races?—A. I am specially employed by the Liverpool, London and Globe Insurance Co., in this city. It is supposed to be the largest insurance company in California.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How does it compare with the State Investment?—A. It stands much higher, in this way: The company which I represent has paid $60,000,000 of losses in the United States. My employer told me that he would prefer to settle a loss with the Chinese rather than with white people; that they were more reasonable in case of fire and partial loss. There is a desire among all people to get all they can on their policy, but the Chinese I know from personal observation are more reasonable, and settle more reasonably than white people.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Does the State Investment Insurance Company take Chinese policies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They do business with the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The State Investment of which my friend Pixley is a member?—A. Yes, sir; they pay a larger premium than other companies to get that insurance.

Q. Does the State Investment seek policies there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is part of your testimony?—A. Yes, sir; I have my books to substantiate it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What do you mean by paying a large premium?—A. Some companies pay a broker, who brings business, 5 per cent., some will pay 10 per cent., some will pay 15 per cent. The brokers are very desirous of getting business that will pay 15 per cent. The State Investment pays 15 per cent.

Q. Is that the name of an insurance company here?—A. Yes, sir; a local company.

Q. That is owned here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that they pay a higher premium for Chinese risks than others?—A. I do not say that that company pays more than other companies pay. That company pays the same price, however, for insurance in that quarter. I do not know of any white people being insured there. I have very little to do with that company, but I know from the Chinese business they pay a higher commission than the Imperial Insurance Company or the Commercial.

Q. Do you mean the company will pay a higher commission to the broker to get the policy?—A. Yes, sir; my business is to go out and persuade people to insure. I find a person who wants insurance; I take it to that company which will pay most to me for bringing the business there, outside, however, of the company that I specially represent. They are restricted by some rules from their home companies to certain classes and certain localities. For instance, they will not take any insurance of this building, (the Palace Hotel,) and so, outside of the business they will take, I am at liberty to place it where I please.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do they take risks on Chinese property, or do they make a discrimination?—A. They take all property, although there are two or three companies that have lately objected to taking such insurance; the Home Mutual, for instance.

Q. Insurance on Chinese property?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have they discontinued it entirely? A. They have discontinued it entirely.

Q. If fires are so infrequent among the Chinese, and so little destructive, why should these companies refuse to take that business? A. They are certainly more frightened than hurt, because they never lost a dollar, with the exception that they had to pay marine insurance to them when vessels have been lost; but I am speaking about fire.

Q. You are speaking about their giving up the insurance of Chinese quarters on land?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. These companies are conducted on business principles?—A. O, yes.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Name one of those companies?—A. The Home Mutual.

Q. Is the office here?—A. The office is here; it is a local company. The Commercial, a local company, also declines that business. The Royal, whose office is in London, declines that business. Those are the only three, out of about seventy, that decline Chinese insurance at all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have they recently begun declining, or have they always declined?—A. Only recently. All of them have formerly taken Chinese insurance; large amounts.

Q. Did all of these companies stop at once, or did one stop, and then another, and then another?—A. They have all stopped within a year.

Q. And not all on the same date?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then that would imply a tendency on the part of the insurance companies to cease taking this business, would it not?—A. I think not.

Q. A year ago there were none who refused, and now three companies refuse?—A. I am not afraid of that tendency, because when I show my balance-sheet to even the most timid they change their minds.

Q. You think that your powers of persuasion would overcome their convictions?—A. Of almost any president of an insurance company.

Q. Your interest is solely in this business?—A. Yes, sir; my business is to remove any prejudice that a director of an insurance company might have against insuring that property.

Q. Do you think that the insurance of property surrounding Chinese property is charged higher?—A. I know it is not. I know it from the books in my office and from my own observation.

Q. Let me understand you. Suppose there is property on Mission street which is insured at a certain rate, and in the midst of that property a Chinese wash-house is set up. What is the effect on the insurance of the surrounding property? Is it increased?—A. It is increased, but it is not increased any more than it would be if it was a white man's wash-house or any other laundry.

Q. It is not increased more?—A. No, sir; the insurance is not increased because of the fact that it is a Chinaman's laundry. Laundries pay a uniform price.

Q. How does Mr. Bigelow stand as to his knowledge of the insurance business?—A. I think that Mr. Bigelow has taken a wrong view of the injury to adjoining property by the presence of the Chinese.

Q. All these persons who differ with you of course are wrong. When he testifies to a fact that it cost a great deal more to insure on account of a Chinese wash-house being put in a neighborhood, is he in a position to know what he testifies about?—A. Yes, sir; he is.

Q. And you admit his correctness as to his facts?—A. Perhaps the committee do not understand that the rates of insurance are determined by certain scales. A wash-house pays one price, and a house adjoining that pays the same price as a wash-house, because it is endangered by it.

Q. These Chinese wash-houses are being scattered pretty much all over the city within the last few years, are they not?—A. They are about this city; yes, sir.

Q. And have been increasing during the last few years until the city might be said to be districted by Chinese wash-houses?—A. Yes, sir; that is true.

Q. Then the effect of that has been to raise the insurance which our people have had to pay throughout the city, necessarily, if the presence of one of these wash-houses makes a difference?—A. Not to any alarming extent.

Q. It does not alarm you who have the business, but how about the men who have to pay the insurance? If a man has a house on a street which he pays one-half of one per cent. to insure, and a Chinese wash-house comes and sets down by the side of him, and he has to pay three per cent., it does not alarm you who have the profit, but how is it as to alarming him?—A. There is no doubt but what that does increase the insurance in the rest of the city.

Q. All over the city?—A. Adjoining those places.

Q. You admit that those houses have been scattered all over the city, as if by plan or system, so far apart?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then it has had the effect of raising the insurance all over the city, and that is one disadvantage the people of the city have had in the insurance line by scattering this property among them?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is the insurance of adjoining property increased because the wash-house is a Chinese wash-house, or just because it is a wash-house?—A. Just because it is a wash-house. The insurances are classified in differ-

ent kinds of business, and houses occupied by Chinese or white people pay the same rates.

Q. If the wash-house is necessary, therefore, it makes no difference whether it is a Chinese or an American wash-house; it has the same effect?—A. It has the same effect of increasing the insurance to the adjoining property.

Q. You spoke of three companies that have declined Chinese risks.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I ask you whether, in your judgment, this excitement against the Chinese here has had anything to do with regard to the action of those companies.—A. Not the least. One of those companies, the Home Mutual, insured, unfortunately, two ventures, by which they lost between sixty and seventy thousand dollars; but they were on steamers, the steamer Japan and the steamer America. They were lost about four or five years apart, and they were so put out at that circumstance that they determined not to have anything more to do with the Chinese. They thought they were an unlucky class to deal with. I think that was the prompting of the Home Mutual; but in firing business they never lost a bit of risk that I placed there, and I do not know of any other Chinese fire insurance that they lost. In the case of the Commercial, they had, I think, not less than four or five Chinese fires at short intervals, and they were rather unsatisfactory in settlements—that is, they thought they had overinsured, and they concluded not to have anything to do with that class of the community. In the case of the Royal, the agent of the Royal told me that they wrote him from London that they would decline that business on account of the fear of riots and incendiarism

Q. Growing out of opposition to the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you ever know an American wash-house in San Francisco?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they not rather in the outskirts?—A. No, sir; there are some white establishments right in the Chinese quarter of the city.

Q. How many of them?—A. There are three within a stone's throw.

Q. Is that all?—A. No, sir; there are others besides them; a block away there are two more.

Q. Is not the Chinese wash-house a peculiarity of this city, and are they not scattered all over the city? In other words, is it not the fact that were it not for the Chinese wash-houses the washing would be done by women in families more largely than it is done?—A. Yes, sir; I think that is true.

Q. That has been displaced by the Chinese wash-house, has it not?—A. The French may get their washing done at their laundries; but I refer to Americans usually.

Q. Has not this system of the Chinese wash-house absorbed the business and consequently multiplied the number of wash-houses?—A. I do not know that it has, but I think it is very likely.

Q. These wash-houses are little shanties.—A. I beg pardon; they are not little shanties; some of them are substantial brick buildings.

Q. In the Chinese quarter?—A. Outside of the Chinese quarter; in different parts of the city.

Q. Are there not hundreds of wash-houses in this city?—A. I think there are not one hundred.

Q. Are there seventy-five?—A. I think there may be in the neighborhood of one hundred, but to run up to the hundreds would be an exaggeration.

Q. Are there wash-houses carried on by Americans to the extent of one hundred or fifty?—A. Yes, sir; in the outskirts.

Q. Outside of this question of insurance and the effect upon neighboring property, is it not a peculiarity in the wash-house establishments that these Chinese wash-houses in the city scattered about among them are shanties, some occupied in non-fire-proof brick buildings?—A. I do not doubt but that they do increase the insurance on the adjoining property; but I think that property is increased in value by the convenience of having those wash-houses scattered about the city which is sufficient to overbalance it.

Q. Do you think it also overbalances the want of the employment of women who would do the washing if the Chinamen did not? If a man can get his washing done on the next block instead of three or four blocks, do you think that would overbalance the extra cost and the extra risk of burning up his house and goods?—A. I have a doubt in my mind whether he could get those convenient laundresses that you spoke about.

Q. How much of your life have you spent in California?—A. Over eighteen years.

Q. Where did you live before coming here?—A. In New York City.

Q. Did you ever get washing done there?—A. I was a poor boy in New York City, and did not have much washing.

Q. Do you know whether there is any difficulty in a man getting clean shirts if he goes to New York?—A. The washing was done in the house in New York; and at that time and before that time I knew of but one or two large laundries, and they did up shirts for manufactories. There was no such laundry in New York City, I think, and I was familiar with the whole city. I do not think there was a regular laundry in New York City at that time, like there is in San Francisco, doing miscellaneous washing.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I will ask you if there are not now through all the eastern cities laundries with signs up?—A. I have not been in the East for eighteen years, except on a visit.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Are you a native of New York City?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are or are not premiums higher on property occupied by Chinese than upon property occupied by white people?—A. No, sir; the premium is no higher.

Q. Is the premium for insurance on Dupont street, between Clay and Sacramento, no higher than it is on Kearny street between Clay and Sacramento?—A. Not one cent.

Q. Do you insure Chinese personal property at the same rate that you insure white personal property?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there not a great rivalry here between insurance companies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. This particular company that you act for is the London Globe?—A. Yes, sir. I do not think our house is unreasonable in their rivalry. They want to get a fair share of the business.

Q. What premium do they usually pay for procuring insurance?—A. Ten per cent.

Q. You say the State Investment pays 15 per cent.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know that?—A. From being benefited in that way.

Q. They have paid you 15 per cent.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they pay all their solicitors 15 per cent.?—A. I think not.

Q. How do they happen to pay you 15 per cent.?—A. There is a little history about that.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What system do you proceed upon? If you have an insurance do you effect it in the name of a company or do you effect it and sell it to such company as will pay the most for it?—A. I have placed insurances, that is, I have taken insurances, to as many as forty different companies. I have placed insurances on Chinese property in probably not fewer than forty companies; but I have an arrangement with my employer to give him the pick of my business, and I place the rest elsewhere.

Q. Do these other companies understand that the business has been covered over when you bring it to them?—A. Yes, sir; and some of them object to it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. If you insured a ship and her cargo worth a hundred thousand dollars, does your company take it all?—A. No; we distribute it around to other offices.

Q. What amount do the Chinese pay of insurance, to your knowledge?—A. They pay of fire insurance probably not less than $5,000 and $6,000 a month. For marine insurance, they pay not less than from $6,000 to $7,000 a month.

Q. Who supports these hundred laundries carried on by Chinese?—A. White people mostly. Some few Chinese patronize Chinese laundries.

Q. Generally white people support these hundred Chinese laundries?—A. Yes, sir.

CHARLES CROCKER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been in this State?—Answer. I have been here twenty-six years.

Q. What has been your business?—A. For the last fifteen or sixteen years I have been building railroads.

Q. The commission is here to get information in reference to the Chinese question. You have had considerable to do with the employment of Chinese in constructing railways, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you commence the construction of the Central Pacific with Chinese or white labor?—A. We commenced with white labor.

Q. How long did you continue it?—A. We never discontinued it; we have always employed white labor.

Q. I mean how long did you continue with that kind of labor extensively?—A. We continued about a year and a half, when we found we could not get sufficient labor to progress with the road as fast as was necessary, and we felt driven to the expediency of trying Chinese labor. I believe that all our people were prejudiced against Chinese labor, and that there was a disposition not to employ them.

Q. You mean that the railroad people were prejudiced?—A. Yes, sir; especially Mr. Strobridge and myself, who had charge of the construction more particularly. I had the charge of the construction and Mr. Strobridge was under me as superintendent. He thought that Chinese labor would not answer, including what they eat, and other things, and from what he had seen of them; he did not think they were fit laborers; he did not think they would build a railroad. We advertised very

thoroughly and sent circulars to every post-office in the State inviting white labor, and offering large prices for that class of labor, but we failed to get over 800 men. Our force, I think, never went much above 800 white laborers with the shovel and the pick, and after pay-day it would run down to six or seven hundred, then before the next pay-day it would get up to 800 men again, but we could not increase beyond that amount. Then we were compelled to try Chinese labor, and we tried them on the light work, thinking they would not do for heavy work. Gradually we found that they worked well there, and as our forces spread out and we began to occupy more ground and felt more in a hurry, we put them into the softer cuts, and finally into the rock cuts. Wherever we put them we found them good, and they worked themselves into our favor to such an extent that if we found we were in a hurry for a job of work, it was better to put Chinese on at once. Previous to that we had always put on white men; and to-day if I had a big job of work that I wanted to get through quick with, and had a limited time to do it in, I should take Chinese labor to do it with, because of its greater reliability and steadiness, and their aptitude and capacity for hard work.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What are their powers of endurance?—A. They are equal to the best white men. We tested that in the Summit tunnel, which is in the very hardest granite. We had a shaft down in the center. We were cutting both ways from the bottom of that shaft. The company were in a very great hurry for that tunnel, as it was the key to the position across the mountains, and they urged me to get the very best Cornish miners and put them into the tunnel so as to hurry it, and we did so. We went to Virginia City and got some Cornish miners out of those mines and paid them extra wages. We put them into one side of the shaft, the heading leading from one side, and we had Chinamen on the other side. We measured the work every Sunday morning; and the Chinamen without fail always outmeasured the Cornish miners; that is to say, they would cut more rock in a week than the Cornish miners did, and there it was hard work, steady pounding on the rock, bone-labor. The Chinese were skilled in using the hammer and the drill; and they proved themselves equal to the very best Cornish miners in that work. They are very trusty, they are very intelligent, and they live up to their contracts.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. As to their social, moral, and financial effect upon this coast I wish you to be elaborate in giving your views to the commission, as you have had great experience that way. How as to their advancement of this State or otherwise?—A. I think that the presence of the Chinese as laborers among us goes very far toward the material interest of the country; that without their labor we would be thrown back in all branches of industry, farming, mining, reclaiming lands, and everything else. I believe that the effect of Chinese labor upon white labor has an elevating instead of a degrading tendency. I think that every white laborer who is intelligent and able to work, who is more than a digger in a ditch, or a man with a pick and a shovel, who has the capacity of being something else, can get to be something else by the presence of Chinese labor easier than he could without it. As I said before, when we were working 800 white men, and that was the extent we could get, we began to put on Chinamen. Instead of our white force decreasing it increased, and when we had 8, 9, and 10 thousand Chinamen on the work, we had from 2,500 to 3,000 white men. Instead of these white men

being engaged shoveling dirt, or with a pick and shovel, they were teamsters, mechanics, foremen, and men in an elevated grade of labor, receiving wages far above what they would have done if we had had the same number throwing up the dirt and digging in the rock. I know of a great many instances where men have come on to the road and taken a foremanship over Chinamen, and have acquired a little start which they afterward used, and they are now independent citizens, owners of farms, owners of corner groceries and stores in the country towns, &c. The start they got they would not have got without the help of Chinese labor. I believe, to-day, if the Chinese labor was driven out of this State, if there are 75,000 Chinese laborers here to-day, there are 75,000 white laborers who would have to come down from the elevated classes of labor they are now engaged in and take the place of these Chinamen, and therefore it would degrade white labor instead of elevating it. That would be the effect it seems to me without any doubt, and it would be a very hard pill for our white laborers to take. There is a certain class of white laborers in this country, as in every other country, who go on to railroads and all public works, who are not capable of elevation; they will not elevate themselves. They only expect to be day-laborers, and the more money they get for their labor the less labor they do. It is a notorious maxim among railroad men, that the lower the wages are, the more work you can get out of white laborers. That is curious, but it is true, and it is illustrated by an incident that occurred on our work, which a gentleman told me, and I will relate it here. We were working in the heavy work just this side of Colfax, and the stage road from Virginia City passed alongside of the railroad at that point. There was a very heavy cut there, and we had employed white laborers at that time to work on it. We, at that time, thought that only heavy things could be done by white labor; but there were some Chinamen near by. This gentleman spoke to one of these laborers, asked him what wages they were receiving. I think we were paying $35 a month and board to white laborers, and $30 a month to Chinamen and they boarded themselves. Said the workman, $35. The gentleman remarked. "That is pretty good wages." "Yes," says he, "but begad if it wasn't for them damned nagurs we would get $50 and not do half the work." That is an illustration of the effect of high wages on that kind of labor. There are men among that same nationality, that same kind of men, who are good men, who when they have an opportunity will get themselves up and elevate themselves. There is proof of that in the fact that after we got Chinamen on to the work, we took the more intelligent of the white laborers and made foremen of them. I know of several of them now who never expected, never had a dream that they were ever going to be anything but shovelers of dirt, hewers of wood and drawers of water, and they are now respectable farmers, owning farms. They got a start by controlling Chinese labor on our railroad, and they are good, trusty men. But there is a class that will not do anything else but what they are doing; and those men, no matter whether the Chinamen are here or whether they are not here, never will be anything else but what they are. They will work just long enough to get something to buy liquor with, and then they will spend their time drinking it up.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the character of the Chinese whom you have employed, for temperance?—A. They are all temperate.

Q. Have they peaceful habits?—A. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman on the work, and I do not know that I have ever met a

drunken Chinaman on the streets. I have no recollection of ever having seen a drunken Chinaman. I have seen them under the effect of opium by going into their rooms where they smoke opium. I have gone around through their quarters as a sight-seer and I have seen them under the influence of that drug, but never under the influence of liquor. Yet they drink liquor.

Q. Does opium have the effect to stupefy them or to make them violent?—A. It stupefies them. They lie in a state of stupor and dream pleasant dreams, as I understand it.

Q. What are the habits of Chinese while at work in gangs? Are they quarrelsome or peaceful?—A. Entirely peaceful. In one or two instances I have known of fights among the Chinese, clannish fights. They have their clans. I think there is what they call the upland and the lowland Chinaman. Mr. Strobridge is better posted on that subject, because he has been among them more than I have. There is a kind of a dark-skinned race of Chinamen who are antagonistic to another class. I do not know that I can describe the difference between them, but they will once in a while clash and fight.

Q. There seems to be some hostility which they have brought with them?—A. Yes, sir; when two different gangs of those men get into the same neighborhood they may clash, but by separating them there is no trouble. So far as the controlling of large bodies of laborers on works of the magnitude of the Central Pacific, we had one strike with the Chinese. We had then our maximum strength. I think that we very nearly approached 10,000 men on the work. The Chinese circulated a document among themselves, all through the camp, and on the next Monday morning they refused to come out. That was done on Saturday, and on Monday none of the laborers came out. It was a strike; they remained idle.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What was the occasion; a strike for higher wages?—A. Yes, sir; I think they were incited to this by emissaries from the other side who wished to keep us in the mountains while they were building the road over the plains. We always supposed they were incited to it by emissaries from the other side, although we never could prove it. If there had been that number of white laborers on that work in a strike there would have been murder and drunkenness and disorder of all kinds; it would have been impossible to have controlled them; but this strike of the Chinese was just like Sunday all along the work. These men staid in their camps; that is, they would come out and walk around, but not a word was said, nothing was done; no violence was perpetrated along the whole line. I stopped the provisions on them, stopped the butchers from butchering, and used such coercive measures. I then went up there and made them a little war speech and told them they could not control the works, that no one made laws there but me. I talked to them so that they could comprehend what the rules and regulations were, and that if they did not choose to obey they could go away from the work, but under no circumstances would I give way to them. I gave them until the next Monday morning at six o'clock to come back, and told them that every man who went to work then should be forgiven for the week's strike, but that all others should be fined. We had a system of fines for men not coming out, keeping foremen and keeping horses at work when there were not enough laborers, and we charged the expenses of the horses and carts to the gang who failed to keep them employed. They well understood what fining meant for the week's idleness, and on Monday morning at six o'clock the whole coun-

try swarmed with them, and we never had so many working before or since as we had on that day. They returned peaceably to work.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you lived on this coast?—A. Twenty-six years.

Q. You have been acquainted with the operations of the Chinese since their first arrival here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State what, in your judgment, is their effect upon white labor; whether they have the effect to deprive white men of employment, or have had that effect at any time.—A. I think that they afford white men labor. I think that their presence here affords to white men a more elevated class of labor As I said before, if you should drive these 75,000 Chinamen off you would take 75,000 white men from an elevated class of work and put them down to doing this low class of labor that the Chinamen are now doing, and instead of elevating you would degrade the white labor to that extent. For any man to ride through California, from one end of this State to the other, and see the miles upon miles of uncultivated land, and in the mountains millions of acres of timber, and the foot-hills waiting for some one to go and cultivate them, and then talk about there being too much labor here in the country is simply nonsense, in my estimation. There is labor for all, and the fact that the Chinamen are here gives an opportunity to white men to go in and cultivate this land where they could not cultivate it otherwise.

Q. You think, then, there is no conflict between the interest of the white and the Chinese laborer?—A. No, sir; I think if the white laborer understood and realized his true interest he would be in favor of the present proportion of Chinese labor in this State. I think that there might be an increase of the immigration to such an extent that it would be injurious, but the present equilibrium is not too much. I think that one in ten is about the number that is healthy.

Q. Do you mean one Chinaman to ten white laboring white men?—A. I mean the entire white population, one laboring Chinaman for ten white persons as they are generally enumerated for population.

Q. Do you think there are too many Chinamen here now?—A. No, sir; I think the number is just about right. I believe that not long ago there were a few too many of them, but they went away, seeking other places for profitable employment. I believe the law of supply and demand will regulate itself if they are left alone. I recognize a Chinaman as more than an ordinarily intelligent man, and they will not come here unless they can get profitable employment. When there are too many here they will go somewhere else; they have done that repeatedly. There have been times when there was a less number in the State than now, and there have been times in 1864 or 1865 when, I think, there were more Chinamen here than now. Whenever there is a scarcity of labor for these Chinamen you see them taking the steamers for home, and when there is a demand for their labor they come.

Q. You think this law of supply and demand would regulate their coming without any legislation by Congress?—A. I do. I believe the best thing to do is to let the subject alone and leave it to regulate itself, and it will regulate itself. There may be a time for a month or a year or eighteen months when there are too many Chinamen here, but they find they cannot get labor, and go away.

Q. Is there among intelligent people here an apprehension that the State is liable to be invaded by vast hordes of Chinamen?—A. I do not know what public sentiment is more than as I meet persons on the street.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. As an old citizen, suppose we should call a convention here, after all political matters have been settled, and pass a resolution saying that both political parties in convention agree to submit to the voters of the State of California the question of Chinese immigration, yes; or, Chinese immigration, no. What, in your opinion, would be the result of that ballot?—A. I believe if it was argued calmly and deliberately before the people, without any of this hue and cry, eight-tenths of the people would vote for the amount of Chinese labor there is here now. You can get up a hue and cry against the best man in the world, and hang him, if the newspapers will only say enough about it. If the politicians and men who harangue the people will talk fast enough and hard enough you can get them to hang a good citizen; but if you will argue this question legitimately before the people on its merits, without any partisan feeling, you can come down to any man who owns a little homestead, if it is only worth $500, and I believe that eight-tenths of the people will vote for the amount of Chinese people that is here now. I believe that if to-day the question could be presented to the people of California, free from partisan politics—free from that agitating tirade against a race, particularly on account of their color, their manners and customs, and all that—the people to-day would vote against this anti-Chinese sentiment. That is my opinion. That is what I say, and I mix in the community. The men I come in contact with are farmers and men who have got something to work for, and they feel that way. They are in favor of them. I know when I was a boy I assisted in riots in the city of Troy, New York, when the Irish immigration was coming into the country. This same hue and cry was raised against them, and there were riots against the Irishmen. It was said they were going to overrun the country, and the people were mobbing them. Well, the Irishmen have never hurt us, I believe. I believe they have done us a great deal of good; but at that time it was argued that the Irishman was going to deluge the country and ruin the country, and that there would be no chance for an American.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Where were you born?—A. In Troy, New York, on the Hudson River.

Q. Were you born rich?—A. No, sir; very poor.

A. You worked for a living, did you not?—A. I am a working man, and always have been. I started from home when I was 16½ years old, owing 62½ cents, without a copper in my pocket and not a change of clothes, and I have never received any assistance from any living man since unless I paid him for it and interest upon it.

Q. You were a contractor for the construction of the Central Pacific Railroad?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any money out of that contract?—A. Yes, sir; I made all I could; just as you would, and just as other men would do.

Q. You say that you employed ten thousand Chinamen?—A. About that number; I never knew exactly how many.

Q. Did you make more money out of that contract by employing them than if you had employed white men?—A. I think I did.

Q. You preferred to employ Chinese because you made more money out of the contract by employing them?—A. No, sir; as I said before, I tried my very best to get white men.

Q. Answer my question. I do not want to go into an argument.—A.

I choose to answer questions to suit myself. I do not intend to place myself in a wrong attitude before the committee.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have a right to explain any question before answering it.—A. I say I did not prefer the Chinamen at all; I was convinced that I had to employ them in order to complete the work; I preferred white labor.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Did you not once pretend to sell out your interest in that railroad?—A. No, sir; I never made any pretensions whatever.

Q. Was it not asserted that you did sell out?—A. I did sell; I did not make any pretension about it; it was an actual fact.

Q. Was not the reason of your selling the fact that your conduct there as a contractor so incensed white men against you that there was fear of their burning up and destroying your works?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was that not so stated at the time?—A. No, sir; it was not.

Q. You actually sold out there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You then bought back?—A. Yes, sir; do you want to know why I sold?

Q. That was the reason given at the time.—A. It was not the reason given at the time.

Q. That was the common report.—A. I never heard it.

Q. Had they not been burning up and tearing up tracks and burning sheds there before you sold?—A. Not more than they have since.

Q. Have there been any since?—A. Yes.

Q. Was it not the common report?—A. Nobody ever dared stop any work that I heard of.

Q. They burned their sheds; that is, you assumed they burned them?—A. The sheds caught fire from the engines, and, in one instance, we thought they were set on fire, but we never could prove it.

Q. Was it not the common report that these things were set on fire on account of your conduct in employing Chinese labor to the exclusion of white labor?—A. Allow me to say that the American River bridge we believed was burned by incendiaries, actuated by this feeling that was manufactured against the company on account of their employing Chinese labor. At that time, and at the time of the burning of the Sacramento bridge, I had just moved into my new house in Sacramento. A woman came to my wife and told her she overheard a plot to burn my house.

Q. On account of your employing Chinese labor to the exclusion of white labor?—A. Not to the exclusion of white labor. We always employed every white man who came to the work while we were building the Central, and I dare any man to prove the contrary. We never turned away a white laborer, for we wanted all the labor we could get, and we could never get enough of Chinese labor or white labor.

Q. You say you never got anything you did not work for?—A. Never.

Q. Did you work for that $27,000,000 in subsidies that you got?—A. I never got $27,000,000 of subsidy.

Q. How much did you get?—A. That is my business. I got all I could, I assure you.

Q. You got very nearly that, in the neighborhood of it.—A. No, sir. I do not think that has anything to do with this matter.

Q. You went into an elaborate explanation about the Chinese.—A. I have a deep feeling in regard to the interests of this State.

Q. You are a common carrier; that is your business?—A. Yes, sir; I am interested in that.

Q. Chinamen especially ride a great deal on your road?—A. Yes, sir, and white men.

Q. The more Chinamen you have to ride on it, the more passengers you get?—A. The more white men the more passengers we have.

Q. The Chinese ride more than the white men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are more profitable passengers?—A. No, sir; they are not so profitable because they generally ride second class.

Q. Is not that the same class that other passengers ride?—A. No, sir; it costs just as much to ride second class, but we would rather have every man ride first class, and would rather furnish them with a drawing-room car and let them pay for it.

Q. The more people that come to California, whether they be Chinese or white men, the more profit there is to your road?—A. Yes, sir; that is so. We are deeply interested in the prosperity of this State.

Q. I suppose so; and you are a good deal interested in some other things. You are interested in a steamship-line between here and Hong-Kong?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the prosperity of that line depends in a great measure upon emigration and immigration?—A. It may incidentally.

Q. I say it does; does it not?—A. Yes; in some respects.

Q. Suppose there were no Chinese going to and fro between here and Hong-Kong, do you think you could run your line with profit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is precisely what I want to know. You think that these steamship-lines between here and Hong-Kong can be run profitably as a business proposition by these Chinese companies? You are not in the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, are you?—A. No, sir.

Q. There are two companies profitably engaged?—A. You are changing the nature of the question. You asked me about the line I was interested in, and now you say these lines. I do not believe both lines could be supported without the aid of the immigration.

Q. You believe you could run your line profitably as a business proposition independent of emigration and immigration of the Chinese to and fro?—A. Yes, sir; I wish to explain, however, in respect to that matter. Our Oriental Steamship Line is an auxiliary of the railroad. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company at one time refused to give us any teas; they refused to receive any teas in China consigned to New York over the railroad. They carried that on for a year and we did not carry a pound of their teas, excepting some few that were shipped here at San Francisco and then transshipped, which made it more expensive. In order to get that business, which we in some measure built the road for, and for which Congress argued the necessity of the road and the people of the United States justified the building of the road, we organized this steamship company and went after that tea. Whether we made any money off of those ships particularly or not, we brought the tea to the road and made some money on the road. It brought business to the road and carried the business through this country instead of carrying it through a foreign country by the way of Panama. We did that because we thought it was our duty to do it and our profit to do it.

Q. As a fact, you cannot run your steamship alone profitably, as a business proposition, independent of the emigration or immigration of Chinese from Hong-Kong to this port?—A. I think we can run those three ships as we run them, in connection with the railroad; and viewing

it in that light, one company could run without Chinese immigration, but I do not believe that the Pacific Mail Steamship Company could run theirs also.

Q. You are a very rich man, are you not?—A. I do not know, when my debts are paid. I do not know how much I am worth. I owe a good deal of money, and have a good deal of property.

Q. What men, other than capitalists and large land-holders, have you ever heard express the idea that Chinese immigration to this coast was an advantage?—A. I have heard farmers and fruit-raisers, I have heard manufacturers, I have heard small mechanics express that opinion.

Q. What mechanics?—A. Mechanics who have a family and must have a servant to do a little work, when they could not afford to pay thirty and forty dollars for a female servant. They are willing to take a Chinaman at twenty dollars. They can afford that, but they could not afford forty dollars for white servants.

Q. You mix a good deal with that class, do you?—A. Yes, sir; I have always been a friend of mechanics, and I believe they are friendly to me. I think I am as good a friend of the workingman as there is in the State of California.

Q. Were you or were you not very much opposed to negro slavery?—A. I was, always. I was an abolitionist from a boy.

Q. You were prominently engaged in the underground railroad to some extent?—A. What do you mean by that?

Q. It is a common expression.—A. Explain yourself.

Q. You were so much opposed to slavery that you would have aided a negro to escape?—A. If a negro slave came to my door and wanted bread he would get it, and if he wanted a little money to help him along to freedom he would get it.

Q. Do you or do you not believe that the Chinese immigration to this country has the same tendency to degrade free white labor as that of negro slavery in the South?—A. No, sir; because it is not servile labor.

Q. It is not?—A. It is not; it is free labor; just as free labor as yours and mine. You cannot control a Chinaman except you pay him for it. You cannot make any contract with him, or his friend, or supposed master, and get his labor unless you pay for it, and pay him for it.

Q. Did you ever make contracts with the six companies or any particular Chinaman to import here a certain number of Chinamen to work upon your roads?—A. I never made any contract with the six companies. I made a contract with a merchant here.

Q. With any one?—A. We made a contract with Koopmanschap.

Q. For how many Chinamen?—A. I told him all he would bring, up to 2,000. He brought 500.

Q. When you employed Chinamen, did you employ the individual Chinamen, or did you employ some man to furnish you with a certain number of Chinamen? Did you employ your Chinamen that you worked on that road as individual Chinamen, or did you employ some boss Chinaman to furnish you with so many men?—A. The way the labor was employed on that road was this——

Q. I speak of that road, or this road, or any road.—A. On any road when we employed them for labor we have always procured our Chinamen through the house of Sisson, Wallace & Co. here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. They are white men?—A. They are white men, a mercantile firm here.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What are they—Americans?—A. They are Americans; one of them is a very good democrat.

Q. I am not talking politics now; that is over.—A. You inquired so particularly.

Q. I simply want to know whether they were English, Chinese, or Americans?—A. I do not want you to think that republicans have made all the money out of the Chinamen.

Q. That is immaterial.—A. That house furnished us with Chinamen. They gathered them one at a time, two, three, four of them in a place, and got them together to make what is called a gang, and each gang is numbered.

Q. Just like mules?—A. Well, sir, we cannot distinguish Chinamen by names very well.

Q. Like mules?—A. Not like mules, but like men. We have treated them like men, and they have treated us like men, and they are men, good and true men. As I say, we employed them in that way. They come together in gangs of twenty-five and thirty, as we need them to work on a job of work, and the account is kept with the gang, No. 1, No. 2, 25, 30, 50, 100, just as it is. Each gang has a book-keeper to keep the account among themselves. We have a foreman and he keeps the account with the gang and credits them. Every night the Chinese book-keeper, who is one of the workmen and works in the pit along with the rest, comes up with his book, and he says so many days for that gang, do you see? and they count it up and they agree, and each puts it down. Then the Chinese keep their own accounts among themselves; but we keep an account with the gang. When the pay-day comes the gang is paid for all the labor of the gang, and then they divide it among themselves.

Q. Does the same thing obtain with the white men?—A. No, sir; we get the individual names of the white men.

Q. You do not pay the individual Chinaman when he works for you?—A. We pay the head-man of the gang.

Q. Some head-man?—A. He is a laborer among them.

Q. You do not pay them in the same manner that you pay white men?—A. In the same manner, except that we cannot keep the names of the Chinamen; it is impossible. We would not know Ah Sin, Ah You, Kong Won, and all such names. We cannot keep their names in the usual way, because it is a different language. You understand the difficulty. It is not done in that way because they are slaves.

Q. Is it not a kind of servile labor?—A. Not a bit. I give you my word of honor under oath here that I do not believe there is a Chinese slave in this State, except it may be a prostitute. I hear of that, but I do not know anything about it. If you do, you know more than I do.

Q. Can a Chinaman immigrate from this State on your steamers or the Pacific Mail Steamship Company's steamers as free as a white man can?—A. Certainly.

Q. It has been testified here by Mr. Gibson and others that they cannot.—A. What is that?

Q. Can the Chinaman immigrate as a white man does, and pay his passage on your steamers or the Pacific Mail Steamship Company's steamers as freely as a white man?—A. If he cannot I do not know it; I am not familiar with the regulations.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Must he have anything like a permit from the Chinese companies to go?—A. Not that I know.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. It has not been testified that the Occidental and Oriental Company had any such regulations?—A. I am not familiar with the regulations.

Senator SARGENT. (To Rev. Mr. Gibson.) Did you refer only to the Pacific Mail or to the other lines also?

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. I referred at the time to Mr. Otis. I think it is a system that prevails on all the steamers. I suppose Mr. Crocker does not know anything about it.

The WITNESS. I know they are very strict about their debts; that they must pay their debts before going away, and I wish the practice was just as good among white men.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You are from New York?—A. I am from the city of Troy, six miles above Albany, on the Hudson River.

Q. Do you think these Chinamen who are here are as much advantage to this State, to its well-being, both morally, materially, and politically, as the same number of immigrants from the State of New York and from New England would be?—A. No, sir. If we could get the same number of New England men here, I would rather have them a good deal.

Q. You think it would be more advantage to the State, both morally, socially, and politically?—A. Undoubtedly; but I do believe in the same connection that the presence of the Chinamen does not prevent the New Englander from coming; but, on the contrary, when the New Englander comes here he can use the Chinaman very much in opening a farm, and cultivating it after he gets it open.

Q. Then, that is to say that the Chinese are an inferior race—to be employed as servants and laborers by us, their superiors?—A. We are superior when we prove ourselves superior. There are a great many white men who do not prove themselves very much superior.

Q. I speak of the general run of white men.—A. The general run of white men, I think, can get along in California a little better than any Chinamen, particularly in walking the streets in peace and comfort.

Q. In your opinion, is it not building up a kind of servile labor here, as you have admitted yourself?—A. No, sir; I have not admitted it. I have told you, on the contrary, that I do not believe there is a slave among them. I do not think when you employ a man and pay him his wages that it is servile labor because he works in my wood-yard. I would do it myself if I could not hire a man to do it. If I were "busted" to-day and could not get any better work to do than sawing wood, I would saw your wood for you.

Q. You know what peonage means?—A. I have heard of it.

Q. You know in Mexican or Spanish-American countries there is a system of peonage?—A. Yes, sir; where a man gets in debt and he has to work it out. But they keep charging him more than he earns and he never gets the debt paid.

Q. Does not that system prevail among the Chinese here to a great extent?—A. No; I do not believe it; I never heard of it.

Q. Do you think that the Chinese immigration here is equal to the European immigration which comes to the United States, in a moral, physical, material, and political sense? Compare the Chinese with the same number of European immigrants who would come to this country.—A. I believe that the same number of European immigrants coming here would be a better class of population politically, and possibly morally, though I do not know anything immoral in the great multi-

tude of the Chinese. There may be immoral people among them, but I do not see it; I do not go out where their immorality is practiced. It certainly is not on the streets; it certainly is not on the railroad, where we have large numbers of them; but I believe that white population is better for the country than Chinese population.

Q. I am glad to hear that from you.—A. Do not understand me to have said, for one moment, that I would not prefer white labor to Chinese labor if we could get it; but my point is that the Chinese labor enables white men to come here and cultivate land, and cultivate it without Chinese labor. In the proportion that I say now and for years to come, of one to ten, the Chinese are a good, healthy element in our political body.

Q. Suppose that no Chinamen had ever come to this coast, do you or do you not believe that an equal number of white immigrants would have come from eastern States and Europe to fill their places as laborers and mechanics?—A. No, sir; I do not. I do not believe that the presence of the Chinamen has ever prevented a white man from coming here.

Q. Do you not know that a great many laboring men come from the East here and cannot find employment and go back?—A. No, sir; no one who really wants work ever did come here and go back. I have employed lots of them and know when they want work.

Q. Do you not know that you carry back a great many laboring men after they come here and stay a month or two months? You have seen them on the trains going back to the East?—A. I have seen them do that when they could go into the mines and make $15 a day; they would get discouraged and go home or to some other place. When I was getting $15 and $20 a day a man alongside of me would get discouraged and say, "Damn the country," and go home. I have seen that, Senator Sargent has seen it, and you have seen it if you have lived here that long. I do not know whether you are an old Californian or not.

Q. Older than you.—A. You have seen them, then, in all stages of our existence as a people.

Q. Does that feeling obtain among the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; lots of them turn around and go back as soon as they can get off. Some of them get discouraged, some of them get homesick, and they go back.

Q. Then you do not think Chinese labor is better than white labor?—A. No, sir; I do not believe it is better. I believe it is a mighty good substitute for white labor, and when you cannot get white labor it is good to get Chinese labor.

Q. About as good as negro slavery in the South?—A. I never was a believer in slavery. The poor white man was degraded by negro slavery, because it was a servile labor; but now that the negro is free and can earn his money, the next generation or two will not feel ashamed to labor alongside of him.

Q. You are not much of a philanthropist?—A. I believe I am, as much as any man of ordinary parts. I was always a great opposer of human slavery. By God, I would have given my last dollar to have had them free. Uncle Sam could have called on me for every dollar I was worth, and my life, too, to fight for freedom.

Q. Particularly when you were getting a good many dollars from Uncle Sam?—A. Well, I got all I could from him. When I make a bargain I make the best one I can, and I live up to it right to the last item.

Q. Do you give much money to these missionaries here who are trying to convert the Chinese?—A. I have given some money for that purpose.

Q. Do you think that to convert them to Christianity is going to improve their morals?—A. I am not much of a believer in Christianity, I am sorry to say. I believe "a man is a man for a' that," as the saying is; but I do not know that my belief on religion has anything to do with the matter.

Q. You are a common carrier; that is your business, and the more Chinamen there are here, the more people you will carry?—A. I would rather have white men than Chinamen for travelers. (To the Chairman.) Who is the gentleman who has been questioning me?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Piper, your Representative in Congress.

The WITNESS. Mr. Piper, I did not know who you were when you were questioning me; and if I have wounded your feelings, I apologize.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You think that the proportions of Chinese that we now have, or, in other words, the proportion of one to ten, would be healthful?—A. I think so.

Q. You have explained why you think a less number than the proportion of one to ten might be a disadvantage. Will you please explain why you think a greater number than one to ten would be a disadvantage?—A. That proportion, in my judgment, is a proper equilibrium. I believe when they get to be more than that here they will go away. I believe that has been proved by what has transpired heretofore.

Q. So you only want the number that would be willing to stay?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You do not take into consideration the moral question or the effect upon political institutions? You do not consider any question except whether they will stay or not?—A. I consider that as they are wanted for labor they will come, and when there are too many of them here to find profitable employment they will go away.

Q. I thought that your answer perhaps embraced some care for our institutions, that you thought more than one to ten might injure us in some way more than our labor or advancement of material interest would compensate, but I find you eliminate all such considerations?—A. I have never seen in my experience any injury that the Chinaman has worked to any of our institutions. I have never noticed that they have affected the morals of the people. They keep to themselves. If our people keep away from them, the Chinese will not force themselves upon them. I am speaking now of prostitutes. The prostitutes are slunk away in blind alleys, and if our people keep away from them they are not going to go hunting after our people. I believe if our people want to be debauched, they will find plenty of white prostitutes to debauch them in the absence of the Chinese.

Q. Do you think it would be a good idea to admit the Chinese to citizenship here, as voters?—A. I think we have got voters enough now.

Q. You do not think that would be a good idea?—A. No, I do not.

Q. I should like to ask you if you think the presence of a very large number of a non-voting male class is desirable in a republic?—A. No, I do not.

Q. Then would not that be an objection to there being large numbers of them here, if you think it would not be a good idea to admit them to the ballot? Would not the presence of a very large number of them here, when you think it is against public policy to admit them to the ballot, be a disadvantage, as you say it is a disadvantage to have a large non-voting male class?—A. I will tell you, Senator, I believe in an educational standard for voting. If a Chinaman has lived in our country

long enough to become educated in our language and to understand our institutions, he will make just as good a voter as I will. If he should become a citizen, I believe he would make just as good a voter and have just as much care for his material welfare and prosperity as a citizen as I have.

Q. Under those circumstances you think it would be safe to let him vote?—A. Yes, sir; but I do not believe they are going to remain here long enough to become good citizens, and I would not admit them to citizenship.

Q. Then they make a large floating non-voting class? Is not that undesirable in a republic?—A. If they were white men, speaking our language, and had our aspiration for political power and for influence in society, they would be very undesirable; but as they have no such aspiration, and as they do not desire to be citizens, and they have no particular care about our political institutions, they are harmless and indifferent, and they would not affect our politics, nor affect our morals, nor affect our status in any way, I think.

Q. Do they not really affect our politics? It has been urged here, and stated over and over again, that we get up political quarrels over them. Does it not make quarrels among ourselves, and in that way indirectly affect our politics?—A. I do not think the mass of the people are interested in these quarrels. I think they are the corner-grocery politicians mostly that get up all this trouble about Chinamen.

Q. Did you see the petition of nearly twenty thousand names sent on to me in two large bound volumes which I presented to Congress, and are you aware of the character of the men who signed that petition?—A. No, sir; but I know how easy it is to get up petitions.

Q. Do you think we have in this city twenty thousand corner-grocery politicians and men of that kind?—A. No, I do not think we have.

Q. Are you aware that on that petition there were the names of lawyers, of merchants, of bankers, and clergymen?—A. I did not see the petition.

Q. If you were told that was true, and the names of large numbers of these classes were there, they signing freely, of course, would that modify your opinion, whether this objection to them comes only from corner-grocers?—A. You were asking me about political agitation. I say this political agitation and this quarreling between parties comes from corner-grocery politicians. I do not believe, in other words, that the respectable signers of that petition agitated the public mind about Chinese immigration, or agitated the political parties about it.

Q. Do you think that that political agitation is unwholesome, undesirable?—A. Yes, sir, I do.

Q. Then I ask you if the presence of Chinamen here does not affect our politics unwholesomely?—A. In that respect it does.

Q. Then if they are a non-voting class they may be a bone of contention and a cause of bad blood between parties?—A. Not necessarily; but we are foolish enough to make them so. That is no fault of theirs.

Q. No matter where the fault lies, has not their presence here had that tendency?—A. I think if we quit this agitation and come right down to a quiet atmosphere, politicians would not have so much trouble as they have now.

Q. You and I are old republicans. Do you not know that it was said in defense of slavery, that if we would only stop agitating the slavery question everything would be quiet and lovely; just the same argument that you are now advancing?—A. It is a different thing. They are not parallel cases, I think.

Q. Is it not a fact that the same argument was used in regard to slavery?—A. I know that the southern people used that argument; but I believed in agitation then.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You were an agitator then?—A. I was an agitator then, you bet.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. And you were an agitator on principle, you thought?—A. Yes, sir. I tell you I sacrificed lots for that principle, too.

Q. I know you to be an old republican well.—A. I am an old abolitionist.

Q. I want to know whether the defense of slavery was not also that it enabled the white men to be an employing class, and that here was the labor at their command?—A. No; on the contrary, the poor white man could never employ the negroes.

Q. I am not asking you the fact; I am only testing your information. Do you not know that one prominent argument advanced by the friends of slavery was that it elevated the white man, gave him a class below him, and that he could employ the slave and make money out of him?—A. Yes, sir; that was an argument, but a false argument.

Q. Is not that the argument advanced in regard to Chinamen to-day?—A. The truth is, that was a servile labor, and it made labor with the poor white class what you may say unfashionable or degrading, so that the white men could not afford to labor at the same labor as the slave labor; but a white laborer can afford to labor alongside of a Chinaman when they are both paid for their labor. That is what I believe.

Q. Do you not know that an objection exists in the minds of many laborers in the State to working alongside of a Chinaman because they think that the Chinaman is a degraded person? Do you not know that the objection exists, whether it is sound or unsound?—A. I guess it does to some extent, but I think to a very limited extent now. I think that that feeling of prejudice is fast wearing out.

Q. On the contrary, is not whatever feeling there is against Chinamen as strong now as it has been in our previous history?—A. That kind of feeling against working alongside of them is not as strong as it was, because when we first commenced employing them on the road white men would not work in the same cut with them; they would not work within a hundred rods of them; but now they work right together, and one man will take hold of a piece of iron on one side and the Chinaman on the other. No prejudice of that kind is general now.

Q. You say you think that one to ten is the right proportion, because that is the proportion that would stay. Suppose that one to one would stay, instead of one to ten; would that then be the right proportion?—A. No; I should not like to have so many.

Q. Why not?—A. I think that would be too many of them.

Q. Why?—A. I would not like to have them get so thick.

Q. I want to know why?—A. It would be unpleasant. I do not believe, however, they will ever come to that extent.

Q. Is the only reason because it would be unpleasant? Is it a mere matter of taste?—A. Yes.

Q. That is, you do not like the Chinaman well enough to have him here in that proportion?—A. I cannot imagine such a state of affairs. I think it is overdrawing the thing. It is not one of the possibilities that they will ever come to that extent.

Q. Suppose they do come to that number?—A. I will join you then in preventing their coming.

Q. Why would I be any more right then than now? What is the objection to their immigration? Is it on account of their peculiarities? You do not speak of these matters merely as a matter of taste; neither do I. It is a matter of conviction.—A. There being an equal number of whites and Chinamen in the community is a phase of the matter that I never thought about.

Q. Suppose Congressmen from all the facts were convinced, intelligently convinced, that that is likely to happen within twenty-five years from now. Do you think it would be well for them to take some measures that would look to preventing that enormous influx?—A. I should not like to see an even number of Chinamen with the whites here.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What can a Chinaman live on per diem and support himself, his food and lodging?—A. I do not know. I never figured it up.

Q. What did you pay them per diem?—A. When they were on the work, I was told that the cost of provisions, their purchases at the store, amounted to an average of about $9 a month.

Q. About 30 cents a day?—A. You can get about the exact figures, if it is important to know, from Sisson, Wallace & Co.

Q. What did you pay them per diem for their labor?—A. The most we paid them was $35 a month.

Q. The average was a dollar a day, and they would board themselves?—A. No, sir; it was $35 a month. There are 26 working-days in a month, and it was about a dollar and twenty-five cents a day, I should think,

Q. Can a white man support himself upon the same wages that a Chinaman can?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We will assume that a Chinaman can support himself upon 40 cents a day. I think they say they can support themselves for 20 cents a day. How could a white man, who has a wife, and probably two or three children, support himself and his family on 40 cents a day, or a dollar a day, in this country?—A. I do not think he could.

Q. The Chinaman works for a dollar a day. Our witnesses all swear that that is the common price now for Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can a white man, American, Irishman, German, Italian, or even a Portuguese, who I believe next to Chinamen are the cheapest laborers, work for a dollar a day and support his family in this country?—A. It is not necessary. The presence of the Chinamen obviates the necessity of his doing that kind of labor. The white man gets a better class of labor by the presence of the Chinamen, and he gets better pay.

Q. Do you believe that a white man can support himself at a dollar a day in this State?—A. At the present price of provisions, clothing, &c., a laboring man with a family would have to live very plain and simple on a dollar a day.

Q. Is it possible for them to live in this State now upon a dollar a day, as a white laborer would live in Massachusetts or in New York?—A. O, no; he could not live the same as a laborer lives there upon a dollar a day.

Q. I am not speaking now of a man who is capable of being a boss or superintendent, like you and I were in our junior days; we were probably a little more intelligent or better educated; but can the common mass of laborers, who have to work for their living by the day's labor for pay, live upon a dollar a day and support a family?—A. I do not know whether they could. I cannot answer your question because I never made any figures on it. But the actual wants of a man are

very few, his actual necessities are few, and a dollar a day will buy a good deal of common and ordinary provisions—good meat and good flour. When you come to little luxuries they cost; and a man cannot live as most of our laborers want to live on a dollar a day.

Q. As a matter of fact, coming right down now to facts, would it not be the consequence that the white laborer would have to work precisely at the same price as the Chinaman provided he does no more work than the Chinese laborer?—A. No, sir; I say that the Chinaman's presence here elevates and procures better wages for the whites. That is what I say; and I believe it earnestly. I say that there is a class of men who will always do this kind of work that the Chinaman is doing, and they will never try to do anything else.

Q. Will he not have to work for the same price as the Chinaman, provided he only does the same amount of work?—A. He does not do it. He gets better wages.

Q. You are a philanthropist, I suppose. Suppose you want a certain amount of work of this lower class of labor that the Chinese could do, and you could get them to do it for a hundred dollars, and you would have to pay white men to do it one hundred and fifty dollars, would you employ Chinamen or white men? I take it you are a very liberal man about labor.—A. Men generally look after the dollars pretty closely.

Q. And you would hire the Chinamen, I suppose, if they did the same amount of work for a hundred dollars that the white men would do for one hundred and fifty dollars?—A. I have hired white men and paid them bigger wages than I did Chinamen when I knew that the Chinamen were earning more money for me than the white men. I did it, nevertheless.

Q. The mass of men would do that, I take it?—A. No; I would not do it on a very large scale.

Q. The result is that the white man will have to come down to labor for the precise amount that the Chinaman does, providing he only does as much work per diem. I think that you will admit.—A. No, sir; I do not admit it at all. On the contrary, my evidence has been to show that the presence of the Chinese laborers furnishes a better class of labor for the white man.

Q. I am not speaking about that.—A. That is what I want to speak about, and that is what I want to go on the record here. I do not want to be on the record as saying what you want me to say, but just what I mean and know, and I feel is true. That is what I want to say.

Q. Then you think that the Chinese perform a class of servile labor that white men will not or do not perform?—A. I do not call any labor servile. I believe that there is no man servile because he labors with his hands. I believe the laboring man is just as good a man as you and I. I tell you, if I was broke to-day, I should not consider myself degraded to saw your wood if you paid me honestly for it, which you would have to do if I did it.

Q. Would you be willing to saw it for the same price that I would pay a Chinaman?—A. If I could not get any more. I would get all I could for it, and I would do it well.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Would you like it if the Chinamen would do the work for less than you could afford to do it, and leave you without a job?—A. I would not do as I saw an Irishman do not long ago. He took a job at sawing wood from an anti-Chinaman, and then let out the job to Chinamen and he bossed it. I saw that done, actually.

Q. Suppose the employer would not give you any more than he would give the Chinamen?—A. Then I would be compelled to do it myself.

Q. Would you like that as well as if the Chinamen were not competing so that you could get a decent price and support your family?—A. I do not think the Chinamen would compete with me if I were a laboring man.

Q. Do you not think his wages would compete with you if you were a laboring man?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you not think he would compete with you?—A. No, sir; I believe I could enter the field and beat the Chinaman.

Q. Could you beat him rolling cigars?—A. I would not roll cigars; I would do something else.

Q. By your foresight, industry, and brain-power you have got to be a very wealthy man; but do you think that a man without your education and your knowledge could compete as you could against the Chinese?—A. I never went to school after I was nine years old.

Q. I mean that a man with less of those qualities would be less likely to succeed. Suppose a man has simply that grade of faculties and perceptions which enable him to do common labor instead of becoming an employer. There are many men of that class. If you belonged to that class of men, how then would the competition of Chinamen affect you?—A. I have a better opinion of white men than you have if you think there are a great many of that class. I do not believe there is anybody except a demented fool who is not capable of elevating himself if he has a disposition and a will to do it. I believe those white men who are now occupying low positions in our society here are men who have degraded themselves by their vices; they feed their appetite for liquor and for vicious habits and keep themselves down in that way.

Q. Let me give you an illustration to show you that you do an injustice. There are employed in the hydraulic mines of this State as laborers, miners, under men who own the mines, hundreds, perhaps thousands of white men who work for day's wages. Do you make your remark apply to this large class of men who handle the hose and work in hydraulic mines and work for wages?—A. I am not familiar with men who work in hydraulic mines. I never was among those mines.

Q. They work for wages year after year, and get regular wages, $2.50 and $3 a day. Your remark does not apply to them about drinking whisky?—A. I tell you they do not remain there long; they get a start and get into something better.

Q. You are mistaken. For instance, we have labor in my mine that we have had there for a dozen years, and it always is the same class, heads of sober, decent families, whose children go to school. These men are contented with their wages. Suppose we displace them and put Chinamen in their place. Suppose we can get Chinamen for $1.50 a day and turn off the white men, what effect would that have upon them?—A. If you go to supposing things, I do not know what will occur to these men any more than to any other men; but I believe this, and it is grounded in my experience and from what I have seen here, that the presence of Chinese laborers enables white men to do a better class of work and get better pay than they would if the Chinamen were not here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you not mean to qualify it by saying some white men?—A. I mean the majority of white men. I mean all the white men who have got the faculty of getting along in the world.

Q. This is the class of labor that Senator Sargent is calling your attention to?—A. The Chinamen have not interfered with them.

Q. There is a class of people, we will say, represented by the cigar trade. A young man commences the rolling of cigars, he makes that his pursuit in life clear up to my age or yours, fifty years, say. That is the only occupation he knows, the only business in which he is skilled, the only place for him. He is an unambitious, simple toiler for bread. He has no brain-power; he has muscular power for his business. That class is represented by some 2,000 in this city. Now, then, if the Chinaman comes in and can take that occupation and do better by dextrous finger-manipulation than he can, and at a less price, and turn such a man out of his avocation, what is the result to him and his family and his class?—A. I believe that a white man is better than a Chinaman. I believe that when the brain of the white man rubs against the brain of the colored man the white man will come out ahead all the time. I believe that the man who is bred in the lap of luxury is not as good a man as he who is bred in the lap of poverty, where his necessities impel him to exertion. When the white man comes in contact with Chinese labor he is impelled to greater exertion and he comes out a better man. I believe that the white man has got more brain than the Chinaman, and when he is driven out of a lower class of labor he will aspire to a better class.

Q. But after he has attained the age that I have suggested, is it not exceedingly doubtful? If he had been a cigar-maker up to fifty years of age and was then crowded out by Chinese, what would he do?—A. If I had always followed the business of cigar-making up to my present age, I do not believe there is any Chinaman who would ever beat me.

Q. Then you would be willing to work for his wages?—A. I would make myself so useful that the man who employed me would rather employ me than Chinamen.

Q. Suppose he could get Chinamen at half the price?—A. I would beat him then.

Q. It has been proved here that Chinamen will live on somewheres from ten to fifteen cents a day.—A. O, pshaw! that is all nonsense.

Q. In our State's prison and jails do you know what they pay? What does it cost per capita to maintain prisoners with meat and bread and coffee?—A. They are generally let out to some political friend, and he makes a good thing out of it. He supports them, or pretends to support them, at eighteen and nineteen cents a day, I believe; and I guess they count up the heads pretty fast, and count more mouths than they fill. That is my experience in those things.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You ascribe a great deal to the energy and brain-power of white men who have succeeded?—A. Yes, sir; and to the white race generally, whether they have succeeded or not.

Q. You are a very rich man, and I am a man supposed to be of an independent fortune. Do you not think the fickle goddess has had something to do in our case, so that it was not owing particularly to our brain-power and energy?—A. My answer was to Mr. Pixley's question, I do not take such men as you. You have more than the average brain-power, you know.

Q. Do you not think that the fickle goddess has been rather more favorable to us than our success has been owing to our particular brain-power?—A. I think your own knowledge and capacity have put you where you are. I do not think the fickle goddess has had much to do with you.

Q. And you think the fickle goddess has never had much to do with you?—A. No; whenever I trust to the fickle goddess I come out behind. I never trust to her at all. I go on my own hook.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understood you to advance the opinion that there was no danger of a very great influx of Chinamen so as to overrun the country?—A. From my observation since I have been in California, I believe that the supply and demand is regulated just as all other things are regulated. I believe that if they are let alone the demand will regulate the supply. You may get a few more Chinamen at one time, but they will stop coming here when it is not profitable for them to come; and I think it is not profitable for them to come when they have to live on twenty cents a day, and they would not come here under such circumstances.

Q. Is the number of Chinamen in the proportion to the number of white people in California any greater now than it was ten years ago?—A. No, sir; it is less, much less, in proportion to the white population.

Q. You think, then, that the growth of the white population, in proportion, has gone beyond the growth of the Chinese population?—A. Yes, sir; I believe that the statistics will prove that there were more Chinamen here in 1863 than there are now. There are at least 150,000 more white people here now than there were then. I do not know but that this moment there may be more Chinamen here than there were in 1863, but I think last year there were not any more.

Q. Comparing the Chinese population of to-day with the white population of to-day, is the proportion greater or less than the two populations in 1860?—A. I think that there is a less proportion of Chinamen to white men now than there was in 1860.

Q. As you understand it, the increase of Chinamen has not kept pace with the increase of white population in the last ten years?—A. O, no, sir; I do not think it has.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Looking to the ultimate and final development of our State, do you favor Chinese immigration as against the immigration of western Europe and our eastern States?—A. O, Lord! no, sir. Understand me that I want to be on the record as saying that the white immigrant is worth more to the country than any other.

Q. Why is the white immigrant worth more to the country?—A. Because he can become a member of our institutions and be a white man among white men.

Q. Do you think that our civilization, our morals and religion, and everything, are superior to those of the Chinese?—A. As to that I am not quite so sure whether our civilization is any better than theirs or not. I rather think our civilization is not as good as theirs. I think an American going to China stands a better show for justice than a Chinaman coming to America.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not know that we have to organize our own courts there to protect our citizens; that we do not allow American citizens to be tried in Chinese courts?—A. I do not know why it is done, but I know it is done. I know that we would never consent to let the Chinese have a court here and try Chinamen by it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You regard our Chinese immigration as a temporary expedient, immediately useful and necessary, but in the ultimate future of the

State not as desirable as other immigrants?—A. I do not think that the Chinese immigration prevents white immigration from coming here at all. I think, on the contrary, it helps it.

Q. Would you have it grow apace with our immigration?—A. Yes, sir. I think we have got space enough in the State of California alone for twelve or fifteen millions of people, and if we had twelve millions of white men, a million of Chinamen would not come amiss to do our laboring work, and the State would be more prosperous for their presence.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. I see that you have no prejudice about this matter?—A. No, not a bit. If there is any one who loves California, it is me. I can prove that I have stuck by old California. I love California, and I love its people.

Q. Do you not believe that it is better for all of us that our population should be homogeneous rather than heterogeneous? I mean, so far as white people are concerned, would it not be better for all of us, in the permanent future prosperity of the State, that we should be a homogeneous people, that is, people of one race?—A. What do you call homogeneous? Do you call a Dutchman, an Irishman, and an American homogeneous?

Q. Yes; all of the white race.—A. I do not think they are homogeneous very well. A homogeneous population is better than a heterogeneous population; there is no doubt of it.

Q. You believe that it would be better for the present and future prosperity of the State of California to have a homogeneous population?—A. Now, do not make me contradict myself. I say here, and I have said it repeatedly, that I believe the material prosperity of this State will be advanced by the presence of the Chinese labor, in the proportion of one to ten. If you ask me whether I would rather live in a community which is homogeneous with myself, I say, of course I would rather live in that community.

Q. It is a very simple question to answer, yes or no. Then you think you would prefer a homogeneous population in this State?—A. In the sense that I have spoken of it, I would.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you remember what the entire population of the State was in 1860?—A. I am not very good at carrying figures in my head.

Q. Take the white population?—A. I think that it was in the neighborhood of 600,000; but I am not good at remembering figures.

Q. You were asked if you did not sell out your interest in the railroad at a certain time for a certain reason. Do you desire to give the reason?—A. I sold out because I was threatened with the same disease that my brother died with—that is, softening of the brain. I was working very hard, had been working for a number of years very hard, and I had some symptoms which my physician, who was the same physician who attended my brother, said betokened the same disease, if I prosecuted my business with energy and close application as I was doing. I thought my health was better than all the money in the world, and I said to my associates, "I am going to quit. I am going away. I do not want you to work for me while I am gone, and I will sell." I sold at a very great sacrifice. I was gone two years. I came back, and they very generously said, "Consider this a two years' leave of absence and come right back." I did so. There was no other reason under heaven why I went away, and no other reason why I came back. I

came back restored in health. I felt as strong for work as I ever did in my life, and I went to work, and am working now. I am very sorry that I came back into the road, however. I think I had better have staid out.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. There is great prejudice in this State against the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By a large element of the white population?—A. As I stated, I do not think that it is a very large element. I think it is a very active element. I think that if there was a good square vote on the proposition, Chinese or anti-Chinese, down to property-owners of three or four hundred dollars' value of freehold, eight-tenths of them would vote for the Chinamen.

Q. That prejudice works to the injury now of the Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir; they are insulted, and you see it done in every place you go. For instance, yesterday I saw a boy jerk a Chinaman out of a seat in a railroad-car, which he took himself; and he did it in such a way that he would not have dared to have done it to a white person. All that sort of thing is done. It was a boy who did it.

Q. Do you think that would be approved by a majority of your people?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Do you think it would be just to hold a majority of them responsible for it?—A. I do not think a great majority of the people of California justify any such conduct.

Q. It would be wrong to hold a majority of them responsible for such treatment?—A. I think we are responsible for it, because we do not correct it.

Q. Would you think it right to say that a majority of your people favor it because they permit it?—A. It would be pretty hard to say that. I do not want to say that against California.

Q. Then you would not say that?—A. I do not believe that a majority of the people justify this oppression of the Chinamen.

Q. What remedy would you suggest to remove the ill-treatment of the Chinamen?—A. I would punish those who ill-treat them.

Q. Does that ill treatment occur now?—A. There has not been so much of it recently as there was about six months ago.

Q. Because of punishment to those who did it?—A. No; I think the excitement that was fanning into a flame at that time has died away, and that there is no particular incentive now. I think there is a class of lawless people in the community who, when there is an exciting cause, do these things, which they would not do if they were not excited by class-prejudice.

Q. What would you say was the exciting cause?—A. The political agitations that were taking place here.

Q. If you gave them the ballot would it not remedy that ill-treatment?—A. I think it would.

Q. About as soon as anything else, would it not?—A. Yes; I think there would be no trouble; but I do not wish to be put down on the record, however, as in favor of the Chinese voting.

Q. You do not want to restore peace in that way, then?—A. No.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you give it as your opinion that a majority of the intelligent and disinterested popular opinion of this State is in favor of the influx of Chinese?—A. To a moderate extent I do; about the extent that I spoke about.

Q. From your large circle of acquaintances name off a list of gentlemen, who are disinterested and do not make any money out of them, who favor an influx of Chinese?—A. I could make out such a list if I had leisure, but I cannot sit here and call it right off.

Q. Think of one prominent name.—A. It is so difficult to tell who are interested in your sense of the word. In other words, I do not believe there is anybody who is not interested more or less in Chinese labor.

Q. Are you not rather reflecting the sentiment of those people whose material interests are advanced and promoted by the Chinese being here?—A. I believe that the material interests of eight-tenths of the people of the State of California are enhanced by the presence of the Chinese.

Q. I speak of those who are directly interested?—A. They are all pretty much directly interested. Whoever makes the country prosperous is interesting to every citizen who is ambitious.

HENRY K. W. CLARKE sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am a lawyer by profession, although I am engaged somewhat extensively in farming.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?—A. I arrived in California in July, 1849.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Where do you reside, and where are your farming operations?—A. I reside with my family on Bush street, San Francisco, above Taylor. My farming operations are in Contra Costa County, about seven or eight miles from the top of Mount Diablo, near Pacheco, four and a half miles from Pacheco.

Q. What is the character of your farming operations?—A. I cultivate nearly four hundred acres of land in grain, fruit to a limited amount, and also sheep and cattle.

A. Do you spend much time on your farm?—A. I generally go there on an average one or two days a week, and often spend two or three days there.

Q. Have you had any opportunity of observing the Chinese?—A. I always employ one Chinaman on my place, in the house, who does my cooking. In my neighborhood there are a good many Chinese employed, but they are employed generally in the same capacity, as cooks for the farmers.

Q. To what extent does that practice prevail throughout the State?—A. I think it is very extensive. I recently went over to see some property on the western side of the mountain, in Lassen County, and I think without exception there I found Chinese employed as cooks in the hotels and in the families where I visited.

Q. Outside of the cities and large towns, who occupy the places of domestics?—A. To a very great extent, the Chinese.

Q. Do you find any American women occupying those places?—A. Very rarely American women. When I say American women, I limit it to those who are born in America.

Q. Upon the isolated farms and ranches and wayside stations, you find Chinese almost exclusively?—A. In many farmers' families the wife and daughters do a great deal of the household work; but where they work any large number of men they usually employ at least one

domestic in the kitchen. They do that particularly in my neighborhood.

Q. In what other ways do you see them employed throughout the country in industries?—A. They are employed also in various manufactories, on railroads, in diking, and in fruit-raising. I sometimes see them, but not often, employed as plowmen.

Q. What is their moral and physical condition?—A. The moral condition of the laboring classes is remarkably good. For the class of people, filling their condition in life, I think they are unexceptionally good. To use the word "moral," perhaps, in its ordinary acceptation, they are free from what we call public vices. I think they are an exceptional people. I know that during the harvest-season, when we employ a great many hands, averaging on the farms all the way from six to twenty white men during harvest, a large proportion of these men always congregate on Saturday nights at the little towns, like Pacheco, Concord, Walnut Creek, and Martinez, after the labors of the week, and they spend very freely on their vices at such times; whereas I have never seen any community of Chinamen indulge in intemperance.

Q. What do you say of the Chinese in regard to temperance?—A. I say they are a remarkably temperate people.

Q. What do you say in regard to their peacefulness?—A. They are the most quiet and docile people I ever witnessed anywhere.

Q. What do you say in regard to their habits of industry?—A. The Chinese and the Portuguese are the two most industrious classes that we have in California; and their industry is accompanied with great economy in both of these classes.

Q. Have you had any experience in regard to their faithfulness in performing their work? How do they compare with other laborers?—A. I think they compare well. So far as my experience in my immediate neighborhood, as I said before, they are confined pretty much in their labor, but I find that I differ from some gentlemen who testified in regard to their services. I find that with us we pay the Chinamen as high wages as we do white people for the same work. I know of Chinamen employed to fill the position of cooks in Contra Costa County where they are paid as high as $40 a month. My next neighbor, I know, paid $30 a month. I usually employ younger Chinamen, and get them, therefore, at a lesser rate.

Q. For what reason do you employ Chinamen?—A. In the first place, that in regard to ordinary men as cooks, Irish or Germans, we never fancied them; so far as my experience is concerned, they are generally not neat people about the house as cooks, they are not light-fingered, and not light of step; and a household that is cared for by men of that standing in life is generally not well cared for. Therefore women would be preferred. I have found it utterly impossible to procure women to go into the country to do that work.

Q. Is that a general difficulty?—A. It is a general difficulty.

Q. It relates to the whole State outside of the city?—A. Yes, sir; and it is more or less difficult in little villages. Where you have a Catholic church you may often engage Irish girls to go into a village, but in the absence of a church it becomes exceedingly difficult. I have not only had experience with reference to myself, but also coming frequently to the city and being here so much of the time, I have attempted to employ servants for my neighbors. I never yet have been able to procure any girls who are willing to go to any place outside of such villages.

Q. Do you know whether it is easy to procure white girls to do the

work of small families, maids of all work, in the city?—A. It is very difficult.

Q. As a general rule, do they prefer to go where there are two or three servants kept?—A. Yes, sir; always. There are a great many families here who are obliged to keep two or three servants, when the same families, with the same amount of labor to perform, in New England, where I was raised, would not think of employing more than one.

Q. Will the Chinamen perform that duty here?—A. A Chinaman will perform all the duties about a house.

Q. All the work of a small family?—A. All the work of a small family.

Q. How do these Chinamen come here, voluntarily; or by what means do they get here?—A. I have heard and read a great deal about cooly labor, and of the manner in which they are brought here, but my observation and experience, so far as they have extended, satisfy me that there is no truth in it, that it is a whispered tale and has no real source.

Q. For what purpose do they come—with the intention of remaining and making the United States their home, or returning to their own country?—A. I think they were attracted here as probably you and I and all of us. In early times we came to get money with the intention of returning, but having arrived here, many of them, no doubt, would remain and become permanent citizens if there was any encouragement given them to become permanent citizens.

Q. Do they become attached to our institutions, and reconciled to live and die here?—A. They certainly die here; they live here until they die or return. When you talk about their becoming attached, I will say they would become attached if they were encouraged to become attached. I have in my mind a Chinaman who came to Alameda, where I formerly resided many years. He came a boy of about seventeen years of age, and was employed in a stable. While he was employed he learned to read and write the English language, and having by nature some gift with the pencil, he became quite expert as an artist and became a painter. He assumed American clothes and lived in San Diego for many years. I think he is as well-informed as any laboring man I know of in that community, and as much attached to American institutions. He has thrown off his Chinese habits and has assumed American habits.

Q. How is he treated?—A. He is treated very well, because he is known very well, and the people there all speak well of him. I never heard any one speak ill of him.

Q. Do you not think that his changing his habits and throwing off Chinese garments has had a great deal to do with it?—A. It has had a great deal to do with it. This Chinaman has been encouraged in business, and he is getting along very well. I think it was about 1866 that he came to me and wanted me to make an application for him to become a citizen. I told him I did not know what view the court might take. I took him before Judge Hoffman, of the United States district court, and made a motion before the court. The court said he did not know what effect the recent legislation of Congress might have; his impressions were that Mongolians could not be citizens. I am well satisfied this Chinaman would have made as good a citizen as any citizen we have, as intelligent a man, and as intelligent a voter.

Q. Did the court receive his declaration?—A. He did not receive it. The court took the matter under advisement, and it finally dropped there. We found the inclination was against it.

Q. What has been their treatment in California?—A. By certain

classes, generally a low class, their treatment has been very brutal. By the vast majority of people I think they have been treated very well; but there is a certain class that always want some one below them to kick and cuff, and they use the Chinamen for their purpose. They formerly used the negro in the same way.

Q. How were they treated in the mines?—A. Of that I cannot speak, only from hearsay rather than from observation. I have seen them working frequently in the mines, and they have been working in generally what are called worn-out mines. There they have been content to work for amounts for which white men would not work.

Q. When they find any diggings which are worth a white man's working, do you know what happens?—A. I understand that frequently they are driven from them; that when they will pay above a certain amount the Chinamen must not work them.

Q. Is that light labor, working up those old diggings?—A. It is very heavy labor.

Q. It has been said here that Chinamen shy hard work. How is that?—A. That has not been my experience. A Chinaman will do any work that you will pay him for doing. We all know that they are not a large-boned or large-muscled people, but an exceedingly active people, and very patient to toil.

Q. State to the committee what is the nature of working up these placer diggings, what kind of work they have to do.—A. It is done with the pick and the spade, and consists in the turning over of large bowlders, running tunnels in different directions, throwing out the dirt and bowlders, and saving the fine dirt. If it is in the proper season they wash the dirt as they go along; if not, they keep it until the rainy season comes on, when they will take this dirt and throw it into rockers and wash it. It is work in which there is a great deal of exposure, they being compelled, in the washing season, to be constantly in the water, and in the warm season the weather is exceedingly hot. It is very severe work.

Q. What is the hardest, most difficult, and dangerous work that is done in this State?—A. I do not know that I could state it, there are so many hard kinds of work.

Q. Do you recollect anything of that character which surpasses the passage of the Sierra Nevada at Tehatchipa Pass?—A. Railroad work?

Q. I mean, is there any work in the State harder or more dangerous than the building of the tunnels that were made across the Sierra Nevada?—A. I consider blasting the most dangerous work in tunnels.

Q. By what class of men is that work done?—A. By Chinamen.

Q. Is there any work less desired by white people than the building of levees in the tule lands?—A. None.

Q. Has there been considerable of that work done here?—A. A great deal of it. It is being done now.

Q. By what class of men is that done?—A. By Chinamen.

Q. Is there any work that is too difficult or too disagreeable for them to accept?—A. I do not know of any work that they will not contract to do.

Q. They do it patiently and perseveringly and uncomplainingly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is their character in respect to the performance of their contracts?—A. Their notions are very elevated in regard to their contracts; you can rely upon them.

Q. You have been a practicing lawyer in this city since 1849?—A. Since 1850, but not always in this district.

Q. You have been practicing in the district courts and the supreme court?—A. In all the courts.

Q. What is the character of the Chinese in respect to litigation?—A. So far as my own practice is concerned, I never had any litigation with a Chinaman.

Q. Have you ever known of any suits brought against a Chinaman to enforce the performance of a contract or to recover damages for its breach?—A. I do not now recall any. There have been suits between Chinamen and white people.

Q. You do not recall any suit against a Chinaman to compel him to the performance of his contract or to punish him for a breach of it?—A. I have always understood from my clients, who are merchants, some of whom have had large dealings with Chinamen, that they always place the greatest confidence in Chinamen, and they uniformly keep their contracts.

Q. What do you say in regard to their truthfulness as compared with other people in the same class of life?—A. I think as you put the question that they compare favorably considering the chance they have had, being governed in my view by that. I believe that the merchants, who are the highest class who come here, are as high-toned in reference to their word as any merchants in the world. Of course, as you go down it is the same as when you go down with every other class of people; the lower you get the less education they have, the less confidence can be placed in them.

Q. Is truthfulness a prevailing feature among the lower class of whites here, in courts of justice?—A. In courts of justice I cannot speak less flatteringly of the lower classes than of the higher classes. I think you will find that the judges of our courts say they are made to tremble every day at the amount of false swearing that must be going on in the court-room. Men of good standing will swear diametrically opposite to each other. We have seen it here to an extent which is really alarming.

Q. Is there any punishment for that?—A. I do not know that there is any punishment for it. We have laws against perjury, but they are very rarely enforced.

Q. Do you recollect any convictions for perjury?—A. I do not remember any, and therefore I say they occur very rarely.

Q. This perjury in the courts is very common?—A. It is very common.

Q. And that you say is not confined to the lower class at all?—A. It is not confined to the lower class, I am sorry to say. Where people's interests are largely at stake it seems to bias or cloud their judgment and memory.

Q. Comparing class with class, how do the Chinese compare with the whites in that respect?—A. Class with class, I think they compare very well.

Q. How does their employment in this State affect white labor?—A. I have always supposed that the tendency was to elevate it. I look upon the use of Chinamen as I do upon all manual labor. Always the lower classes are complaining of anything which appears to affect their labor. I remember when the cradle was opposed by laboring men, because it required less men than it did to use the sickle. Then, again, a clamor was raised against the reaper, and so on with the threshing-machine, whereby we are able to cultivate a thousand acres where formerly we could cultivate but from twenty-five to fifty. The experience has always been that these labor-saving machines, though apparently reducing the

demand for labor, have increased the demand. I remember, very well, when I was a boy and railroads commenced in this country, in the neighborhood where I lived the farmers raised a hue and cry against railroads, because they said there would be no sale for their horses; but the result was that horses went up in price and more horses were demanded.

Q. You think it would not increase the happiness of the laboring people if we would abolish reapers in this State?—A. Nor any other labor-saving machine; though for a time it may disturb the established order, it always results in greater prosperity.

Q. The consequence is, the white man gets more employment and gets more for his labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you consider the Chinaman in farming here as a labor-saving machine?—A. I do; or rather he creates a demand for labor; the more labor we have the more he is demanded. It is not that class of people who do not labor and who are injurious to the community.

Q. Are there many of those here?—A. Consumers who are non-producers are never any real benefit to a community.

Q Is the number of those consumers large in this city?—A. Very large. They are in all cities, I suppose; but perhaps there is a larger element here of that kind than almost in any other city in the country.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 15, 1876.

HENRY K. W. CLARKE's examination continued.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. As a lawyer, do you think that legislation limiting the immigration from China would be a violation of the fifth article of the treaty, or not?—A. As I understand the treaty I should think that it would. I certainly think it would be very bad political economy.

Q. Would a law limiting the number of passengers that an English ship can bring from Hong-Kong to this port be in accordance with our treaty with England?—A. I have not examined the question.

Q. Let me read the preamble of a joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives last winter:

> Whereas the large immigration to the Pacific States and Territories of the United States of Mongolians, who are, by nature, disposition, and habits, incapable of assimilating with our laws and customs, tends to establish a foreign colony in the republic, and directly brings American free labor in competition with that which is semi-servile, disturbing the harmony of our political system, and detrimental to the spirit of manly independence, which should be its highest result and best security.

Is that recital true in point of fact?—A. I think not.

Q. If an act were passed by Congress containing such a recital as that, would it be in violation of a treaty of amity and friendship between us and another nation?—A. I should think so.

Q. It would not be likely to promote amity?—A. No, sir; quite the contrary.

Q. Do you remember the terms of our treaty with England?—A. I do not, on that topic.

Q. Has any nation undertaken to regulate the number of passengers which should be brought to their country by the ship of another nation?—A. I have never understood it so.

Q. Our passenger-acts regulate the number of passengers on our ships, and the English acts regulate the number on their ships?—A. Each under its own government, governed by its own laws.

Q. No nation, that you are aware of, has ever undertaken to say how many passengers a ship of another nation shall carry?—A. No, sir.

Q. Has any nation, so far as you are aware, attempted to limit the number of persons that should come to the country from another nation?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. Nor to limit immigration from any country?—A. Not that I know of.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you not know that all nations limit the number of passengers that may come into their ports?—A. Each nation may control its merchant-marine, but not that of foreign nations.

Q. Does not the United States limit the number of passengers that can be landed from an English ship in this port?—A. They could not do it.

Q. They do it?—A. I mean to say it is not in accordance with the comity of nations.

Q. Do you undertake to say that an English ship coming from Hong-Kong is not subject to our passenger-laws?—A. I understand that we cannot interfere with a ship in that regard, according to all principles of law which govern nations.

Q. You are a lawyer?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Does not the law limiting the number of passengers apply to both foreign bottoms and our own?—A. Grant that in terms it may, I say it cannot control the English marine.

Q. Are you not aware that that law is in force in New York and enforced in the United States courts?—A. I am not aware of it. They may do it; but I say if they do it, they should not. England cannot say to America that America shall not take five hundred people on an American vessel.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Hong-Kong is an English port?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would any question limiting the number of passengers that may come to this country from an English port in an English ship, Chinese passengers, say, be a question between England and us or between China and us?—A. It is an English port, and in an English ship it would be a question between England and our Government, and not a question with China. I do not suppose that China undertakes to exercise any control over English shipping. I do not understand that England can exercise such control over our shipping as to say how many Irishmen shall come aboard any American ship coming to America. America can fix laws governing her own marine; but she cannot fix them for England, nor can England fix them for America.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The United States provide that no vessel, foreign or domestic, shall land criminals upon our shores?—A. I do not say that one State or one nation cannot pass such a law, but to enforce that law is another proposition. You may pass a great many laws which are not capable of being carried into effect.

Q. Do you admit that the United States law does make that provision both as to foreign and domestic vessels?—A. I believe that the presumption I suggest would cover both cases.

Q. Then you set your judgment against the judgment of Congress,

which has deliberately passed such a law?—A. I do not care to make any issue with Congress or anybody else. You asked my opinion and I gave my opinion. It is a national question. As you and I know, Congress, like every other political body, makes mistakes.

Q. You bring the test of your judgment against that of Congress through its judiciary committees and eminent men?—A. I suppose I do. The opinion of no eminent man controls my judgment more than it controls yours. I consider that every man's reasoning is upon his own judgment.

Q. I merely call your attention to the fact that the eminent lawyers of Congress appear to be of that opinion because they passed such a law. Do you believe there would be no power to enforce a law on the part of the United States which prohibited the bringing over of paupers and criminals in English ships?—A. I do not think that Congress has any power over English bottoms, to say how many or when they shall bring them, any more than they have the power over American bottoms.

Q. It may be that we both have the power?—A. I believe each nation has the control of its own marine.

Q. Suppose the United States put a penalty upon bringing paupers and criminals in English bottoms to our shores. Suppose that the law provided that such vessels could not be entered at the custom-house, and there would be certain fines imposed, to be enforced by our local courts, what would stand in the way of enforcing the law in our local courts?—A. There are some sanitary matters that would properly come within the purview of a nation and be recognized by all nations, but it is not within the power of our courts, or, rather, it is not within the power of this Government, according to the rules which I understand govern between nations, to control English law in regard to its own marine.

Q. I am not speaking of English law; I am speaking of American law, which provides, as you say, sanitary regulations, that criminals and paupers shall not be landed on our shores. Do you deny that power?—A. I go very far in that way. I do not believe that our Government has a right to prevent the landing of them. They have a right to control them after they are landed, and have a right to send them back.

Q. You think the Government is powerless to prevent their landing?—A. I do not see how the Government has got such a power.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Let me ask you whether a law prohibiting ships from carrying more than a certain number of passengers to this country from the port of Hong-Kong would be invidious and in conflict with our general commercial relations with England?—A. I think so.

Q. Then you think that such a law would require the concurrence of England?—A. Yes, sir; so far as English bottoms are concerned. So far as our merchant-marine is concerned, of course we can control that. Otherwise it is a matter that should be arranged between nations; and where, as I understand the treaty between England and America and between America and China, the countries are open to emigration from one country to the other, they should carry that treaty further and make such restrictions by treaty if it becomes necessary. As long as they do not modify such existing treaties the emigration is entirely open and free.

Q. You think that such a discrimination would be in conflict with our general commercial relations with England?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Whether the passengers intended to be affected by it were Chinamen or Englishmen?—A. Yes, sir; it would not make any difference.

Q. The question then comes up between England and the United States, and not between China and the United States?—A. That is my idea, where the emigrants are shipped in English bottoms from an English port, and not from Chinese ports.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The United States statute, which I carefully examined at the time that I drew a bill upon this subject, provides that a certain amount of space shall be allowed to each immigrant on board any ship, foreign or domestic; and it provides certain penalties to be enforced against the vessel in case that limit is exceeded. Do you say that is illegal and against the law of nations?—A. I think it would be in conflict with the law which governs between England and the United States; not but that the passage of the law is all right; but I mean to say that it is not in the power of this Government, under the treaty with England, to enforce that law, or to punish a captain of the English marine for bringing more passengers than that law would allow. I do not believe that England would ever submit to any such thing as the punishment of any of her officers by America.

Q. So that in the case of a proper limit for health, to prevent contagious diseases from breaking out, &c.—say 800 passengers upon a ship landing in New York—if the English saw fit to crowd in 3,000 and send them in such a condition as that overcrowding would produce into the port of New York, the United States authorities would be powerless?—A. I do not see what America has to do with English officers, or Englishmen, or English bottoms.

Q. No matter how much contagion they may spread in our country by overcrowding their ships?—A. That is an outside question. England is as good a judge as to what is a proper space for passengers or how many passengers her marine can take as America. If she chooses to say 300 are sufficient, while America insists on 500, there is a conflict, of course; but she has as good a right as America to judge.

Q. The United States has no power to protect herself against England?—A. I think not. She might control the number in her own bottoms.

Q. Are the habits of the Chinese the same as ours?—A. I do not know the habits of any nation that is like the American nation.

Q. Is their disposition the same as ours?—A. In many things it is the same. If you tickle them, they may laugh; if they are hungry, you feed them; and if you reason with them, they will listen and form a judgment.

Q. They have fingers and toes?—A. They have fingers and toes.

Q. Do you think that is my question?—A. What is your question?

Q. I ask you if this law, which you condemn here——

A. Excuse me, I do not condemn it; I choose to differ from other people.

Q. I was testing your knowledge in reference to the habits of the Chinese. What do you understand by the word "disposition" as used in the preamble which was read to you?—A. Read the connection.

Q. "Whereas the Mongolians are by nature, disposition, and habits." What do you understand by the meaning of the word?—A. In nature, I think they are like other human beings.

Q. What do you understand by disposition?—A. I perhaps would hardly know what you meant. It is a sweeping term. Do you mean whether they can be angered easily?

Q. If you do not know what it means, why do you pass upon it?—A. I pass upon it as the word is generally used.

Q. Then give its meaning as you passed upon it?—A. I suppose there it would mean the character of their minds. That is what is meant by disposition. I suppose it is used there in rather a metaphysical sense. The word "habits" refers to mode of life; and disposition, I suppose, rather refers to their mental qualities.

Q. You say you know nothing about their habits?—A. I did not make that remark. I say the habits of all people differ, and that the Americans are unlike any other people in their habits.

Q. Then the Chinese are unlike the Americans in their habits. What is the difference in the habits of the Americans and Chinese?—A. They dress differently, associate differently, their treatment of women is different, the manner in which they live is different. Is that a sufficient answer?

Q. What is their disposition toward republican institutions as distinguished from their own form under which they have lived for centuries?—A. So far as I have had any opportunity to observe, and I have made it somewhat a study, very little is known about what their feeling is toward republican institutions. I think that the matter of our republican institutions, or the difference between our political institutions and theirs, has not been a matter of explanation to the Chinese, and their opinions on the subject have not been sought. We have treated them as an inferior race. There is a very prevalent opinion that they are inferior in every respect, which I think is a very erroneous view. I think we have not sought to know what are their feeelings toward republican institutions.

Q. You think it is a very prevalent opinion that they are inferior?—A. Yes, sir, very; because very few people have informed themselves in regard to the Chinese nation, its history, or its people.

Q. By "prevalent opinion" you mean prevailing opinion?—A. I mean the opinion among the masses. I think the masses have the opinion that the Chinese are very much inferior. We formerly had an opinion that the negro was very much inferior.

Q. Do they keep themselves separate from our people by their dress, quarters, &c.?—A. We had better say that we keep them separate rather than that they keep themselves separate. To illustrate, if you bring to this city a large number of Polish people, they naturally, speaking their Polish language, and not speaking the English language, associate together, and apparently they are clannish. As they become informed, learn to speak the English language, do business with Americans, as they progress in their different trades and occupations, they become more interested, they mix more with Americans, and cease to be clannish, because there is no direct obstacle in the way. As to the Chinese, the moment they land here until they lay down their bones or leave this shore there is a constant opposition, a constant building up of a Chinese wall between them and the American people.

Q. Does that have the effect to make a separate colony or community of them in our midst?—A. Yes, sir; decidedly so. Without that disposition on our own part there would not be that separate colony of the Chinese outside of the circumstance that, as they talk Chinese and do not talk English, therefore they naturally associate together.

Q. Does the building up of a separate colony of that kind, very large in dimensions, tend in any degree toward a disturbance of our ordinary operations?—A. With intelligent people, no, sir.

Q. I mean the fact, not as it is in the minds of the people. Take 60,000 or 100,000 people, who, by their dress, their customs, their habits, which you say are somewhat different, and by public opinion tending

in that direction also, keep themselves isolated, is that an anomaly in American society?—A. Not altogether an anomaly, because, for instance, we have our savage tribes kept so.

Q. We are speaking about difference in habits, in customs, and in modes of thought, and the different state of society in which they are raised. You say it has a tendency to produce a colony among ourselves of a foreign element?—A. You put a wrong construction upon my words. I say they are kept in this isolated position by reason, first, of not talking our language, and second that the American people or the white people here have an idea that the Chinese are very much inferior, and therefore keep them off, and build up a partition between them and the Chinamen which keeps them apart.

Q. Their own habits of thought also tend to it somewhat; their desire for the society of each other?—A. No more than any other people. I think the Chinese would associate just as well with the American people as Germans and Irishmen if they were treated in the same way.

Q. Do you think they would intermarry to the same extent?—A. That I am not aware of, because we have had no opportunity to observe it. I do not know of any intermarriages here. We have had no Chinamen to marry American women.

Q. We have plenty of Chinese men and American women here?—A. They do not assimilate; they cannot assimilate under the circumstances. We had many negroes in the States, and how rare a thing it was for a white woman to marry a negro.

Q. Do you mean that they cannot assimilate?—A. They cannot by reason of difficulties that we raise, not by reason of difficulties that exist in nature.

Q. After the answers which you have given, I should like to read to you again this preamble. You have stated that they do not or cannot assimilate; that they are different in their habits, making a foreign colony in our midst, &c. This is the preamble:

Whereas the large immigration to the Pacific States and Territories of the United States of Mongolians, who are by nature, disposition, and habits incapable of assimilating with our laws and customs.

Let me ask you about the word "nature." I suppose you say all men are one blood. Would you make a point on nature—the nature of the negro, Indian, or Chinaman—the nature of the Aryan race?—A. I believe all people differ more or less in nature.

Q. Then "nature" comes in to help out the preamble?

Who are by nature, disposition, and habits incapable of assimilating with our laws and customs, tending to establish a foreign colony in the republic.

A. I say there is nothing in nature, there is nothing in disposition, there is nothing in habits, that would prevent the Chinese in the course of time from assimilating in customs and habits with the Americans.

Q.

And directly brings American free labor in competition with that which is semi-servile, disturbing the harmony of our political system, and detrimental to the spirit of manly independence, which should be the highest result and best security.

That is all I want to ask you about.—A. I do not think it is semi-servile.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to say that our treatment of the Chinese tends to keep them together and separates them from the white people, and but for that, in the course of time, you think they would assimilate?—A. My

own observation leads me unquestionably to take that proposition in the affirmative.

Q. You were speaking about a question of law, and I want to call your attention to that again. Is there not a law which regulates the number of passengers that may come upon any ship, governing the arrival of emigrants from all countries?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Prohibiting any vessel from carrying more than a certain number of passengers, according to its capacity?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose we should pass a law by which we should restrict and alter that law as to a particular part of England, France, or any country; would such a law be invidious and in conflict with the general commercial relations with that country?—A. I should think that it would be. As I understand it, all these matters are the subject of treaty between nations. Nations may agree among themselves that immigration and emigration shall take place to and from such points, one port or twenty ports, or all ports. That is a matter to be arranged between nations and settled by treaty, and therefore one government cannot make the law for another. If we chose to be exclusive, then we would shut out people altogether, and it would result in that extreme. Yet a war was brought on by such extremes, and would be, I suppose, now, in any enlightened state, if the people were shut out entirely; and if the principle is admitted, where is the limit?

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You said yesterday that the Chinese are as truthful as other people, did you not?—A. I may have made that statement. I made the statement that there was a great deal of perjury. That is true now. I said, taking class for class, they are truthful. I made a distinction among different classes of Chinese as among different classes of foreigners and natives of this country. The most unreliable of all witnesses I have ever had on the stand are Polish people. In fact, I have found them almost entirely unreliable.

Q. Did you ever have any suits where the Chinese were altogether witnesses?—A. No, sir; I have had suits where some of the witnesses were Chinese. I have never had any experience in our police courts here. I have never heard any Chinese testify there. I am told their testimony is very loose, but they are a lower class of Chinese who appear in our police court.

Q. Have you any accurate personal knowledge as to the truthfulness of Chinese witnesses?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many witnesses?—A. I do not know; I have been practicing law for a great many years.

Q. You are not a criminal lawyer?—A. I am not a criminal lawyer, although I have had some criminal practice. I have declined it in later years altogether.

Q. Did you ever try any suit when there were two Chinese witnesses in one case?—A. I have tried a great many.

Q. You think they are just as truthful as white men?—A. As a class, understand me.

Q. What class?—A. One class is exceedingly low, you may call them almost a mendicant class, and perhaps you can place no reliance upon them, as a mendicant upon the streets here can have no reliance placed upon him.

Q. Is it not a fact that the common mass of laboring people are the most truthful on the witness stand?—A. I should not say so.

Q. As truthful as any other class?—A. Ah, that is another proposi-

tion. I think that my judgment would be that the more intelligent, the more enlightened a community, the more I would rely upon them.

Q. Is it not a fact that there is more perjury committed in our courts here by what are termed the upper classes than by what are termed the middle classes?—A. Do you say so?

Q. I ask your opinion?—A. I do not think there is any more.

Q. Is there not a good deal of perjury committed here among the profession by way of affidavit in putting off suits, swearing that witnesses cannot be got, and all that thing?—A. As I said yesterday, there is a great deal of false swearing in our courts.

Q. In that particular line of affidavit business?—A. I have known some very strong affidavits.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you remember that in 1872 there was an immigrant ship arrived in the harbor of New York having on board some eight or nine hundred of the lowest paupers in Italy, and that the question was submitted to the United States Government to prevent them from landing, and that it was thoroughly investigated at that time, and it was determined they could not prevent them from landing?—A. I do not remember any particular case; but my reading is to the effect that the Government cannot interfere in such cases.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You said that if a law was passed restricting the number of passengers which come from Hong Kong, it would be a matter between us and England. Suppose a law were passed limiting the number of German passengers that could come from England to this country, would that be a matter for England alone? Would Germany have a right to complain in regard to Germans embarking from England?—A. I think that would depend upon our treaty with Germany. There might be some question raised in that case in regard to our discriminating against German citizens.

Q. If we had a treaty with Germany allowing free immigration, and then passed a law that German passengers should not come in an English ship beyond a certain number, what would you say to that?—A. I think it would be discriminating against Germany, and Germany would have a right to complain.

Q. Have you stated what is the opinion of your neighbors in regard to the questions before this committee, whether they agree with you or disagree?—A. I think that they agree with me so far as I have conversed among them. I had occasion to send some pamphlets to my neighbors on this subject. I have since met several of them, and they seem very much pleased that I sent them, and say they fully concur with the views expressed.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What pamphlets?—A. A pamphlet on the Chinese question, I think, published by some ex-Catholic priest here. The name has passed from my mind now. I have copies of the pamphlet.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In regard to these passenger-acts, is not the line on which legislation divides, the line between police regulations and commercial regulations?—A. Yes, sir. As to my views in regard to population, I notice that nearly all the witnesses have testified that a homogeneous population is the most desirable. My own opinion is that a heterogeneous popu-

lation is more beneficial to the country. I think the order of development is from homogeneous to heterogeneous always. I believe that is the more scientific view. I believe that a people will improve better by having a heterogeneous than a homogeneous population.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there a strong opposition, with a large class of people here, to the presence of the Chinese or to their further coming here?—A. I think I remarked yesterday, and I still am of the opinion, that, with a vast majority of the intelligent people of this coast, there is no such opposition, but that, on the contrary, they would be in favor of leaving the question of Chinese immigration to the law which governs immigration throughout the world.

Q. Is there not, however, a strong opposition here?—A. There is a strong opposition here.

Q. I want to ask you, as a resident here and as an observer, what is the cause of that opposition? There must be a cause for every current of strong public opinion. What is the cause of it; what does it originate from?—A. In ignorance. That is its true source. People do not understand the principles which govern immigration. They do not understand that there is a law which governs immigration, neither do they understand the law which governs labor. A large class of our laboring people have an idea that because Chinese labor in some departments is cheaper than we get American labor for, therefore they are injured by it, and deprived of proper employment; but this is the result of their not understanding the principles which govern labor. People of more intelligence, wishing to avail themselves of that degree of ignorance, use it for political purposes. I do not say they all do it with the intention of making a bad use of it; but it has been a very common thing, from my youth up, to see people in different political parties appealing to the lower passions of the ignorant in order to avail themselves of their political support. I remember very well, when I was a young man, that the same prejudice existed against the coming to America of the Irishmen, and afterwards the Germans. I do not think there is any stronger prejudice here to-day, leaving the question of Chinese immigration alone, than there was when I was a young man against the Irishmen coming to this country. I think the prejudice then was just as strong as it is now against the Chinese. But this prejudice disappears; the people become enlightened; they become acquainted with them. The people think they foresee an evil, and they try to build up some defense against it. In other words, we are all trying to do the work of the Almighty in providing for the future, but in the end we find how futile it all is. The most sagacious politicians are every year being convinced that they have been in error where they thought that great detriment was to be the result of certain measures, and they find, perhaps, that good has been the result of it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You have stated here that it is your opinion that the intelligent opinion of this State is in favor of Chinese immigration, in favor of letting it alone, and not legislating for its inhibition?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you be kind enough to give, from the circle of your acquaintances, the names of disinterested persons who do not employ Chinese and make no money out of them, or are not engaged in proselyting them, who are of that opinion?—A. I think it would be very difficult to give you the names of all.

Q. What names can you give?—A. It is only a few days since I was talking to Judge Alexander Campbell.

Q. Do you pretend to say that he agrees with you?—A. I pretend to say that he agreed with me in regard to this question.

Q. You have named one; name another.—A. Judge O. C. Pratt.

Q. Does he not employ Chinese upon his estate in the north?—A. I think not.

Q. Do you know that he does not?—A. I do not know, but I think not.

Q. Do you not know that he does?—A. I do not know it; on the contrary, I think possibly he may employ one as a cook.

Q. I ask you to name disinterested men not engaged in making money out of the Chinese who entertain the views you have expressed here.—A. Do you mean to say that a man who employs a Chinaman as a cook is not a disinterested man?

Q. I mean those engaged in mechanical industries.—A. Take Mr. Walker, one of my neighbors in Contra Costa County, a large farmer there.

Q. He does not employ them?—A. No, sir. Take Mr. Loshe, my neighbor.

Q. You are naming from your own neighborhood, when you are a resident of San Francisco?—A. Of course. I name men with whom I have talked.

Q. When I ask you to give me some representative names, you pick out two or three farmers from Contra Costa County that I never heard of. I ask you to give me the names of intelligent, representative men, who you say form the intelligent public opinion of California, who favor the idea of Chinese labor, those who are not interested in a material sense in employing them. If you do not know any such, the answer is that you do not.—A. I do know them.

Q. Name them.—A. Among my acquaintances, and it may be very limited, it is true, the prevalent opinion is, I might say, among nine-tenths of my acquaintances, that the Chinese are a benefit.

Q. You have stated that already; but I am trying to test that fact by getting some names.—A. I could sit down and give you a list of the men I know. I know a great many lawyers here.

Q. I cannot test your assertion by names that nobody else knows.—A. My acquaintance is not probably very extensive among very intelligent men. I name those in the neighborhood where I carry on farming, and they do not satisfy you. I name a gentleman here, and you contradict me, and say he does not agree with my views.

Q. I recognize Mr. Campbell as a representative man.—A. Do you know Mr. Holland?

Q. Mr. Nathaniel Holland? Yes, sir.—A. He agrees with me in my views. Do you know Mr. Judge Wheeler?

Q. We have had him here.—A. You had Lawyer Wheeler. Judge Wheeler agrees with me.

Q. You, of course, give those names from your knowledge of the fact that they agree with you?—A. I give men that I associate with. I cannot tell you when this matter has come up for particular discussion; but I find that the prevalent opinion of intelligent people is that way.

Q. As an evidence of intelligent opinion, do you or do you not know that the democratic party, in its national and county conventions, have decided on this question and expressed themselves against Chinese immigration?—A. Yes, sir. You call up another thing to mind as sometimes these things arise. I have been trying to recall with whom I have discussed this matter.

Q. Wait until I get through with my question. Do you not know that the republican party, through its county conventions throughout the State, and in its State convention, has made the same declaration of principles against Chinese immigration?—A. I believe so.

Q. Do you know that the consecutive legislatures of this State, which have been both republican and democratic, have passed resolutions of the same general tenor?—A. That is a matter of record. I think they have eaten more or less dirt on that subject.

Q. They have passed such resolutions?—A. They have eaten a great deal of dirt on that subject.

Q. I ask you if the legislatures have passed such resolutions?—A. I believe they have, both kinds; and then, after they have come away from there, they will say, "O, well, we did it so as to keep even with the other side; we did not want to be outdone by the democrats, and therefore we have done so and so." That is what they will say outside.

Q. You are an ultra partisan?—A. I am not a partisan; I am cosmopolitan in my notions.

Q. In reference to the press of this State, what attitude has the press taken?—A. If you want to get my honest opinion of the press, one of my opinions in regard to it is not very satisfactory to the press.

Q. I have not asked your opinion in regard to the press. I am trying to get facts from what I suppose is a very disinterested witness. I ask you what position the intelligent press has taken upon this question in this State?—A. I will answer that by saying that I think the press—and I will not qualify it as the gentleman does—I will say that the press on the Pacific coast has generally been opposed to the further introduction of Chinamen, while there are many, I think, who are not opposed to it. Of course, I should pronounce those who were not so opposed as being more intelligent than the others.

Q. Will you name one of the daily press of San Francisco that is in favor of Chinese immigration as you are?—A. I cannot say that they are in favor of it as I am.

Q. That is, in favor of Chinese immigration generally, one daily journal of San Francisco?—A. I do not know that I can say that there is one daily journal that is particularly in favor of Chinese immigration. I do not think the Alta Californian is particularly opposed to it.

Q. I should judge so from its writings.—A. I do not think it is.

Q. Will you name one paper in your county of Alameda that is in favor of Chinese immigration?—A. Alameda is not my county.

Q. It was formerly your county?—A. I do not think I have read a paper from that county.

Q. Will you name one daily journal in your State that is in favor of Chinese immigration?—A. I do not think that the Gazette of Contra Costa is opposed to the Chinese.

Q. That is a weekly paper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I ask you to name a daily paper in the State that has not taken a decided position against Chinese immigration?—A. I do not recall any. In fact, I see very few of the papers outside of San Francisco and Contra Costa.

Q. Then, in relation to the national convention of the democratic party, do you know what its attitude is upon this question?—A. I think it is rather mixed.

Q. Have you read the resolution which it passed?—A. I read it at the time. I read all those things, but they do not generally linger long in my mind, whether from either party. I generally have opinions in

dependent of either party. I do not profess to be a partisan in any shape.

Q. Then you do not respect the opinions of parties?—A. Not when embodied in platforms. I have respect for the opinions of men where they are intelligent opinions.

Q. And so of journalism?—A. Yes, sir; and so of journalism.

Q. Then you accept it as of no evidence of popular intelligent opinion that both parties and all the intelligent journals of the State are on one side of this question?—A. I do not think that you can thereby judge of what is the intelligent opinion of the people of this State. Take, for instance, the Call, which, I think, boasts of the very greatest circulation in this city. I think it is very bitter on Chinamen, but you must be aware that, to a very large extent, it panders to a class of people who are not your associates or mine; a class of people who are full of this ignorant prejudice that I have before spoken of. That paper, in my judgment, panders to that class. That is my answer to the question.

Q. I will ask you in reference to the other property belonging to the same firm, the Evening Bulletin; what is its class of readers?—A. The Evening Bulletin is less prejudiced against the Chinese than the Call.

Q. What is the class of readers that it has?—A. It has a better class of readers, and it has a far more limited circulation.

Q. How about the Chronicle?—A. I do not read the Chronicle.

Q. You state that the motive of the Call is to pander to a base population?—A. I do not say the motive. Do not misunderstand me.

Q. Does the Bulletin pander to this class?—A. Every paper here panders to its class. Take a religious paper: if Presbyterian it panders to Presbyterian notions; if Methodist it panders to Methodist notions.

Q. You say that the Bulletin goes to the most intelligent of our people?—A. I did not make that remark, but I say it has a better class of readers.

Q. Then it panders to them?—A. Yes, sir; but, mark you, it is more quiet on that subject because its readers are not satisfied with that kind of pandering.

Q. They are decidedly opposed to Chinese immigration, are they not, very emphatically?—A. I do not think it is as bad as you represent it.

Q. How about the Evening Post?—A. It is about the same class, seeking for popularity.

Q. Then they are all the same?—A. I think the Post, Chronicle, and Call are cheap papers, taken up by the multitude, and they are very anxious to keep a large circulation among that class of people.

Q. Those papers are all the same price, are they not?—A. I do not know what the price of the Post is. I always take my paper by the week. They are all five cents when I buy single copies.

Q. You pay five cents for the Bulletin, do you not?—A. They are all the same.

Q. Then you do not mean to throw any disparagement on the Call, Chronicle, or Post as being cheap papers?—A. They are cheaper papers They are only twelve and a half cents a week, I think.

Q. Do you know that?—A. It is so advertised in their columns.

Q. You are mistaken.—A. Look at the Call and see. I think it is only twelve and a half cents. For the Bulletin we pay twenty-five cents a week, and for the Alta we pay, I think, twenty-five cents.

Q. Then all the daily journals are opposed to Chinese immigration, and they are opposed to it because they desire to pander to public sen-

timent?—A. I did not say that they desire to pander to public opinion; I said to the opinion of a certain class.

Q. To the opinion of their readers?—A. To a certain class of their readers.

Q. Then does it not indicate that it is their interest to pander to this class because that class is opposed to Chinese immigration?—A. Not because a majority of their readers are opposed to it.

Q. Then they pander to a minority?—A. Let me state the proposition. I would subscribe for a paper, because of its general intelligence, its general high tone and intellectual production, though it might on some subjects differ very widely from my views and from my ideas of what it ought to advocate, whereas there may be a large number of people who, while they would not object to that portion of the paper that I do not object to, would refuse to take it if it did not suit them on certain side-matters, as, for instance, on this Chinese question. Although the papers that I take are opposed to the Chinese, and I see many articles that are offensive, still I will not refuse to take that paper in my house and to read it simply for that reason, because I am not biased and prejudiced on the other side so as to prevent my reading or taking a newspaper because it does not advocate my views on that subject, whereas more unintelligent people will do that, as you will see very well.

Q. I do not see how that is an answer to my interrogatory.—A. It is to show why these papers do not lose the patronage of the more intelligent because they pander to a baser passion in a different class of readers. That is the reason; I think everybody will appreciate it.

Q. You admit the fact that they pander to their readers?—A. I admit that they do pander more or less, some on one subject and some on another.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are you satisfied to leave it as the record on this occasion that all who differ with you are ignorant, that your side is the intelligent side, and the other side, on the subject of Chinese immigration, is ignorant and low?—A. On the subject of Chinese immigration, I think they are ignorant.

Q. You are satisfied with that statement?—A. I am satisfied to have it go on the record that they are ignorant. Both you and I are old enough to have seen frequently men ignorant on certain subjects and very wise on others. I have given considerable thought to this subject, and I am satisfied those who are contending for the exclusion of the Chinese and driving out those we have here are not well informed on that point.

Q. You have an opinion, a very strong and decided opinion on this matter, which you say is founded on good judgment. Suppose, for instance, that I have an opinion on the other side, in which I am just as set, would it not do you an injustice for me to say that you and those who think with you are governed by ignorance?—A. On that subject, if you think I am ignorant, it is all proper.

Q. That is the way in which you wish to be understood, that the persons may be a more intelligent class of the community, but on this subject they are ignorant?—A. On some subjects they may be very intelligent and yet very ignorant on this subject. Take the question of labor: how many thousand people that you meet are very ignorant on the laws which govern labor, and yet a man who may be very well posted in regard to the laws which govern labor may be very ignorant in ref-

erence to some scientific questions, or in regard to some religious questions.

Q. I want to know if you admit that persons may be very intelligent on some matters and differ with you on this question?—A. They may be very ignorant on this very subject. I think they are.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Those men who are unintelligent on the labor question are generally the men who have the work to do, are they not? and it is we who do not work that understand the question?—A. You cannot put me in your category on that question. I work about sixteen hours a day.

Q. At what?—A. Sometimes at one thing and sometimes at another. When on the farm I work with the farming tools, or direct those who do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How many jury cases do you try in the course of a year?—A. Very few.

Q. Did you ever try any?—A. Never when I could avoid it. I have tried several in my life.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. I think you said yesterday it was the non-producing class which was opposed to the Chinese?—A. I think to a very large extent what we call the non-producing class is opposed to the Chinese.

Q. Are lawyers, as a class, a producing class?—A. I consider myself as belonging to a producing class.

Q. You are only a semi-lawyer; you farm. Do you think these lawyers who hang about the city-hall, commonly known as shysters, are a producing class?—A. I think some of them are. I think some of them are exceedingly bitter toward the Chinese. I think that so far as the testimony before this committee has been taken there are very few people willing to come forward and swear that they want to drive out the Chinese who are here, and yet all these cooly clubs and all these public assemblies against coolies take the very method to drive them out if they could be driven out, as you know very well. It reminds me very much of the story of the toad in the tea-kettle. The old lady found a toad in her tea-kettle——

Senator SARGENT. We do not need any story of a toad in a tea-kettle.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you live in the neighborhood of Antioch?—A. In the same county.

Q. Are you familiar with the circumstances of the outrage committed upon the Chinese there about a year ago?—A. I know there was a very great outrage committed upon them at Antioch.

Q. What were the circumstances of that outrage?—A. I am not familiar with the circumstances. I know there was a very great outrage perpetrated upon them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Mr. Pixley asked you certain questions about the attitude of the political parties here towards the Chinese question. I want to ask you, as a general question, whether you regard the resolutions of political parties here as indicative of the general sentiments of the people, or whether you regard it as rather a race or struggle for a particular vote?—A. The latter. If I had not been interrupted by Mr. Pixley in one of my remarks when he was asking me to name people, I recollect of having a conversation with a county judge on the other side of

Alameda County, Judge Glascock. Speaking with reference to the democratic meeting which had been passing resolutions against the Chinese, I said to him, "How is this, judge?" He said, "O, well, we do this simply as politicians; but as a citizen of California I am as much in favor of Chinese immigration as you are." Now, my experience of politicians of different parties has satisfied me that that is the prevailing opinion among them. One party will start in opposed to the Chinese because they are after a certain vote. The other party does not wish to lose that vote and it will adopt similar resolutions.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. I will send for Judge Glascock and Judge Wheeler.—A. Judge Glascock will not deny my proposition.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Complete your statement.—A. I have made it. I say that all these things are got up for political effect.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Are you not a politician?—A. I am exceedingly independent in my politics. I sometimes vote for one side and sometimes for the other side.

Q. I remember a number of years ago you were very active in politics?—A. Yes, sir; in early times here I was very active as a whig; but I have long since learned that many of the views which were the basis of the old whig party were not such as I would advocate to-day.

Q. There has been a good deal said here about politicians. Should not every good American citizen be a politician?—A. If you use it in the general sense of acquainting himself with the political matters of the country, I think he should.

Q. Should not every good citizen take an active part in politics?—A. I think every citizen should be well-informed in regard to the interests of the country.

Q. And take an active part in politics?—A. And take an active part in politics in that general sense, but I do not think every good citizen should belong to what you term a political party.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. With what party do you generally act?—A. My first political views were those of a whig. I became a strong republican. After the war was settled I voted with the democratic party, and should have voted with them until this time if the present House of Representatives had not acted, as I consider, in such a manner as to awaken my fears for the future. I intended to vote for Mr. Tilden when he was talked of for the nomination, but I did not vote for him finally, because I was afraid of results hereafter.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You were afraid of Ben. Hill, I suppose?—A. No, sir; I would put Ben. Butler against Ben. Hill and let them fight it out. It would be about an even thing between them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand that most of the time since the war you have acted with the democratic party.—A. I have acted mostly with them; but you must understand I do not call myself a member of that party. I am what you may call independent in politics.

Q. My question simply goes to this point, that in your opinions ex-

pressed here you are not governed by allegiance to any party?—A. I am not governed by allegiance to either party; and if I were, I would not make remarks about the republican party. I think, so far as the Chinese question is concerned, they have acted as foolishly as the other party.

Q. Which party led off in that matter?—A. The democratic party.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. They are the progressive party at any rate here?—A. They progress like a crab.

Q. You ought not to vote with them, then.—A. I do, however, when they are right.

WILLIAM F. BABCOCK sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident on this coast?—Answer. Since November, 1852.

Q. You are connected with the commercial house of Parrott & Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Give the commission your views of the effect Chinese immigration has had upon this coast in its past, and what your ideas are of its future. We are here for the purpose of inquiring into that matter.—A. I think in a new country cheap labor is absolutely necessary. I think the effect has been beneficial, and will continue to be beneficial; that instead of driving out labor by cheap labor it increases it. Labor begets labor.

Q. What effect has it had upon the advancement of California?—A. I think it has been very beneficial.

A. Added materially to our wealth?—A. I think so in very many ways.

Q. In manufacturing?—A. In all the industries where they have been employed. There is one point that I have never seen mentioned before the commission. We probably have 120,000 Chinamen in this State, and they spend at the lowest 25 cents a day. That would be $30,000 a day, or $900,000 a month, in round figures a million dollars a month that they spend among us. If we take that million dollars a month away, it certainly would do us a very great injury. Every thousand dollars' worth of merchandise that we sell in this State, goods of any description, is an advantage if it goes into consumption.

Q. To what extent have they added to the material wealth on the coast?—A. That is impossible for me to say at all. I do not know anything about it.

Q. They have been actively engaged in building railroads and reclaiming lands?—A. In building railroads, reclaiming lands, and in mining.

Q. They have been engaged, in fact, in nearly all the industries of the State?—A. In nearly all the industries of the State, I believe.

Q. Have you looked upon them as a necessity?—A. I do look upon them as a necessity, and I think to drive them out of the State would be a very great disadvantage to it and to all of us who live here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What do you think of the propriety of restricting this immigration?—A. I think, under certain rules and regulations, it would be very proper indeed. We have here probably 120,000 Chinamen now, and we have a population of from 750,000 to 800,000. I do not think we have too many Chinese at all. I think very few gentlemen in the city

think we have; but I would not overrun the country with them. The country, however, will never be overrun by them. They will come here just as the demand for their labor enables us to give them employment, and they will come to no greater extent.

Q. How does the Chinese population in numbers compare with the white population in numbers now and ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago? In other words has the ratio of Chinese population increased or diminished?—A. I think it has diminished.

Q. Compared with the whites?—A. I do not think the Chinamen have increased in this country since 1865. If they have, they have increased very little indeed, while the white population has very materially increased, as we all know.

Q. Is there apprehension entertained among the intelligent people on this coast of there being too great an influx of Chinamen?—A. I do not find that to be the case among those with whom I converse.

Q. You know of no such apprehension?—A. I know of no such apprehension, except what I read in the papers. The newspapers have very great apprehension of it.

Q. What, then, is the cause of the strong feeling or prejudice against Chinamen here; there must be some cause for such a state of things; what is it?—A. I think it arises from politicians, office-holders, and foreigners, as a general thing. Very many of our population pander to this low taste, you may call it, and join in the outcry against the Chinese in order to get the foreign vote and popularity among them. That is my idea.

Q. State whether or not there is a real competition or conflict between Chinese labor and white labor in this State.—A. I think not.

Q. Are there more laborers than there is labor for them?—A. I think not.

Q. If there are no more laborers than there is labor, and if the ratio of Chinese population compared with the white has decreased instead of increased, upon what grounds would you place a restriction on Chinese immigration? Why would it be necessary in that point of view?—A. Public opinion in very many quarters is that there will be, or might be, or is a possibility of too large a number of Chinese coming over here.

Q. That is the apprehension I was inquiring about.—A. For that reason I would to a certain extent gratify that opinion, and I would, if possible, put a restriction upon the number, so that they would not increase so largely.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Would you make the increase about at the ratio of departures, so as to keep about the number we have?—A. I do not think it would do any harm if we increased at the rate of 5,000 or 10,000 a year. The whole State is growing rapidly, and we must have labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you think at the present time they are coming or likely to come in a greater ratio than that?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Then in the business of immigration itself there is no necessity for limitation?—A. No absolute necessity. I think it would be good policy for the Government to restrict the number, as I said before, for certain reasons.

Q. Would that be in accordance with the treaty between this country and China?—A. No, sir; it would not. The treaty with China says:

The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual

advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects, respectively, from the one country to the other, for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents.

Q. If we should by law impose a restriction upon the immigration of Chinese, would it not appear to you to be in direct contravention of that treaty?—A. Certainly; and that treaty was forced upon China by the Americans, rather than courted by them. The emperor of China and his officials, I am told by everybody who has lived there, preferred that the citizens of China should remain in their own country rather than leave it, and the entire emigration comes from the British port of Hong Kong.

Q. Was this particular clause an innovation? The move came from us?—A. The move came from us, I understand, entirely.

Q. It was rather a breach of their policy to admit that free emigration was proper or right?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What would be the effect upon our commercial or our amicable relations with China to present a document to them restricting by law any further immigration of Chinese into this country?—A. That question can be better answered by our Senators and Representatives and men high in authority than by myself.

Q. You have been engaged in trade here for some time?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were at one time agent of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company?—A. I was from 1852 to 1862 agent of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, but we had no line to China and no relation with China at that time. I have constant dealings with them, selling them silver, quicksilver, and articles of that kind.

Q. Is the trade with China extending; is it growing up?—A. I do not think it is increasing very much.

Q. From what source do we expect it when we look for an increased trade with China?—A. As the coast builds up and our population increases our necessities increase for certain requisites of China—tea, sugar, silks, and we shall require a larger amount of them on this coast when we have four or five millions of people here than we need now.

Q. What is it that will increase the demand of the Chinese for our commodities?—A. I do not know of anything at all.

Q. Do not the Chinese who come to this country learn to use our American products?—A. I think so, entirely, and they gradually wear our clothing.

Q. Do you think that by the Chinese coming here and acquiring our habits, using our commodities, and going back to China they will carry our habits with them and gradually open up trade?—A. I think not. I think they never would wear our clothing in China, and they never would consume our food to a greater extent than they do now. When flour is very low, they consume it largely; when it is high, they consume it very little. It is used for cakes, bon-bons, candies, and things of that kind more than it is eaten in China, except by the foreign population.

Q. You were not connected with the steamship company since that immigration has been coming here?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think the immigration of Chinese to this coast has prevented the immigration of white labor here?—A. I do not.

Q. Has it had any effect upon it at all?—A. I think it has not. It has rather increased the demand for white labor than decreased it. As I said before, labor begets labor.

Q. What effect has the building railroads down in the valleys of California had upon white labor?—A. It has opened the country, settled

it, and drawn a white immigration to the coast. There is no doubt about that.

Q. Has the immigration of white families been large during the last few years?—A. It was very large last year, and has been materially large this year. That I get from the newspapers entirely.

Q. Do you know whether that southern country has been settling up more rapidly than during the last year or two?—A. Much more rapidly. I was in Salinas Valley two or three years ago, and it was a barren waste then comparatively.

Q. What is it now?—A. Farms in every direction; fences for miles and miles.

Q. How many towns have grown up along the Salinas Road?—A. Three or four, I think.

Q. Salinas City?—A. I am not familiar with that portion of the State.

Q. How is it with the San Joaquin Valley?—A. It has been growing and increasing very rapidly, I am told, since the railroad has been built there.

Q. How has the increase of white population followed the opening of these railroads?—A. The railroads were proposed to be opened, and opened, and of course the white population would settle, farms would be taken up, and the country fenced.

Q. How much of that is due to the building of the railroads?—A. I think pretty much all of it.

Q. To how many white people has that work given homes and employment?—A. I do not know.

Q. How much increase of white population do you attribute to that cause?—A. I attribute a large proportion of the immigration, the largest, I think, of white people we have had here, to that cause last year, and this year also.

Q. In the whole, has the immigration of white people which Chinese labor has brought in equaled or exceeded the Chinese population?—A. You mean to say, has it increased more than Chinamen have increased?

Q. No, I mean have the labors of the Chinese in building railroads and opening up that country brought more white people into the State than their own numbers; that is to say, suppose their number to be one hundred thousand in this State, have they by their labor brought more than a hundred thousand whites into the State?—A. I do not know. I am not prepared to answer. I think very probably they have. I am not familiar enough with the subject to give an answer.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In your dealings with the Chinese how do you find them for honesty and integrity?—A. They are very keen, clever merchants; they buy closely. I never lost a dollar with one of them in my life. I would trust them with four, five, ten, or fifteen thousand dollars just as soon as I would any of the jobbers in the city.

Q. Would you not trust them a little sooner?—A. No, I cannot say I would trust them a little sooner. Mr. John Parrott did all their banking business here for years, and he told me that he had never lost one dollar of principal or interest from any Chinamen while he was in the business. We sell them Mexican dollars frequently, every week almost, and if they want to take them up to their place to sharf them, which means to examine them, we always let them do it.

Q. You are aware of the outrages which have been committed on this people?—A. I have heard of them. I never saw any of them.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In speaking of the necessity of and benefit arising from Chinese immigration, do you confine yourself exclusively to the material interests of the country?—A. That is, the benefit they confer or the detriment to the State?

Q. Yes.—A. Entirely to the benefits to the State.

Q. The material interests and industries of the State?—A. Entirely.

Q. You are not considering, so far as your testimony goes, the moral or political questions?—A. Not at all.

Q. You have not, perhaps, reflected upon that view?—A. I have reflected a great deal on the question, and have heard a great deal about it.

Q. With reference to its influence upon the morals of our rising generation?—A. Exactly.

Q. Have you any opinion to give on the moral view of the question?—A. I have always found the Chinese a most quiet and industrious people, and quite as moral as the low classes of whites. The Chinese will smoke opium, and the whites will drink whisky. While I was president of the water-works for eleven years we employed every summer from 120 to 150 whites. They were neat, cleanly, industrious, hard-working; but they would smuggle in whisky occasionally and drink it.

Q. You have been a large employer of Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are largely identified in your interest with Chinese labor?—A. I am not identified with it in any shape or form at present.

Q. In the past?—A. In the past we employed whatever labor we considered cheapest.

Q. You are now engaged in the Chinese trade?—A. I am not.

Q. As a merchant?—A. As a merchant we do business with China and all parts of the world.

Q. You sell the Chinese silver?—Yes, sir.

Q. Quicksilver?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Opium?—Yes, sir.

Q. And such commodities as are exported from this port to their ports?—A. Yes, sir; and we receive sugar from there.

Q. Then you are in trade with China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And in a large trade with China?—A. Not very large; we get trade wherever we can find it.

Q. You think that the employment of Chinese does not affect our industries prejudicially?—A. I do not. I think it very beneficial.

Q. You are speaking, of course, in general terms?—A. In general terms.

Q. Let me particularize. What is the effect upon a trade: we will take for illustration the cigar-making trade, where our white people have been engaged all their lives in becoming skilled in this particular production, and the Chinese come in and, we will assume, they do the work as well or better, and at prices at which white people cannot live; what is the effect of that incoming immigration and competition upon the class of cigar manufacturers?—A. Upon the population it has one effect, which is to cause cheap cigars, and the people are enabled to smoke their cigars at much less price than they paid before. Whether it throws white cigar-makers out of business or not I do not know.

Q. You are not prepared to answer?—A. I am not prepared to answer.

Q. Then let me call your attention to another branch of industry. Of what part of the country are you a native?—A. I am from Massachusetts.

Q. In the State of Massachusetts, up to the time that you left, all of the washing or most of it was done by women?—A. I am sure I do not know. I left Massachusetts when I was eight years old.

Q. Before you had any washing done?—A. Before I had any washing done for myself, certainly. I lived in New York until 1845, in New Orleans until 1852, and in California since.

Q. Then you are a fair average of rather the general run of the country, so I will broaden my question. In all those parts of America have not the women, as a general rule, been the laundry-women and wash-women, and done the great bulk of that work?—A. I think so.

Q. I will ask you if it is not true that the Chinese have monopolized that work here?—A. In this city.

Q. What is the effect upon that class of domestic industry in the community who would do the washing; does it deprive them of labor?—A. I think the women should be very glad to get clear of washing, for it is one of the hardest labors in the world. These Chinamen, as a general thing, do the washing for all the mechanics, and they would give it to women if they did not give it to Chinamen.

Q. What is the effect upon that large class of poor working washer-women who have no other means of support?—A. I do not know; I think they have all found some other means of support. They lose the washing and go to something else.

Q. What else?—A. The Lord knows; I do not.

Q. You are in sympathy with all poor people who are without work and willing to get it?—A. People who know me pretty well in San Francisco can answer that better than I can.

Q. I believe, according to our statistics, there are between six and seven thousand Chinese wash-people engaged in that vocation; assuming that each one has driven a woman out of employment, it has deprived six or seven thousand women of labor. Is not that embarrassing to them as a class?—A. I should say that is embarrassing to them as a class.

Q. As to the women who were engaged in running sewing-machines to the extent of two or three thousand, which, by other testimony in this case, is entirely in the hands of the Chinese, what is the result?—A. I never heard of anything of the kind. I did not know that Chinamen were running sewing-machines here.

Q. Did you ever go up Sacramento street?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you never see the Chinamen through the gaping doors running these sewing-machines?—A. I never heard of any such thing. That shows you my ignorance.

Q. To drive them out of the country we all agree would be a great disadvantage to the country?—A. Most decidedly.

Q. One of your statements is that if there are 120,000 Chinese in this State, and they spent twenty-five cents a day, the result would be an expenditure of nearly a million dollars a month?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will only correct your statement by saying that it will amount to $9,000,000 per annum.—A. It will amount to more than that, if you will excuse me; 120,000 Chinese would spend $30,000 a day at 25 cents *per capita.*

Q. I estimate three hundred working days in a year.—A. You would have nine million dollars then.

Q. Suppose 120,000 white laborers could find employment at the average rates of Chinese labor, which is about a dollar a day, and white labor is about a dollar and a quarter a day; if 120,000 adult male whites could obtain employment in our State, how much money would the aver-

age white man spend out of that dollar that he earned?—A. He would spend more than the Chinaman.

Q. Would he not spend the whole of it?—A. No, sir.

Q. If he was a permanent fixed resident of the State with a family?—A. I do not think that he would.

Q. What would he do with it?—A. He would accumulate, as they all do; buy a lot here, and buy a lot there.

Q. Then he would either spend or accumulate?—A. He would either spend or accumulate, and the Chinamen would do the same thing. If our laws gave the Chinese protection, it would enable some of the wealthy classes of Chinamen to come here and bring their money. They are afraid to do it.

Q. By buying a lot and making a house and building a home; that would be spending money in the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the white man would spend his dollar?—A. I do not call that spending. The Chinaman spends money too. I put it at very low figures when I said twenty-five cents. I think a white man, on the same ratio, would spend forty or perhaps fifty cents.

Q. Then that would be an increased expenditure of twelve million, and the balance would be kept in the State in the way of accumulation?—A. Precisely.

Q. In that view of the case, which do you think most desirable?—A. I think the Chinamen, for the reason if you brought 120,000 white laborers here, you could not get employment for them, and they would not earn their wages.

Q. In other words, white labor cannot obtain employment where the Chinese can?—A. I do not say that at all; but the factories here can exist and make money by paying for labor a dollar a day, the Chinamen finding themselves, and they can compete with the East, while, if you brought white labor here and gave them two dollars a day they could not be employed, for the labor would cease to exist.

Q. Who does the labor in the manufactories of New England?—A. Whites.

Q. In England who does the labor, whites or Chinamen?—A. There are no Chinamen there.

Q. And none in our Eastern States?—A. No, sir; comparatively none at all.

Q. And here we have railroads and manufactories, all sorts of industries?—A. You know that labor is much cheaper in New England than it is on this coast.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is the average less than $1 a day there?—A. No. But what is our white labor here in this State? I say in New England white labor is lower than it is in California.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Very little lower, according to the evidence that has been taken here?—A. As they count a dollar, a dollar is only 90 cents in the East, paper currency.

Q. Do the Chinese come with the intention of remaining and becoming permanent citizens or returning?—A. Of returning. Their rule is, or was formerly, to return every fourth year.

Q. Does the average white immigrant from the East come with the intention of remaining and becoming a permanent citizen?—A. He comes with the intention of becoming a permanent citizen.

Q. Then which do you think is best for the future of the State, that

it should be settled by white immigration or by Asiatic immigration?—A. I think it better that it should be settled by white immigration.

Q. Why?—A. The whites, we all know, are a superior race to the Asiatics. If we take a religious view of the case, they are pagans.

Q. No, if you take a religious view of the case, they are better than we are, because we have had five preachers here who so testified.—A. They are pagans, and we all pretend at any rate to be Christians. Therefore it is proper and right that we should people the State with the whites; but, as I said before, I consider that cheap labor in a new country is absolutely necessary, and we should have the cheapest labor that we can get.

Q. Then you are looking upon it as a temporary necessity?—A. No, sir, I do not look upon it as a temporary necessity. I believe that a hundred years hence when our descendants are living in California they will turn back the page of history and see these proceedings, and they will then cast their eyes abroad over the country, look at the industries and how much Chinese labor has added to it, and they will smile with derision at the ignorance of their ancestors. That is the view I take of it. We have got to look to the future of America, and if we will just think of it, eighty years hence we will see a population of 150,000,000 souls.

Q. What proportion of Chinamen would you have of them then?—A. You might have one or two million Chinamen, and what harm can they do? I would not give them a vote. I would never give a negro a vote. That is my platform.

Q. Is it desirable to have within a free commonwealth a non-voting population?—A. Yes, sir; I see no objection to it at all; not a particle. The Chinese do not want to meddle with our politics. They are the most quiet, industrious, and best people I ever saw. They are the most valuable laborers I ever saw in my life. I was up at the Clear Lake quicksilver-mines, in which I am largely interested, four or five weeks ago. There we employ a hundred Chinamen, and it would be almost impossible to get along without them. It is an out-of-the-way place.

Q. You said you were not employing Chinamen?—A. I am a director in the company. We have got about 80 white men and 120 Chinamen. The superintendent told me that every night of their lives every Chinaman bathed himself from head to foot, and if you had asked that question of Daniel McClennan the other day he would have stated the same thing.

Q. That was in his testimony?—A. I did not read it. They wash themselves from head to foot. If you go down to Battery street at 4 o'clock in the morning you will see 200 or 300 Chinamen waiting to go into the factories, and if you will look at their hands and feet and neck you will see them as clean and neat-looking people as you ever saw in the world. They are different from the lower white classes.

Q. As a merchant you say the trade with China has not increased much?—A. I do not think it has increased very much.

Q. You also say they probably will not wear our clothing in China?—A. In China they are just as proud of their national costume as we are of ours, and it is just as likely that we will put on the Chinese costume as that the Chinaman will put on the American costume.

Q. They are not likely to consume our flour unless it competes with their rice?—A. Rice is their grand staple.

Q. Why are you of the opinion that the trade will not increase proportionately? You say it will increase somewhat, but the probability is that American products, such as clothing and breadstuffs, will not be

largely increased in China?—A. Simply for the reason that Chinamen are naturally proud of their own costume and will not wear our clothing in any way, shape, or form. In the next place they are brought up to eat rice from time immemorial, and they will continue to eat rice. They use flour as an auxiliary, and when it is very cheap they use it to a moderate extent. I do not know what the export is. When it is high of course the consumption decreases very much. Of quicksilver they are very large consumers, and they get it principally from this coast, more than from London—whichever market is the cheapest.

Q. You stated, I think, that our immigration would not be likely to increase?—A. Where from?

Q. From the East?—A. No, sir; I did not. I think and hope it will increase. I have got nothing but the interests of the State at heart. We all hope that it will increase.

Q. You think the Chinese immigration has not prevented eastern immigration?—A. I think it has not.

Q. How does it happen that Iowa, Minnesota, and the farther West, (I do not mean the ultimate West, our own coast, but the Northwest,) are so rapidly filling up with white immigration, and that we receive comparatively so little, considering our advantages?—A. If I should answer that question it would make me perhaps very unpopular in certain ways. If I were a farmer in the East I would never come to California to farm. I would go to those Western States, and I think the advantages there are very great over California. That is a very improper conclusion for an old Californian, who expects to live and die here, to come to, but that is my idea of it entirely.

Q. You think those people in the East have come to that conclusion?—A. I think many of them have, and I guess the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Cooper) thinks about the same thing.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You think cheap labor is the great desideratum in this State?—A. I think it necessary.

Q. You think your descendants about a hundred years hence will look upon these proceedings as a farce?—A. I did not say so. I said they would smile at the ignorance of their ancestors in endeavoring to stop Chinese labor, or to drive it out of the State. You must remember that a hundred years hence, although it is perhaps very foolish for us to talk about it at all, this State will be a garden comparatively from one end to the other, and Chinese labor, to a certain extent, in reclaiming lands where white people will not work or the lands will not pay us for employing white labor, is a great advantage. I believe the more railroads we have in the country the greater we will become.

Q. Were you in favor of slavery?—A. Never; but I was no abolitionist. Before the war was over I was an abolitionist, heart and soul, and wanted to see slavery ended, but in the beginning no greater insult could have been offered to me than to tell me I was an abolitionist. I lived seven years in the South and liked the people.

Q. Was not negro slavery a cheaper system of labor than Chinese labor?—A. We will not talk about slavery at all. There is no more comparison between a negro and a Chinaman than there is between day and night. Did you ever see a Chinaman who could not read and write? They are borrowing one of their great laws from China now in our eastern cities—compulsory education.

Q. Mr. Gibson says very few of them can read and write.—A. I never saw a male Chinaman in the State who could not read and write.

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. I said a great many of them could not read and write. I said one-fifth of them would not be considered to have a common-school education.

The WITNESS. It is compulsory for the males. The females are cast aside, but the females read and write.

Q. (By Mr. PIPER.) Then you think the Chinaman much superior to the negro?—A. Decidedly. They are bright, clever, intelligent people. I am not speaking of the very lowest that we have here, but of those that I am brought in connection with; but the ordinary class of laborers have letters, correspondence.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. As to the general integrity of the Chinese in their dealings, what is your opinion of their integrity as a people?—A. I think they pay their debts of all sorts and kinds ten times more promptly than white people. I believe they pay their rents better and more promptly.

Q. How extensively are they employed as domestic servants in this city, for example?—A. That I do not know, whether pretty generally or not pretty generally. There are a great many of them employed. I have never had them in my house.

Q. What is your opinion of the honesty and integrity of Chinese servants?—A. I would trust them just as soon as any other men. Perhaps I have no business to have that opinion, for I have never employed them. I have a large number of servants in my house, and might have one Chinaman. He would be very handy. A great many of my friends have a Chinese boy to wash windows, &c., but the others would not let him stay if I got him.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You prefer white domestics?—A. Yes, sir; in my house, of course, I do.

Q. You would rather pay a larger price for white servants?—A. O, Lord! do not talk about that; but then I have had some of my servants a great while, my cook for 15 years, a dining-room servant for 14 years. Of course I pay them a high price.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You do not think they stay with you from gratitude?—A. Not a bit. They stay because it is their interest. They get $50 a month and their board.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did you ever know any such number as twelve hundred washerwomen here?—A. I do not know anything about it one way or the other. I think this very employment of the Chinese in laundry-work causes mechanics to change their clothing much oftener than they did when they paid a high price for their washing. Take, for instance, the top of these houses where the Chinese laundries are, and look on the lines of ragged clothing, old red shirts, pantaloons, and every ordinary common thing, garments that I do not believe were washed half as much before, and they were not even fit for a woman to wash.

Q. Were there any women engaged in the business here before the Chinese?—A. That I do not know anything about. Domestics do that work now, but to what extent I do not know. I have a laundry-woman in my house.

Q. You do not understand me. I want to know whether there were any women engaged in the business of keeping wash-houses on the

streets and seeking clothes to wash, the work that the Chinese are doing now?—A. Not of any consequence. There were some few French laundries.

Q. Is not a great part of the support of these Chinese wash-houses from the poorer classes of people, who are thus relieved from doing their own washing?—A. I think so.

Q. Is not the washing of the more wealthy classes generally done in their houses by white servants?—A. I think so.

Q. That is the case with your own house?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And so far as you are acquainted, is not that the general custom?—A. It is with all my friends, I think, pretty much. I do not know of anybody who would ever give out their clothing to a Chinese laundry.

Q. Do these Chinamen, then, in fact, displace any one in that business?—A. That I do not know.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. If I understand Mr. Babcock, his opinion is that the washing done by these Chinese is in a great part done for mechanics?—A. I will not say in great part, but there is a large portion of it done for them.

Q. If wealthy people have their washing done at home by white servants, they would not patronize these laundries?—A. They do not patronize these laundries, I think.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Did you ever find any difficulty in getting domestics?—A. No, sir.

Q. You are able to get all you want?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you ever tried to get a white servant to do all the work of your family?—A. I have never been poor enough to do that, of late years.

Q. You have employed a white servant to cook, doing nothing but the cooking, and waiters, doing nothing but waiting on the table. It is easy enough to get those servants; but is it easy to get a white domestic to do all the work of a family?—A. I think it would be pretty difficult. The Chinamen are a great advantage, all through the State. In the little hotels, wherever you are traveling, if you go into the kitchen you see a nice Chinese cook and Chinese waiters. There, I think, they are an advantage; and I think the people in the country find a very great difficulty in getting white servants to remain with them, whereas Chinamen do not care where they go.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. On the line along the Union Pacific Railroad, do not those nice, white girls look better than Chinamen?—A. I would rather have a nice, tidy, white girl to wait on me, and I suppose you would, too. You would show your want of taste, if you did not.

Q. Suppose we did not have these Chinamen here, would we not have nice, tidy, white girls?—A. No, sir; and you would pay such wages that, if you are now able to keep three servants, you could keep only two, probably, and then you would be able to exercise no control over them. The Chinese make a balance of power, and it is absolutely necessary in the condition we are to have the Chinese, in my opinion; yet, I do not employ them.

Q. They do not have Chinese in Iowa and Missouri and Massachusetts?—A. I only know about my own State.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know what amount is accumulated in the savings-banks of this city?—A. I was president of the Chamber of Commerce for two years, and last year in my report I think it was sixty-two millions of dollars.

Q. In what proportion has that increased during the last two or three years? How does the proportion of increase agree with the preceding year?—A. From the 1st of January, 1874, to the 1st of January, 1876, I think it increased seven millions of dollars. I may be wrong, however, in my figures.

Q. How did that agree with previous years?—A. It naturally rolls up more rapidly all the time.

Q. The increase has kept a steady pace?—A. It has kept a steady pace.

Q. Are the laboring classes, as a general thing, land-owners?—A. They are, as a very general thing, I think. Three servants in my house own lots.

Q. How do we compare in regard to bank-savings and in regard to laboring men owning their own houses and lots, with other States?—A. I think our laboring population is richer than any other laboring population in the world—that there is a greater accumulation of money by them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak of the whites?—A. Of the whites, of course. There is one proof of this, when, in a small place, we can show $62,000,000, I think, or $67,000,000 in the savings-banks.

Q. Do the Chinese use these savings-banks?—A. No, sir; I think they do not, nor do they use any banks hardly at all. Some of them, however, I think, do. Fong Tang, for instance, a man who spoke French, German, and English, an accomplished merchant in Hong-Kong now, one of the most intelligent men I ever met, would keep a bank-account, but they seem to be afraid.

Q. What is the character of your Chinese merchants for ability and intelligence, and their manner of doing business?—A. Clear-headed, shrewd, smart, intelligent, bright men. They are ordinary-looking fellows, many of them, as you see them going about the streets.

Q. Are they capable of managing a large business?—A. To any extent. Especially that is true of the hong merchants of Hong-Kong. When Nye failed he owed Han Quo a million Mexican dollars. It never had any effect on Han Quo's business at all whether he lost a million or two millions. If they had proper protection here in this country many of them would bring their money here.

Q. What are the Chinese as a nation in regard to mercantile honor?—A. We have six companies here, and I think if one got into trouble and could not pay, the others would come to his relief and give any amount of money required. I have never lost a dollar in my dealings with them in the world. As I told you, they are a shrewd class, sharp buyers.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is it not a fact that our laboring classes are in pretty good circumstances here, and own their own dwellings?—A. Mr. Brooks asked me the same question. I think they are better off than any other laboring population in the world.

Q. Is that due to the Chinese labor?—A. No; I do not say that it is due to anything at all. It is due to their own industry.

WEST EVANS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been in this country?—Answer. It was twenty-five years in January since I arrived here.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a manufacturer and dealer in railroad ties and lumber.

Q. Have you been extensively engaged in building railroads?—A. Somewhat extensively.

Q. What labor have you used on your works generally?—A. In the manufacture of railroad-ties I have used white labor; in building railroads I use mostly Chinese labor.

Q. What kind of labor is most satisfactory to you?—A. Chinamen give us better satisfaction generally.

Q. In railroading?—A. Yes, sir; in railroad-building.

Q. How extensively have you been engaged in getting out railroad-ties?—A. I have been in the business ever since the Pacific Railroad was started, and I think that was in 1863.

Q. Supplying that company and others?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many white men do you employ in your busiest time?—A. Probably from 400 to 500.

Q. Are you the West Evans who advertised in the papers for white labor extensively a year or two ago?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What success did you meet with?—A. I got but very few.

Q. How many did you advertise for?—A. I wanted a hundred.

Q. How many did you get?—A. Twenty or thirty, I guess. I sent more than a hundred up to the work, but they would not work when they got there.

Q. For what reason?—A. They thought it was too hard work.

Q. How many did you retain?—A. From 20 to 30; possibly 30.

Q. Did they work by contract or for stated wages?—A. They worked in building the railroad by the month, and in making ties they worked by the piece.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Which road was that—the Marin County railroad?—A. No, sir; the Mendocino Railroad.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Was there any conflict in Mendocino between your white laborers and the Chinese?—A. There was a threatened conflict.

Q. From which side did it come?—A. It came from the Irish side.

Q. What was their proposition?—A. They ordered my superintendent to discharge all the Chinamen.

Q. Did you do it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think there is a surplus of white labor in this State, such as you employ?—A. I have not been able to employ it. I want men now and cannot get them.

Q. Are you successful in getting men from this city to go up there as laborers?—A. No, sir.

Q. What wages do you pay monthly for labor?—A. In building the road we started the men in on $40 a month and board. If a man was found to be worth more we paid it to him. To some of them in bridge-building we paid as high as $110 a month and boarded them.

Q. At stated times do you have more trouble with your men than at other times?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the cause of that?—A. I have had trouble with my men only during political campaigns.

Q. What trouble did you have then?—A. O, men get dissatisfied; and that is the time generally when they are opposed to Chinamen.

Q. Do they find some one to lead them at those times?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. What class of people generally lead them on?—A. I never had any trouble between white men and Chinamen, except with the Irish. I never had any Americans or Germans or Scandinavians to meddle with the Chinamen at all.

Q. It is the Irish which interfere with them altogether, in your experience?—A. I never had any trouble with any other.

Q. Protestant Irish?—A. No, sir; Catholic Irish.

Q. The Protestant Irish do not seem to interfere with them in any part of the State?—A. They never have with me; I never heard of their interfering with Chinamen.

Q. Then from what source does this opposition to the Chinese arise, in your opinion, periodically?—A. I never heard any business men opposed to Chinamen. It comes through politicians and this class I speak of.

Q. Do you think the Chinese have been a benefit to the State?—A. I think so.

Q. Greatly so?—A. I do not see how we could do the work we have done here without them; at least, I have done work that would not have been done if it had not been for Chinamen—work that I could not have done without them.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You say you could not have done this work without Chinamen?—A. No.

Q. Suppose the same number of white men had come from the East and from Europe here, as Chinamen have come, could you not then have done the work?—A. If they had been here and had worked, of course I could have done it.

Q. White men can do any work that the Chinamen can do?—A. O, yes; but, understand me, I tried to get white men to do this work and failed.

Q. They were not here because these Chinamen had prevented them from coming. Is not that the fact really?—A. I do not think it is.

Q. Did not a great many white laboring men come here last year and year before and go back?—A. Quite likely they did.

Q. Why did they go back to the East?—A. Do you want my opinion?

Q. Yes; I want your opinion.—A. Because they did not want to work.

Q. That is your opinion?—A. That is only my opinion.

Q. Are white men generally loafers and fellows who do not want to work?—A. Not generally.

Q. What percentage of the white men in this State do not want to work?—A. I cannot tell you that.

Q. You must have an idea about it.—A. I am told there is a large percentage of the white population here who choose their work.

Q. Of course, every man chooses his profession and his work.—A. Excuse me. I presume that five hundred men, yes, a thousand, came into my office during the time I advertised in the Chronicle; they nearly worried me out; and they did not any of them want to work at the kind of work I wanted to have done. I wanted them to work on

the railroad, blasting rock, shoveling dirt, and building bridges, or to go into the woods and make ties.

Q. Is there not a class of men that we call lumbermen who work cutting trees and saw-logs for lumber? That is a kind of trade or profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That class are principally Americans?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there not another class who work with the spade, shovel, and pick?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are principally Irish?—A. Yes, sir; that is true.

Q. And you could not get this particular kind of men, these lumbermen?—A. No; I wanted fellows with the spade and shovel to go and dig on the railroad; they could not make ties; they had no experience.

Q. In other words, labor is classified?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you not believe if these Chinamen had not come here we would have the same number of white men here to do the labor that they do?—A. My opinion is, no.

Q. What is that opinion based upon?—A. It is based upon the fact that there is labor here for every man in the State if he will work.

Q. There is?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You still say there is a large class of idlers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And they are principally Roman Catholic Irish, I suppose, according to your views?—A. No; I did not say that.

Q. You say that is the class who are always making disturbances?—A. Yes; disturbances with the Chinamen.

Q. But a Protestant Irishman does not?—A. I have never seen them doing that.

Q. It is a matter of a man's religion whether he is a good citizen or a bad citizen, according to your view?—A. I think their religion has a good deal to do with this Chinese question.

Q. What is the religion of the people of France?—A. Mostly Catholic.

Q. Is there not 90 per cent. of them Catholics?—A. I am not versed in that.

Q. Is there any more industrious people, accumulating people, in the world than the people of France, that you know or have read of?—A. They are industrious; but remember that they are not a priest-ridden people as a class. They are not people who go to confession in the morning before daylight, and who are going in and out of the church from daylight to 12 o'clock at night.

Q. I happen to know to the contrary. The French people are a very religious people. I have been there.—A. I only speak from experience and observation here. I have not been there. I came here a boy, and never saw a Catholic church until I came here.

Mr. PIPER. So I think, from your intelligence.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say you think within three months a thousand men came into your office?—A. That is my opinion.

Q. Asking work?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But they would not accept the work that you had to perform?—A. No, sir.

Q. What was that work?—A. It was building a railroad in Mendocino County and making railroad-ties. I built a road from the coast three miles and a half back into the forest. It was a very heavy piece of work. It took 150 men six or eight months; and I was opening a forest that never had been cut into. During the time I was building that road, I wanted to make railroad-ties in order to have business for my road by the time I got it into operation.

Q. You wanted to prepare the ties for sale in advance of the completion of the road?—A. Yes, sir; by the time I finished the road I wanted business for it.

Q. This work was offered to white men?—A. Yes, sir; I advertised in the Chronicle for three months, wanting help.

Q. Was your road built with Chinese labor?—A. The most of the excavation was by Chinese labor. The bridge-building of course was done by white labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Who did the work of making the ties?—A. White men; but I have some Chinamen there now making ties.

Q. What was the reason white men would not accept this work?—A. They had all sorts of excuses; they said it was too hard work. It is a pretty wild country, and they complained bitterly of camping out. Those were immigrants who came into the office, and they seemed to have come out here for another purpose. They had farms or something of that kind in their heads.

Q. Was it because they could not do the work or because they did not wish to do it?—A. The men generally who came were stout people, fine-looking fellows.

Q. Was it work requiring education?—A. A man wants a little education to split up timber without waste in the making of ties. He can very soon learn it, if he has the disposition to do so. It is a little different from chopping and cording wood.

JAMES H. STROBRIDGE sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident of this State?—Answer. Twenty-seven years.

Q. You have been engaged in the direction of railroad-building for how many years?—A. More or less for the last fifteen years.

Q. You had charge of the work, did you not, pretty much, of the whole Central Pacific Railroad?—A. I was superintendent of construction.

Q. That gave you the supervision of all the labor on the road?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you commence that road?—A. We commenced it with white men.

Q. Did you change to any other?—A. Yes; we changed to Chinamen. I advertised extensively for men, wanted several thousand, and was never able to get over 700 or 800 white men at one time. We increased finally to 10,000. A large number of men would go on to the work under those advertisements; but they were unsteady men, unreliable. Some of them would stay a few days, and some would not go to work at all. Some would stay until pay-day, get a little money, get drunk, and clear out. Finally, we resorted to Chinamen. I was very much prejudiced against Chinese labor. I did not believe we could make a success of it. I believe Chinese labor in this country on that kind of work never had been made a success until we put them on there; but we did make a success of them. We worked a great many of them, and built the road virtually with Chinamen, though the white labor increased very much after introducing Chinese labor. We made foremen of the most intelligent of the white men, teamsters, and hostlers. We increased, I suppose, to 2,000 or 2,500 white men. At that time we were working fully 10,000 Chinamen.

Q. Then you changed your views in reference to the Chinese as laborers?—A. Very much.

Q. How did you find them to compare in that heavy work on the Sierra Nevada, tunnels, deep cuts, and rock works, with the white labor you had?—A. They were equal to the white men.

Q. They were equal to them?—A. Yes.

Q. You had tests occasionally made there, as I read at the time in the newspapers, between white labor and the Chinese?—A. Yes.

Q. Who generally came out ahead?—A. When they were working on a strife, as they did sometimes, if there was any difference it was with the white men; but the key of the situation was the Summit Tunnel, which was very hard rock, and we undertook to stock that with the best of white men. We considered them to be at that time superior to Chinamen. But we were unable to keep the work filled with white men, although we only worked eight hours. We worked in eight-hour shifts; and as we could not keep the work favorable, we put in a gang of Chinamen. Finally, before the work was half done, perhaps, I do not recollect at what stage, the Chinamen had possession of the whole work. At last the white men swore they would not work with Chinamen anyhow.

Q. In that particular tunnel, or all along?—A. In that particular tunnel, not on the other work. We always had gangs of white men. We employed all the white men we could get so long as they would work.

Q. Would you always give white men labor who asked for it?—A. I do not think there was ever a white man turned away for want of a place, to my knowledge.

Q. The Chinamen became expert railroad-builders?—A. The Chinamen were good laborers.

Q. You found them reliable and honest?—A. O, yes; as much so as other people; much more reliable; they would not get drunk and go away as white men.

Q. Whom did you pay their wages to?—A. They were furnished to us by different companies, sometimes Chinamen, sometimes white men. We had different companies at that time of white men. We had a man by the name of Sisson and a man by the name of Wallace. Afterward they consolidated and made the firm of Sisson, Wallace & Co. Latterly they furnished pretty much all the Chinamen that we worked.

Q. Were you familiar with the construction of the Union Pacific at the same time?—A. Only by hearsay.

Q. Did you hear that they had strikes upon that road repeatedly?—A. We saw accounts in the papers of their having difficulties with the men.

Q. Do you recollect that they seized Mr. Durant and imprisoned him?—A. I recollect waiting at the promontory for him to lay the last rail, when it was represented that that was the cause of his absence.

Q. Do you know whether the class of laborers who constructed that road settled along the line and built up farms to any considerable extent?—A. I am not familiar with it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Was that seizing of Mr. Durant because their wages were unpaid?—A. I think so; that was so reported.

Q. There would likely be some commotion among Chinaman if their wages were not paid?—A. I never had any difficulty in that respect.

Q. The tendency was to show that white men make disturbances. You say you remember that you were detained in laying the last rail by the

absence of Mr. Durant, and you understood he was kept by white men, and you say that was because their wages were unpaid. I would like to ask you if the same would not be true of the Chinese? If their wages were not paid they would not like it very well?—A. That would naturally delay any man. We never were delayed in consequence of that.

Q. You always paid them their wages?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Therefore you had no occasion to be caught?—A. Sometimes we did not pay for two months and perhaps more.

Q. Did you find the Chinamen that you employed unreliable?—A. Some of them.

Q. As a rule, were not the white men faithful and steady workmen who built your bridges?—A. Of course; they were mechanics.

Q. Did they not do their work steadily and well?—A. Mechanics are almost always steady men.

Q. That is, if they are white?—A. I believe they are all white.

Q. And you found them regular, steady men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You employed the Chinamenmostly in digging; working with the shovel and pick?—A. Yes, sir; blasting rock and all sorts of work.

Q. And you employed the white men in driving teams?—A. In driving teams and as hostlers.

Q. Were they steady in that employment?—A. They were not.

Q. As a rule?—A. As a rule they were not.

Q. Then as a rule your teams were not driven steadily?—A. We had a great many steady teamsters and a great many unsteady ones; and then the white men who worked in the pit were generally unsteady. The higher classes, the mechanics, were steady men almost universally.

Q. What do you mean by men who work in the pits?—A. Men digging.

Q. Beside the Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I was directing your attention to the teamsters. As a rule, were your teamsters unsteady?—A. Rather.

Q. Then your teaming was unsteadily done?—A. We generally kept a surplus of teamsters on hand.

Q. Did you pay unemployed teamsters?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then what do you mean by keeping a surplus on hand?—A. We kept them at something else.

Q. At what else?—A. We put them to work in the stable, or we would put them to work with the carpenters—something or other—until we wanted them. We did the same way with the foremen; much of the time we had a dozen foremen on hand at a time. Our foremen were very unsteady. Eight-tenths of the foremen used in that work were taken from the pits, from shovelers and from drillers. The most reliable men we had in that class we took and made foremen of them.

Q. Your experience then is with white American labor?—A. We had very few American teamsters and carpenters.

Q. Your experience then of white labor gives you rather a contemptuous opinion of it?—A. Not a contemptuous opinion.

Q. It is unsteady, unreliable, cannot be depended upon?—A. In a measure. The class of men who go upon public works are rather unsteady men.

Q. Have you ever had anything to do with such works anywhere else except in California?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find the same thing elsewhere?—A. Yes, sir; I was the foreman of the Vermont Central at the time that was built.

Q. Do you find it about the same there as here?—A. I think they were more riotous there than here.

Q. Then the advantage is rather in favor of California labor?—A. We had not so many of them here as in the Vermont Central, for they were, of course, all white men there.

Q. So that a person familiar with such works and the peculiarities of the labor throughout the Eastern and Western States can judge what you say to the disadvantage of California labor of that kind by the remark that it is about the same there as here. Is that correct?—A. I never have done any work in the Western States, but in the Eastern States, in New England, there is not much difference, taking that class of labor.

Q. It is about the same thing?—A. Yes; for that class of labor.

Q. Does not your preference to Chinese labor arise from two causes: first, that they are more docile, have less will of their own against their bosses; and, second, that they are much cheaper?—A. With white men seldom any difficulty occurs on the work. The difficulty in working white men on public works is when they are off from the work.

Q. That is not an answer to my question. I ask you whether your preference to Chinese labor does not spring from the two causes that I have mentioned, that they are more docile, have less will of their own against those who work them, and that they are much cheaper?—A. I started to say that I do not think the Chinese are any more docile than white men. While at work very seldom any difficulty occurs with the white men; but the difficulty with white men is when they are off of work. For instance, after they have been paid they will get drunk. That is when the trouble comes with them. The whites are as docile men as can be desired on work. They are so here and were on the Central Pacific; I would not want any more so.

Q. Does it amount to a general rule that when the white men were paid they got drunk?—A. In that class of men, as a general rule, they do.

Q. And the men you employed as teamsters, aside from the mechanics who built your bridges, as a general rule got drunk when you paid them off?—A. Yes, sir; seven-tenths of them.

Q. Is that the rule also in the other States where your experience goes?—A. It was the rule there also.

Q. Seven-tenths of them there?—A. I think so, fully.

Q. And they got drunk, so as to make a disturbance and be offensive?—A. Yes, sir; boisterous.

Q. Then you bring in another element why you prefer the Chinese. Do you exclude the two I have mentioned, that they go where they are directed and do just what they are told rather more than Americans, and that they are much cheaper?—A. No, sir; the white men on our work were willing to go wherever we desired them to go, and we never had any difficulty with them in that respect.

Q. Then your two preferences to Chinese are that they do not get drunk and that they work a good deal cheaper?—A. They are cheaper. With regard to white men and Chinamen here we had no difficulty in getting white men to go on to any work, rock-work or anything else, while, on the other hand, with Chinamen we had a great deal of difficulty to get them to go on to rock, and to do much hard work, because they were not accustomed to it.

Q. Did you hear the testimony of the previous witness, that the Chinamen do hard work and the white men complain and will not do it?—A. I heard it.

Q. Your testimony is opposite?—A. The white men we had on the work went willingly where we wanted them. A great many white men

would not remain; sometimes one fault and sometimes another; they did not feel well enough. There was always complaint when they did not want to work. When they wanted to work we had no difficulty with them.

Q. There is no real cause of complaint, so far as the Chinese are concerned, of their labor or any other characteristic so far as you know?—A. With regard to their work on the public work, I never had any difficulty with them.

Q. You are perfectly satisfied with the Chinese as laborers in every respect?—A. No; I am not perfectly satisfied. We get along with them with very little difficulty.

Q. If you are not perfectly satisfied with them what is your objection?—A. If they had done a great deal more work than they did I would have been better satisfied.

Q. On more wages?—A. When I was contractor myself I frequently had to pay them more wages than I liked to.

Q. Your criticism, then, is that they did not do as much work as you wanted them to do, and they wanted more money for it?—A. I had no fault to find with them in that respect particularly.

Q. Were you a contractor or merely director?—A. On that work I was a director.

Q. You were working for wages?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What wages did you get? I only ask by way of comparison.—A. When I went to work for them I got one hundred and twenty-five dollars a month, and afterwards they paid more.

Q. Afterwards how much?—A. If that is what I am here for I will tell all my private affairs.

Q. Not at all, if you feel the slightest hesitation.—A. I would prefer not to answer the question. It is a private matter.

Q. I was only going to ask whether you thought you were paid too much?—A. Yes, sir; I think I was.

Q. You took it, however?—A. I told Mr. Crocker sometimes when I was sick it was more than I earned.

Q. When you were well was it too much?—A. I think I earned all I took then.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You never struck for lower wages?—A. No, nor higher either.

Q. You received much more pay during part of that time than the others did?—A. I think so.

Q. Still you would like to have the others working for you to work for still less than you were receiving?—A. Did I say that? While I was working for them I never thought we paid them too much, but since then on some contract-work I thought I paid Chinamen more than they earned, or rather more than they ought to have had. I do not know but they earned their money, however. Men generally earn their money when they work for me.

Q. So that one difficulty in getting white labor was that you wanted to pay Chinese wages? If a man wanted to contract for work you wanted him to do the work at exactly what a Chinaman would do it for?—A. We didn't have any contract.

Q. You wanted the white men to work for what the Chinamen worked for?—A. We always paid liberal wages. When we paid Chinamen twenty-six dollars a month and they boarded themselves we paid the white men thirty dollars a month and boarded them.

Q. For working in the pit?—A. Yes, sir. We afterwards paid the

Chinamen thirty dollars and the white men thirty-five dollars. Our track-layers were almost always white men.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. If you could get white men for the same price per diem that you can get Chinamen for, would you or would you not prefer the white men?—A. In large bodies I think the Chinamen would be preferable.

Q. Owing to the facility with which you use them?—A. We have less difficulty with them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Which would you prefer?—A. Chinamen in large bodies. It is a difficult matter to control white men in large bodies after pay-day.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. They go on a spree, I suppose?—A. They go on a spree.

Q. Independent of that would you not much prefer them?—A. I would.

Q. About what percentage more does a good fair white laborer do than a good fair Chinaman?—A. There is very little difference. If you take a gang of twenty or thirty white men together and a gang of twenty or thirty Chinamen there is not much difference when they are well handled.

Q. And really their labor is about thirty-three per cent. cheaper to the contractor than the white labor?—A. It is much cheaper. Their board is an important consideration.

CHARLES S. PECK sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been in this country?—Answer. A little over 18 years.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Drayman or teamster, whichever you please to call it; drayman, I suppose.

Q. What class of people do you do business for principally?—A. With the Chinese almost exclusively. We, however, do other work if we are called upon.

Q. What is the extent of your business per annum, or by the month?—A. Perhaps $25,000 a year.

Q. Do you come in contact with all classes of Chinamen in the transaction of your business?—A. We do.

Q. But particularly the merchants?—A. Yes, sir; our business is with the merchants, of course, but we come in contact with all classes.

Q. How have you found them as to their honesty and integrity in dealing with them?—A. We have found them very honest; indeed I may say strictly honest. I do not know that we ever lost anything by them.

Q. Your business is to dray goods from the warehouses or from the wharves or the custom-house? Just explain it.—A. Everywhere; we take goods from the vessels that discharge here to the warehouses, and from stores and warehouses to the railroads and steamers. The trade of the city goes all over the country; in fact nearly all over the world.

Q. How many men does that give employment to?—A. We keep ten men employed.

Q. With trucks and drays?—A. Yes, sir; mostly trucks.

Q. Your acquaintance is pretty extensive in this city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you an extensive acquaintance among the draymen and laboring classes, the white people you are brought in contact with?—A. I have.

Q. What is their opinion in reference to Chinese immigration?—A. The general opinion seems to be that the Chinese have been beneficial to the State, and that what is here is well enough; but they think there should be some measures taken perhaps to limit the immigration in the future; some think so and some do not. Some think that the immigration will be according to the supply and demand.

Q. How many draymen are there in the city engaged in the business of driving drays?—A. Perhaps 3,000.

Q. Do you speak on this question in reference to their opinion as covering this 3,000, or a portion of them?—A. A portion of them, of course. I do not come in contact with all of them.

Q. About what proportion of that 3,000 would that portion be that you have conversed with and with whose ideas you are familiar?—A. Probably two-thirds of them.

Q. You say that some of them are favorable to restricting and others are not. What do you mean by restricting? Say that 500 went back, would you bring 500 here? Would that be satisfactory to that class?—A. If more came, that is if the Chinese population should increase in a certain ratio with the white population, it would be beneficial to the State and country.

Q. Suppose they did not increase with the ratio of white people, then how would it be?—A. I do not know that I am capable of judging.

Q. From your past experience of what we have had here, with a population of seven hundred or eight hundred thousand white people at the present time, which is about the population of the State, suppose that we had a population of 1,200,000 people, could we endure another 50,000 Chinese?—A. I think we could.

Q. What do you think, then, of restricting the ratio at about that figure as to the labor of the State?—A. I think it would be desirable.

Q. Do you think there is a very large element here opposed to Chinese immigration?—A. There is a certain class; I do not think it is a very large element.

Q. From your observation, who are that class; what are they composed of?—A. The laboring classes.

Q. In your business transactions and dealing with the Chinese, do you work by the contract with them or are you simply a drayman and do their work?—A. I am simply a drayman and do their work. I have certain prices for doing their work, the same as other draymen in the city.

Q. Can you approximate the amount which the Chinese custom pays the draymen annually or monthly?—A. The United States draymen?

Q. All the draymen engaged in business in the city?—A. Perhaps $75,000 a year, including the United States draymen.

Q. You mean the custom-house draymen?—A. The custom-house draymen.

Q. How long have you been in the business?—A. Over 16 years.

Q. Have you noticed that there is a growing trade between this country and China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You find the business of drayman becoming larger every year in that line?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Both to and fro?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose the business of drayman went into the hands of the Chinese, would that modify your opinion at all as to their desirability?—A. I do not think it would.

Q. Do you think it would be as well for you and the other draymen if the Chinese did all the draying and owned the teams?—A. I do not know but that it would. If I was not in draying I should be doing something else.

Q. What else?—A. It is hard to tell now. Draying is not the business I was brought up to.

Q. It is the business of a great many men, is it not, and they were brought up to it?—A. I presume so.

Q. How about those?—A. I presume they would find something else to do.

Q. What else?—A. It is hard to say what else. I might go into the milling business. I am a mill man.

Q. Suppose all the milling business were done by the Chinese, what then would you do?—A. I should do something; perhaps I should compete with them.

Q. Suppose they work individually for lower wages than you could maintain a family on, and you could not compete with them? Suppose it was a competition between your home and the kind of home they have on Dupont street?—A. That is in the future. I do not expect any such thing.

Q. You do not anticipate that they will take the draying right off?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you not aware that they have taken certain branches of industry effectually, such as cigar-making?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is said that they are not accustomed to horses and do not manage them. Has not that been the cause of the protection of your business?—A. They do not understand the language.

Q. Then the real fact is, I suppose, that draymen are protected from this competition by the ignorance of the Chinese of our language, that they could not take commissions as well for wares?—A. They do not understand the language, to read and write, the class who would do that work.

Q. They would not have much facility for doing it?—A. No, sir.

Q. That in itself, then, tends to protect the draymen from that competition? Do you not think it would be a disadvantage to you to be driven out of business and compelled to find something else?—A. Perhaps it would and probably it would not.

Q. The result would be that you might find something to do?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You do not know what it would be?—A. I should not look for it until I was out of business.

Q. Speaking of the opinion of different classes, do I understand you to say that a majority of those engaged in doing the draying business in this town think that we can stand an increase in the number of Chinese here?—A. I think so.

Q. You think that is a prevailing opinion among them?—A. I do.

Q. You have no hesitation in expressing that opinion?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do they ever attend anti-Chinese meetings and sign anti-Chinese petitions?—A. I do not know that they do. I never saw one of those petitions.

Q. On what do you base your statement that that is their opinion, if you never saw the petitions nor attended those meetings?—A. I never attended those meetings. The draymen have a union here, and I have heard them express their sentiments there.

Q. At the Draymen's Union do they express sentiments in favor of the Chinese?—A. I do not know that they do at the meeting; but I

have heard individual members express themselves. The question never has been brought up.

Q. Was it in general discussion you heard this?—A. No, sir; not in general discussion of that question. That question has never been agitated in the meeting.

Q. You have heard individuals express their opinion that way?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever heard any individuals express the opposite opinion?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you simply say there is a division of opinion among them?—A. O, yes; of course. Some would say they ought all to be driven out of the country.

Q. I think that is an extreme view?—A. I think so, too.

Q. I do not think that is shared by many?—A. No, sir; by very few.

Q. But on the question of unrestricted immigration—letting the thing drift; letting them come by a hundred thousand a year or five thousand a year, just as they might—what do you think is the opinion?—A. The opinion is divided. Some say, as I remarked before, that the supply and demand will regulate itself; others think there will be restriction, and others think they should be prohibited altogether from coming here. But those are small classes, so far as my observation goes.

Q. What do you mean by supply and demand? Do you mean the demand for their labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The demand in which they will be employed by others?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you not aware that they are going into the business of employers themselves very largely; as, for instance, that they are buying up large tracts of fertile lands and cultivating them on their own account and with their own labor?—A. I understand that they have bought some tracts of land.

Q. Such enterprises are outside of this law of demand and supply that you speak of?—A. No, sir; that is included.

Q. Is it not outside of the law of demand on the part of white people for their labor?—A. They would come here if white people wanted to employ them, or if they could find employment among themselves.

Q. Then the demand may be indefinitely increased by their taking large tracts of land and starting Chinese farms?—A. That I do not know. I do not think it would.

Q. They are beginning to do that now, you understand, in the last year or two?—A. I understand there have been several tracts of land purchased by Chinese.

Q. Is there any limit to the amount of land they may acquire and the number of colonies they may create of Chinese?—A. I do not know that there is any limit.

Q. There is no limit in the process of our laws?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. If that process goes on, may they not soon practically own the soil of the State?—A. I think there are but few Chinese who would venture in that class of enterprises. There are certain kinds of Chinese who venture in certain kinds of enterprises and others who do not; and I do not think the State would be overrun.

Q. The class which would venture into that kind of enterprises would employ the other class who would not venture into them, and the other class would readily sell their labor to them, would they not?—A. I suppose they would labor for hire.

Q. Then what is there to prevent this thing from going on until finally they get possession of the soil of the State?—A. There is nothing to prevent them that I know of, so long as they have a perfect right to come here the same as other people.

Q. As long as we do not restrict them in any way?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your observation do the Chinese merchants and the contracting class have considerable means, considerable money?—A. The merchants, yes, sir.

Q. And they have the means, if they can make it profitable, to buy lands largely if they wish?—A. Yes, sir, if they choose; but that class does not invest in those enterprises.

Q. What class have bought large tracts of land on Sacramento River?—A. It is a class who have means and perhaps who have been here in the State many years, and have invested in lands as a venture.

Q. Suppose that venture succeeds, that they can compete with the white labor in the market; put down their grain, their fruit, and their berries so as to make a profit below what a white man could afford to take; would not that be an encouragement to the extension of those enterprises?—A. It might be.

Q. Would not that enlarge the law of demand?—A. I presume it would.

Q. In view of such possibilities of their coming here in great numbers would you be in favor, not of expelling those now here, observe, because that we do not contend for, but a reasonable restriction of the number who come?—A. Yes, sir; I would be in favor of that.

Q. Then, everything considered, you would be in favor of a reasonable restriction in the number allowed to come?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I believe Senator Sargent informed you that the Chinese have gone into manufacturing cigars, &c. Has not that increased your business of transporting cases of tobacco back and forth?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would the Chinese buy land if they could not make it pay?—A. No, sir.

Q. They raise what, generally?—A. Vegetables and fruits. I do not think they raise grain much as yet.

Q. Do you know this land that they have purchased?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Did you ever hear of it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does all you have ever heard of exceed a thousand acres?—A. I think there have been only two or three purchases along the Sacramento River, but I do not know the lands. It is no very large amount.

Q. They have been here twenty years, a hundred thousand Chinamen, and they own, say, a thousand acres of land. How long would it take for them to absorb, as Senator Sargent's point is, the lands of this State and colonize them in the same ratio that they have been coming here?—A. It would take a good while.

Q. Would it not take another centennial celebration?—A. I think it would at that rate, buying a thousand acres of land in twenty-five years.

ADEXANDER CAMPBELL sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am a lawyer.

Q. How long have you practiced in this State?—A. Twenty years; five years previously in Oregon.

Q. Have you held any judicial office in this State?—A. I was judge of the 12th judicial district in this State.

Q. In what parts of the State have you resided?—A. In San Francisco and Oakland.

Q. What is your opinion as to the effect the Chinese immigration has had upon the labor of the white population here?—A. I have never given the subject an exhaustive examination, but judging from what I cannot help seeing upon the surface, I believe the effect of Chinese immigration to this time has been a benefit to the whole State.

Q. Do you see any necessity in the circumstances surrounding us at the present time to limit or restrict this immigration?—A. I do not. I believe that the immigration will be regulated by the universal law of supply and demand. I believe the Chinese are sufficiently intelligent perfectly to understand their own interests, and that they will not come here longer than they believe they can be profitably employed.

Q. What is their character as laborers?—A. My experience in that line has been limited. I have employed a Chinese boy the last nine years, not one, but from time to time changing; and I employ Chinamen from three to five every spring for three or four weeks. I value them very highly as laborers and very highly as house-servants.

Q. Do you treat them as house-servants any different from any others?—A. Not at all; precisely as any others.

Q. How is it in regard to the trust and confidence that you repose in them?—A. I have always reposed the same confidence in them that I have in any others. I have one white man, a white woman, and a Chinese boy generally. That has been my average for the last nine years. I treat them all alike.

Q. What is the moral character of the Chinese immigration as compared with a similar immigration of any other people?—A. I am not prepared to answer that question definitely, but from the general knowledge that I have upon the subject I do not think they differ much from any other class of immigration of the same character and standing as themselves; that is, in the same vocations, following the same line of life.

Q. Comparing their merchants with our merchants, how do they compare?—A. I have no knowledge, personally, of the Chinese merchants of San Francisco. My knowledge is entirely derived from others. From that source I have reason to believe that that class of them is a very high-toned mercantile people.

Q. Comparing servants with servants, how do they compare?—A. I prefer the Chinese to any others.

Q. In what respects are they preferable?—A. They are more quiet, they are more systematic, they are very cleanly, and very intelligent; and when there was a press of matter, such as another servant leaving, or sickness in the house, or anything of that kind, when extra work was required to be done, I have found them very ready to take their share of that extra work.

Q. What has been your experience with them in respect to their honesty?—A. So far as my personal observation goes, I have never had occasion to distrust any of those who have been in my employ. They have free access to pretty much everything.

Q. What is your experience in regard to their faithfulness to work when you are absent, or when they are not watched, and as to the necessity of watching them?—A. I have already given you the extent of my experience, but from that little experience I should judge that they were very faithful.

Q. What is your opinion, from the observation and intercourse you have had with them, as to their freedom?—A. In what sense do you use the word freedom?

Q. That is, whether they are under the control as bondmen or slaves of any person?—A. Judging from my own experience, I have never had the least reason ever to suspect that they are under the influence of any other person than themselves.

Q. You contract with them directly?—A. I contract with each one individually.

Q. Do you pay the person you hire?—A. I pay them individually. Sometimes when three or four come together, and are working for me together, one will receive the pay for the whole, but it does not seem to me to make much difference which one it is. One of them will come to me with a full statement of the time each has worked, and he will receive their pay, and I hear nothing of it afterwards; I presume it is divided among them according to their proportion of labor.

Q. What is the character of the poorer class with whom you have come in contact, with regard to performing their contracts and keeping their word?—A. My experience will hardly enable me to answer that question.

Q. I confine it merely to those whom you have employed.—A. I have no data necessary to give an answer to the question.

Q. Do you think their presence here prevents the immigration of whites into the State, or increases it?—A. I do not think it tends to prevent the immigration of whites into the State.

Q. What has been the effect upon the immigration of the whites of the building of the railroads and other works that have been performed by the Chinese here?—A. It has thrown open large portions of the country for white settlement.

Q. What has been the effect of that upon immigration?—A. The effect has been to cause immigration to flow into these regions that have been laid open by the railroads.

Q. What effect has the building the San Joaquin Valley Railroad and the Salinas Valley Railroad had upon the settlement of the country?—A. I think it has facilitated the settlement of the country through which they pass very much.

Q. Are you familiar with the history of the Salinas plains in that respect?—A. I am not very familiar with that region.

Q. Were you not, some years ago, down at Monterey, and are you not familiar with the condition of the country there?—A. I think about 1862 I was down through the Salinas plains. I spent part of a day at the Salinas River. I returned to Monterey over the same route a few days afterwards.

Q. What was the condition of it then?—A. It was then almost entirely uncultivated. It was used for pasture, as far as I could hear or know.

Q. Do you know what is its condition now?—A. I understand that now it is a well-cultivated district of the State.

Q. Do you know whether any towns or villages have grown up?—A. Salinas City has grown up, which is quite a prosperous, thriving town. I do not know the number of inhabitants.

Q. Castorville, Trinidad?—A. I am not acquainted with that region.

Q. What is the opinion of the people of this State, so far as you have gathered it, upon this question?—A. Since the discussion of the question has commenced, in the papers and orally, I have heard and read a good deal about it. I have heard, as a person in business would hear, a matter of that public notoriety discussed; and the conclusion I have come to on that point is that parties disinterested, who have no political objects to gain, taking the intelligent portion of the community, are favorable to Chinese immigration on a limited scale. Of course opin-

ions are very diverse on the subject, but I think the preponderance of opinion is in that direction.

Q. Do you think there is any danger of there being an excess of this immigration?—A. I think not. I base it upon what I alluded to before, the law of supply and demand.

Q. You think that will regulate it?—A. I think that will regulate it.

Q. Something has been said here as to the number of Chinamen employed as laundrymen. Before the Chinamen went into that business, or at the time they went into it, were there many white women engaged in the business, keeping laundry-shops?—A. I am not prepared to say.

Q. Did you ever see any?—A. I am not prepared to give a definite and positive answer to the question. I have understood that before that time washerwomen did a good deal of business. My own washing has always been done in the house, and I never had occasion to know personally how it was outside.

Q. For whom do these Chinamen generally wash?—A. For a great many; sometimes for families, sometimes for individuals.

Q. As a general rule do families have their washing done in their houses?—A. My impression is that they have it done in their own houses.

Q. What class of the community is it, then, that have their washing done at Chinese laundries?—A. It is mere guess-work for me to speak of these matters. I can state what my impression is, but I only give it as my impression; that they are patronized by families of more moderate means, who do not keep a regular servant, or servants sufficient in number to do the washing for their families. I think more of that class get their washing done by the Chinese than wash it themselves; but I only give that as an impression.

Q. Who did that washing before the Chinamen did it?—A. I am not prepared to say.

Q. What is your impression in regard to that subject?—A. It would be merely guess-work.

Q. Do you know Mr. H. K. W. Clarke?—A. I do.

Q. Were you connected with him in business at any time?—A. I have been associated with him in professional business, in suits some years ago, and have also been retained in suits where he was on the other side.

Q. You were not in partnership with him at any time?—A. No.

Q. What is his standing at the bar?—A. Very fair, as I understand it. My own professional intercourse with him has always been very satisfactory.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is he profound as a lawyer?—A. I decline answering that question.

Q. His opinion was asked about international law for the advice of the committee, as a lawyer and professional gentleman.—A. Those who heard his answer can form a better opinion on that point than I can.

Q. Perhaps you can tell what the value of his opinion was if you know whether he is a profound lawyer or not. If you feel a delicacy in the matter, I will not press it.—A. I have my own opinion upon it, but prefer not answering the question.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In speaking of the effects arising from Chinese immigration and their presence here as laborers, have you not, in your testimony here, and in the judgment and opinions you have given, confined yourself to the material questions?—A. I have confined myself entirely to the material

questions involved. I have not expressed an opinion upon any other point.

Q. In summarizing your testimony you think they are a convenience and a profit?—A. I do, both.

Q. Temporarily?—A. At the present time.

Q. Calculating them for their value as citizens and looking to the future, what would be your opinion in regard to the propriety of limiting them to a reasonable number of immigration?—A. I should want in that case to have it understood what their treatment was to be by the whites of this State before I could answer the question. If they are to be treated as they have been heretofore, both by the authorities and by a good many of the people of the State, I do not believe they ever could or would, in the nature of things, become good citizens. If they were received and treated as other people coming to these shores, my impression is, from their natural intelligence, that they would make good citizens as soon as they had time enough to become acquainted with our position.

Q. Do you think it would be desirable in their treatment to give them the right of the elective franchise?—A. As they are treated now I would not wish to see them possessed of the elective franchise, and for this reason: We make them enemies to republican institutions by the treatment we have given them. I would not wish to have a class adverse to these institutions with the right of voting among us.

Q. Independent of their treaty and independent of their history so far in this State, have you any judgment as to whether they would become good citizens in the broad sense?—A. I have very little opportunity of judging. I can give you my impression.

Q. If you have no real judgment, I do not want it.—A. The reason I have no opportunity of judging so as to give you what I would call my judgment upon that point is that they have never been placed in a position to show whether they would or would not become good citizens, in my opinion.

Q. You are conversant with the general history of Chinese civilization?—A. Lay a little emphasis on the word "general," and I answer that I am.

Q. As we all get it from our reading and knowledge of that people, have you ever seen anything in their character which would lead you to suppose that they had an idea of a republican form of government?—A. I cannot say that I have.

Q. Has there ever been anything, so far as we know from their history, that indicated a predilection to that kind of independent self-government?—A. I am not aware of it. I cannot answer the question intelligently.

Q. In comparing their civilization with ours, which do you think is the higher?—A. I think ours is the higher.

Q. In their morality and religion as compared with ours, which do you think is the higher and the better?—A. That is a very difficult question to answer. If you leave out the word "religion," it is not difficult to answer.

Q. It is in proof that they are Buddhists, Tanists, and followers of Confucius?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then what is your opinion as to their morality and religious teachings as compared with ours?—A. I should say that they are not so good.

Q. How are the results which flow from that morality and religious education likely to be compared with the results from ours?—A. I do

not think that the Chinese as a nation are equal to the American people as a nation.

Q. In these particulars?—A. In these particulars. But if you bring a hundred or two thousand Chinese and mingle them with the American people and give them a fair opportunity as other nationalities receive, I think they would imbibe republican ideas, and all the intelligence which that conveys, as rapidly as any other people I know.

Q. Is it in your opinion desirable for us, the white race, to make that experiment with the Asiatic race by importing them in those numbers to California?—A. I do not think the white race would suffer by it for a very long time to come.

Q. Do you think it would improve by it?—A. Materially I think it would.

Q. I am not speaking materially. We are getting entirely away from that subject.—A. You have got to lay a basis for it. Then I will state that I do not think they would ever come here in sufficient numbers to influence our civilization in the slightest degree.

Q. Suppose they all come. Let us make a hypothetical case. If from internal dissension, foreign invasion, or famine, they would come here in inordinately large numbers, what would be the effect on our civilization then?—A. Tell me in the case of Americans who are living in China, and have been living there for a number of years, what effect the Chinese civilization has had upon them, and I will answer your question.

Q. Would that be a fair question?—A. I think so, because your question implies they would come in sufficient numbers. If Americans in China have become degenerated and gone down to the level of the Chinese and below them, then the Chinese here in equal numbers or preponderating our race, might have the effect of destroying our civilization.

Q. Is the character of merchants and others who go there for the purpose of trade, a fair illustration of the effect upon the masses in the future development of this country?—A. I do not understand that the foreigners in China are confined to merchants.

Q. We have but a few hundred Americans in China altogether?—A. Take Europeans and Americans, what we call the civilized nations, and take all classes that go there, my impression is that they do not deteriorate.

Q. What do you think would be the effect of introducing a people who do not assimilate with us, and, as you have suggested, probably would act upon our institutions as a non-assimilating and heterogeneous or non-homogeneous people?—A. I have not intended to say, and if I have been understood to say so I have been misunderstood, that I do not think they would assimilate. My impression is that if you would give them a fair chance they would assimilate.

Q. By intermarriage?—A. I do not think intermarriage necessary for assimilation for political purposes.

Q. What do you mean by assimilation?—A. That they would adopt our manners, habits, and customs, and become republicans.

Q. Of the 250,000 who have already come here during the last twenty-seven years, do you know of any instance where they have assimilated to our habits, customs, and dress; and if so, how many?—A. I do not know that I can call to mind any instances at the present time.

Q. Do you know of a single Chinaman who does not wear, in part or whole, his Chinese costume and the Chinese queue?—A. I am not aware of any.

Q. Do you know of any that live in their family relations as we live in our family relations?—A. I do not know myself personally, for I have never been in a Chinese house in my life; but I understand there are Chinese families in this State who do live as other people.

Q. Do you know the polygamous system as it exists in China?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know that there are first, second, and third wives, the first being the wife of honor?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know of an instance, within the scope of your knowledge or information, where a Chinaman has brought his wife of honor to this country?—A. I have already stated that I have never been in a Chinese house in my life, and therefore I do not know. I have understood that Chinamen are living here with their wives. Beyond that I do not know.

Q. We know they call them their wives, but I particularly confine myself to the question of the wife of honor.—A. Whether it is their wife of honor or not I do not know.

Q. Do you hear of them attending our Christian churches?—A. I have heard of that.

Q. What church?—A. I do not know exactly what Christian church. I have seen then attending the Sunday-schools.

Q. I mean as worshipers at our Christian churches.—A. I am not aware of any.

Q. You never saw any of them?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. Did you ever know of any one single individual case where a Chinaman became intelligent upon our form and structure of government?—A. I have never conversed with any of them upon the subject. My impression is that they generally do not do so. There may be individual exceptions, but I do not know them.

Q. You recognize, as we all do, that there are some exceptional, intelligent, honorable, high-minded Chinese?—A. I do; but the number of intelligent Chinese compares very favorably with the intelligence of almost any other people that I am acquainted with. So far as their character of intelligence goes, their reading and writing, I never met one who could not read and write their own language.

Q. Do you think their order of intelligence is as high as the German immigrant to this State, or the English immigrant, or the immigrant from Scotland, taking the general run of them?—A. It is difficult to answer that question. The character of the intelligence of those people you have mentioned and the character of the intelligence of the Chinese is so different, that it is hardly possible to answer the question. When I speak of the intelligence of the Chinese, I mean their power of, I was going to say, thinking—their natural power of following out and doing that which they are directed to do. Their general intelligence in following the instructions given to them shows that they are able to think as well as that they are able to work.

Q. As mechanics, are they inventive as compared with whites?—A. I have always understood that the Chinese are not inventive.

Q. They are imitative, I understand?—A. They are imitative to a great degree, but they are not inventive.

Q. Then that would carry out the idea that they do not bring so much intellect as they do patient industry and imitative qualities?—A. It does not exclude intellect. The work they do requires in many instances intellect, the power of consecutive thought in following out instructions.

Q. What business are they engaged in in this country that would in-

dicate that?—A. I look upon them as the most intelligent gardeners that we have in the country, judging from what I see of their cultivation and the mode in which that cultivation is carried on.

Q. That might result from their long habit of cultivating the soil.—A. No matter what it results from, they possess the intelligence in those directions in which they have been accustomed to act.

Q. It does not require very much intelligence to make a garden?—A. I beg your pardon, I think it does.

Q. In summing up the whole thing, are you or are you not of the opinion, looking to the ultimate of this State, its normal aspects and its political privileges as well, that it is desirable to confine Chinese immigration within legal restrictions?—A. At the present time I do not see any necessity for it.

Q. But looking to the future?—A. That would depend upon whether they come in such overwhelming numbers as you have alluded to.

Q. If they were coming at the rate they came when this agitation for the last time commenced, in the month of April, I think it was, when about 6,000 of them arrived in a month, would you think that excessive?—A. Not if they could find employment, and I think they could.

Q. Then it all depends upon their labor?—A. It all depends upon whether we can employ them when they come here, and employ them to their own advantage.

Q. Then it all comes back to the material question?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that is what you are considering, and only that?—A. You put the question to me in another light and I must go back to my former view. My opinion is that if you would treat them as you do other people coming from other countries, if you would receive them with open arms, as you receive others, if you would give them the same opportunities in our schools and in every other way that you give others, they will assimilate and become good citizens.

Q. Would you have us do that?—A. I would not have you treat them as they have been treated.

Q. Would you have us do the other thing?—A. Yes, I would.

Q. You would have us throw open our public schools to them?—A. I have not said that.

Q. And welcome them to our coast?—A. I have not said that.

Q. You would give them the right of the elective franchise?—A. I have not said that. My impression is that their civilization has not advanced far enough for that, but I would give them schools where they could be educated.

Q. And the right of the elective franchise?—A. At present I have already said that I would not give them the right of the elective franchise. If they proved, as in my opinion they would prove, to be deserving of it, I would give it to them.

Q. Then you think they would prove deserving of it and that ultimately they would have it?—A. That is my opinion.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understood you to say as I came in that you thought if we received Chinese immigrants as we do other immigrants, gave them the same privileges and opportunities, they would assimilate with our people?—A. That is my view of it, giving them the same treatment. I think I added the word treatment or something equivalent to it.

Q. What is your observation in regard to their intellectual capacity?—A. I have already stated that the extent of my personal acquaintance with the Chinamen has been limited; but I have a very favorable idea of their powers.

Q. State whether, in your judgment, or not, there is a conflict between American and Chinese labor in this State?—A. I am inclined to think in some branches there may be a conflict. Their readiness in learning how to do particular things is very great, and I can readily imagine that in some branches of business they may come in conflict with white labor. It is the old question of cheap labor, or machinery by which labor is facilitated. I do not think that the whites suffer a great deal in the end by that character of competition which reduces the prices of articles, enabling others to buy them cheaper than they could before, and leaving avenues open to those who are able to occupy a higher position than the Chinaman could occupy.

Q. State whether, in your opinion, there is a plethora of labor on this coast.—A. I think there is a great deficiency of labor on this coast.

Q. You think more is wanted instead of less?—A. I think so. I am not a manufacturer, nor a person employing a great deal of labor, and I merely give you my impression without being able to state the facts on which a positive opinion could be based.

Q. What part has Chinese labor performed, in your judgment, in the development of the State?—A. A very large part indeed, in building railroads, in building levees, and labor of that kind, which, I understand, it is difficult to procure white labor to perform.

Q. I understood you to say, in answer to a question a moment ago, that you thought there was no necessity at this time for any restriction upon this immigration?—A. That is my impression.

Q. Is there a strong public sentiment here against Chinese immigration?—A. I think the majority of the disinterested intelligence of the State is against any restriction, so far as I can judge from the discussions which I have heard and witnessed, and from the observations which I have made through the country.

Q. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the opposition to Chinese immigration; you know there is such an opposition?—A. There is such an opposition, there is no doubt of it.

Q. What does it grow out of? In other words, I desire to know whether it grows out of the actual competition of labor, or whether it grows out of some other cause. Our purpose is to get at the facts as nearly as we can.—A. I think it, perhaps, originates in an unfounded jealousy on the part of the working-men, that they are to be cut out of their employments. I think that apprehension is in a great measure unfounded. I think there is labor for all who earnestly and honestly desire to do a good day's work in the State. You will find sometimes in the city a very large superabundance of unemployed labor, but I think, taking the whole State throughout, there is not that superabundance, and that there is not sufficient labor here to do the work of the State at present.

Q. Do you think it grows out of an apprehension among a great part of the working-men that they have been or will be deprived of labor or emolument?—A. I think, with a great many of them, the feeling is sincere, but I believe it to be at the same time unfounded. I think, also, political agitation has arisen out of this question. I make no distinction between the political parties in this respect. I think each has sought to gain popularity by pandering to the Chinese question.

Q. You think that advantage has been sought in this matter?—A. I think advantage has been sought to be taken of that matter by both parties in the belief on their part, as I should judge, that the feeling is more general, more universal, and more pointed against the Chinese than I think it to be.

Q. Is that opposition, as you understand, general through the State, or is it principally in this city?—A. I think it is principally in this city. My impression is that when you get out of the city you find a good deal less of it than you do here; and particularly in the farming districts you find less of it.

Q. Would you, then, say that this feeling is principally in the towns and not in the country?—A. Yes, sir; that would be my belief.

Q. And chiefly in this city?—A. Chiefly here; not exclusively here, but chiefly here.

Q. I suppose you have been a good many years on this coast?—A. Twenty-five years; twenty years in this State and five years in Oregon.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you ever hear the laboring-man who labors for daily wages, a hired man, express himself in favor of the Chinese coming here without limiting them?—A. I do not know that I have. My impression is that I have not.

Q. Do you ever hear a mechanic express himself favorably upon that subject?—A. I cannot call to mind that I have.

Q. Do you work a good many men?—A. No.

Q. Did you ever in this State employ many laborers?—A. No.

Q. You do not know much about the laboring classes?—A. I have already stated that very fully, and given the full extent of my employment in that respect.

Q. If you were a laboring-man would you rather work for a dollar a day than for two dollars?—A. No.

Q. You would rather have two dollars for your work?—A. I would rather have two dollars, of course.

Q. Do you think that cheap labor has a tendency to elevate the laboring-classes?—A. I do not think it has.

Q. It has the contrary effect, in your opinion?—A. If it goes below a certain point sufficient to give them the necessaries of life it may have a contrary effect.

Q. Is not the labor that is best paid the most contented, happy, and prosperous?—A. I think so.

Q. There is no doubt about that?—A. I think there is not.

Q. Do you think that to lower the price of labor and the respectability of it is a disadvantage to the community?—A. Anything in this country which tends to depreciate either the standing or value of labor, I think would be injurious beyond a certain point.

Q. In your opinion, does or does not this Chinese immigration tend to degrade and lower the value and respectability of labor?—A. I have not seen it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Does it tend to reduce the price of it?—A. I suppose it may in some instances. I am inclined to think it may in some instances, but in regard to the broad question of labor and the immediate effect upon it I can only give my impressions. I have not myself had anything to do with these matters.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you not think the community where the government rests upon the will of the people every two or four years would be better if the people were completely homogeneous than heterogeneous?—A. I am inclined to think so.

Q. Do you consider the Chinese a homogeneous people?—A. I do not

consider that we have had any fair opportunity of judging whether they would assimilate with our people or not. I think if any other nationality had come here and been treated precisely as the Chinese have been treated by the authorities and the people, that that people would no more assimilate with us than the Chinese do to-day.

Q. Do you think it would be an advantage for us to intermarry with the Chinese, as one of our distinguished fellow-citizens thinks, Judge Heydenfeldt, whom we all know? He thinks it would be an advantage to the country if our poor girls should marry and become the wives of Chinamen. Do you think so?—A. They would have to be very poor.

Q. Is poverty a gauge of respectability and virtue and sensibility?—A. Not always. What I meant by saying they would have to be very poor is, they would have to be down below where they were able to learn respectable trades. I do not think it advisable for whites and Chinese or whites and Indians to amalgamate.

Q. Do you think it is to the advantage of the State of California to have injected into our population a class of people who cannot commingle socially and politically and religiously with us?—A. I do not know that that is the case with the Chinese, for they have not been fairly treated.

Q. Would it be the case with the negroes?—A. I do not think that the whites will ever assimilate with the negroes exactly, not to the extent that your question implies.

Q. Do you think it would be an advantage either to the negro or the white, or to the State, the body politic, that they should do so?—A. That they should amalgamate?

Q. Yes.—A. No, I do not.

Q. Is there not now, in fact, ethnologically, as much difference between the Chinese and the whites, that is, you and me, as there is between you and me and the negro?—A. My impression is that there is not, either mentally or physically, so great a difference between whites and Chinese as between the whites and the negro.

Q. Does not the negro more readily assimilate to our religion, politics, habits, customs, and way of living than the Chinese?—A. We have had no opportunity of judging. If you bring two thousand negroes from Africa and place them here under the same condition that the Chinese are placed here, I could then form an opinion; but the negroes to whom you allude have been brught up among us, and to a greater or less degree have embodied our views of politics and religion.

Q. The Chinese are civilizied; the African who was brought here was an utter barbarian. Suppose you bring a negro here from the Barbary States, the coast of the Mediterranean?—A. I do not think he would assimilate so readily as the Chinese would.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Has the commingling had any material effect upon our civilization in any way?—A. I cannot see it.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you seen any results of commingling?—A. I have not.

Q. Any children?—A. I have never seen any one on the streets that I supposed to be the production of such commingling.

Q. You see a good many Chinese on the streets?—A. I see them occasionally.

Q. They do not appear to be half-breeds?—A. I think they are full-bloods.

Q. How do they compare with other children as to intelligence and

brightness?—A. I can only judge by looks. They seem to be bright little children.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How many Chinese had we here in 1860? If you cannot state the number give an approximation to it.—A. I cannot give the number. I paid no attention to the statistics.

Mr. BEE. The statistics give as the population of the State in 1860, of all races, 379,994. Other figures we have placed the Chinese at about 75,000 at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Including the Chinese?

Mr. BEE. Every one.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you think that was the population?—A. No, sir; I think the general impression at that time was that the returns of the population were not correct. A good many were omitted.

Senator SARGENT. Whole districts were not taken.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The population is set down in 1870 at 560,247.—A. I think it was generally considered that that was an underestimate, too.

Q. In 1875, up to January of this year, the population reaches 797,480. What has been the relative increase of Chinese from 1860 to this time, in your opinion?—A. I should think more correct than the other, but still an underestimate. I do not think the Chinese increased in greater proportion since 1860, taking these figures.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Did you ever visit what we call the Chinese quarter in this city?—A. I never have.

Q. Then, in fact, you know very little about the Chinese, practically speaking?—A. I have not said that I do.

Q. You say that, practically speaking, you know very little about them?—A. I have already said that my personal intercourse with the Chinese has been very limited, and I have stated the extent of that limit.

Q. You never visited the Chinese quarter here to inspect and examine for yourself as to their character, conduct, and way of living?—A. I have not.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do I understand you to say that the number of Chinese has not materially increased since 1860, or that it has proportionately increased?—A. I think the proportionate increase of Chinese and white men since 1860 would not show a greater ratio of Chinamen than white men.

Q. I have asked several witnesses whether the ratio of increase was greater or less.—A. My impression is that it is not greater of Chinese.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Since 1860?—A. Not since 1860.

EDWARD J. ARMSTRONG sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. (Presenting manuscript.) Have you compared this copy of the report of the joint select committee relating to the Chinese population of the State of California, dated March 11, 1862, with the original or official publication?—Answer. I have; I compared it carefully.

Q. It is contained in the appendix of the journals of the senate and assembly of thirteenth session?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I present in evidence the report of the joint select committee of the legislature of this State, made in 1862, which contains a great many statistics.

Mr. BEE. It enters fully into the Chinese question at that time. It is the report of a committee appointed for that purpose.

(See Appendix P.)

Q. (By Mr. BROOKS.) What has been the number of cases in the district courts of this city up to the present time?—A. Between 69,000 and 70,000.

Q. How many are there in the fourth district court?—A. Over 28,800. I am not sure of the exact number.

Q. Did you examine those cases to see how many of them were cases brought against Chinese to enforce the performance of contracts or to recover damages for their breach?—A. I did.

Q. How many are there?—A. I found that the total number of cases was 28,834.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The total number of civil cases?—A. Yes, sir; in that particular court, the fourth district court, the oldest district court, I believe, in this city, I find there were twenty-nine actions in which the Chinese were defendants, in which they were sued for breach of contract, or debt, or on promissory notes; for the foreclosure of a mortgage, one; damages for assault, one; and for malpractice there were two. I will state that there were numerous cases for ejectment and occupation of land, to quiet titles, where Chinese names appeared, but I took no notice of those cases; I only took notice of those I have named; and most of the cases for debt were after sale and delivery.

Q. In these actions of ejectment the occupants of the land were Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were many of those occupants Chinamen?—A. I cannot say.

Q. I speak of the actual fact whether Chinamen occupied the land?—A. O, yes, sir.

ANTHONY W. EASTERBY affirmed and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In Napa.

Q. How long have you resided in Napa?—A. Twenty years.

Q. How long have you resided in California?—A. Twenty-seven years.

Q. What business did you follow before that time?—A. I was a sailor.

Q. In San Francisco what did you follow?—A. I was a merchant.

Q. Have you been pursuing agricultural interests in other counties, and, if so, where?—A. In Fresno.

Q. Are you connected with the Fresno Navigation Company; and, if so, in what capacity?—A. I am president of that company.

Q. What object has that company in view?—A. Irrigating the land of Fresno.

Q. Taking water from King's River?—A. Taking water from King's River.

Q. That is part of the San Joaquin Valley?—A. That is the upper part of the San Joaquin Valley.

Q. Have you seen more or less of the Chinese population of this State in the course of your operations?—A. I have seen them by employment.

Q. Have you been in the habit of traveling much about the State?—A. I have traveled a great deal.

Q. What is the opinion among the intelligent people of the State in regard to the question agitating the community here about Chinese immigration?—A. The feeling is mixed. Some have prejudices against them, and some think that they fill a position that others could not fill. For instance, in digging canals, they wade in water when the whites would not, and they do work that white men do not do, and in fact could not do.

Q. Which way do you think the balance of opinion lies on the subject of restricting or not restricting the immigration of Chinese?—A. I am not competent to judge.

Q. From your observation does the presence of Chinese labor here diminish the employment of whites or lower their rate of wages?—A. I think not. I think the Chinese do that which would not be done if they were not here. For instance, in the interior counties they fill the places of servants, cooks, &c., work which white people would not do. It would be impossible to get girls to go out into those interior hot counties as cooks or servants.

Q. You are a housekeeper?—A. I am.

Q. Did you carry on agricultural operations up in Fresno?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your family was at Napa?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you keep a house there on your ranch?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you employ white girls to occupy those positions?—A. No; it would be impossible. In the first place white girls would not go among a crowd of men, farm-laborers, to live there alone unless they were married and with their husbands; then the climate is such in the interior counties that it is very severe upon them in the hot season.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You are speaking of the San Joaquin Valley?—A. The interior counties; Napa, for instance.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Speaking of the interior of the State, farms separated from towns, would white girls go there?—A. I think they would not. I have never seen them there.

Q. What is the opinion of farmers on this question, so far as you are acquainted with them?—A. All the farmers that I have ever spoken with are in favor of having Chinese for servants, decidedly. In some cases they use them as laborers on the farm for doing light work, and where horses are not used. The Chinese do not seem to understand the use of horses as whites do.

Q. What is the case at harvest-time? Is there enough white labor then? Are the Chinese employed at that season?—A. They use them for receiving the wheat into the header wagons where there is a scarcity of white labor. For instance, sometimes where there are white men only employed, if one or two knock off, it stops the whole gang. The Chinese, when employed, will stay as long as you keep them.

Q. What is their character generally as laborers?—A. They are faithful and you can depend upon their attending to their work without watching them. For instance, when I was president of the Napa Valley Railroad I had them in the section-gangs keeping up the roads, without any foreman. When you set them upon doing a piece of work, you can depend upon its being done.

Q. How are they then in regard to performing their contracts gener-

ally?—A. Wherever I have employed them, they have faithfully carried them out.

Q. What do you say in regard to their honesty?—A. I have never found a dishonest Chinaman.

Q. How is it in regard to their temperance?—A. I have never seen one—in fact I have never known one—to drink liquor.

Q. How in regard to their industry?—A. They are very industrious. They work continuously. If we set them to do a job of work, they will work until dinner-time or meal-time.

Q. Are there any tramps or beggars among them?—A. I have never seen any.

Q. Do you know whether they ever chew or eat opium?—A. I believe they do.

Q. How do they usually use it; do they usually smoke it?—A. They usually smoke it.

Q. You say they also chew it?—A. I do not know. I know they smoke it.

Q. I ask you whether they eat it or chew it?—A. I do not know that they chew it.

Q. When white men use opium they generally take it into their mouths, do they not?—A. The whites use it both ways.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you lived in California?—A. Twenty-seven years.

Q. In harvest-time would there be any difficulty in getting sufficient white labor to save the harvest?—A. There is sometimes, because all the farmers require labor at the same time. They all require a certain number of men at the same moment.

Q. Farmers then require a large number of laborers that they could not employ the rest of the year?—A. Yes; that they could not employ the rest of the year. After the harvest is over, there is no more use for the hands until the rain comes, when it is necessary to plow, and then only a much smaller amount is needed than during the harvest season.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Does Chinese labor partake somewhat of the character of servile labor?—A. What do you mean by servile labor?

Q. I will put the question in another way. Is there that individuality about Chinese labor that there is about white labor?—A. I think that they are perfectly independent of their foreman. In hiring these men in large numbers you generally employ a foreman to get the amount of men you require; and I have noticed that sometimes some of them leave without the wish of the foreman. Therefore I suppose they are independent.

Q. Do you pay them individually, or do you pay the foreman?—A. I pay the foreman.

Q. You hire them through the foreman?—A. I hire them through the foreman.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are an old farmer, railroad contractor, a reclamation and canal maker, and employer of Chinese?—A. Yes, sir. I have never been a railroad contractor, however. I was president of the Napa Railroad.

Q. Then you are speaking of Chinese entirely in reference to the material interests of the country?—A. Entirely.

Q. You are speaking of them as contributing to our convenience and comfort as laborers, and our money-making capacity with them, and that only?—A. And that only.

Q. Have you considered the matter with reference to the political and moral aspect of the case?—A. No, sir, I have not.

SAMUEL H. DWINELLE sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. How long have you resided in this city?—Answer. Twenty-seven years, nearly.

Q. How long have you been judge of the fifteenth district court?—A. Between twelve and thirteen years.

Q. What are the counties composing that district?—A. San Francisco and Contra Costa.

Q. Is Contra Costa an agricultural county?—A. It is.

Q. Have you had an opportunity of learning the views of the people of the interior on this question which is agitating us?—A. I have to a limited extent; but I have not traveled a great deal over the State.

Q. Have you any interest in this question at all?—A. Not of a monetary character. I have an interest in the question as a citizen.

Q. Will you give your views upon the question to the commission?—A. What question particularly?

Q. I will ask you questions if you prefer it.—A. I want to know what you want.

Mr. BROOKS. Perhaps the chairman would prefer to direct the attention of the witness to the subjects he desires light upon.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. State whether, in your judgment or not, Chinese immigration should be restricted or prohibited.—A. Under some circumstances my opinion is it should be; but I am not prepared to believe that it is necessary at present.

Q. You think that under some circumstances it should be limited?—A. Certainly, if we should have a surplus of population.

Q. Do you think that there is any necessity at this time?—A. I think not. There may be a necessity in the future, and when the time arrives it may be necessary to prevent immigration of all kinds, Chinese as well as any other.

Q. What will that necessity grow out of?—A. The extreme influx of population; too much for the resources of the country.

Q. Have you seen any evidence that such an event is likely to occur?—A. I have not.

Q. Has the growth of the Chinese population in the last twenty years exceeded that of the white proportionally?—A. I have not examined statistics to ascertain; but I should think not. I should think the proportion was much smaller, relatively. I think it is much less in proportion to the whole influx.

Q. You think the proportion of the white population is becoming greater?—A. I do. My impression is from the casual reading of the newspapers—I have not examined the statistics closely—that a very great many of the Chinese are returning to China. However, I have not examined the matter statistically.

Q. State whether there is a conflict between Chinese and white labor.—A. Yes, there is in one sense.

Q. What is the character of that conflict; what does it spring out of?—A. I think it is the high price of white labor, particularly in regard to domestics. Then I think there are business adventures that parties will not embark in on account of the high price of labor, and could not

embark in without Chinese labor; in other words, cheap labor, whether it be Chinese or other.

Q. State whether the employment of Chinese labor does prevent the employment of white labor; whether it is injurious to white labor in the main?—A. As an individual opinion, I should say not; but I never have employed Chinese, and have no practical knowledge on the subject.

Q. State whether in your opinion there are more laborers on this coast than there is labor to perform; whether there is a plethora of labor?—A. I think not.

Q. What effect has the employment of Chinese labor had in the development and progress of the State?—A. If we can believe the newspapers five or six years ago, it has been very beneficial. It was understood that the railroad across the continent could not have been constructed without Chinese labor. It is understood, as I have before stated, that various business ventures could not have been carried on without cheap labor.

Q. Is there an apprehension prevailing here that we shall have too great an influx of Chinese population and be overrun by it?—A. I think there is among some classes, but I think among the thinking portion of the people there is not.

Q. You think among the more intelligent part that apprehension does not prevail?—A. I think not. I have heard the matter discussed a great deal, and those persons in whose judgment I have confidence have universally, almost, impressed me with the opinion that there was not an unnecessary influx and that it is not to be apprehended.

Q. Is there a strong prejudice among the people of this State against Chinese immigration?—A. I think there is among the laboring classes. Outside of them I do not think it is very strong.

Q. It prevails among the laboring classes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that prejudice or feeling grow out of an apprehension that the Chinese are taking their work from them, or will do it hereafter?—A. I think it does.

Q. Do you mean to say that this opposition is confined to the laboring classes?—A. I think so pretty much, as far as my observation goes. I find that farmers in the interior are always ready to employ Chinese, and in many instances they tell me that they prefer them to white labor. I have heard some of them say they could not move their crops without the assistance of the Chinese; that if the Chinese were driven from the country our crops could not be moved.

Q. Does this opposition to Chinese prevail equally in the country and in the city?—A. I think not, for the reason that I very frequently see Chinese insulted and beaten upon the streets, and in the interior I never see it. I know of two instances of homicide, fresh in my mind, which were committed here recklessly. One was by an Italian boy some twenty years old who rushed up to a Chinaman and stuck him several times. The Chinaman was a perfect stranger to him. He finally thrust the knife into the Chinaman's breast and killed him. He was afterwards tried in my court and sent to the State's prison for twenty years. Another was, I think, an American. He was convicted of murder in the second degree and sent to the State's prison for life for attacking a Chinaman he never saw before in the world, and driving a knife into his heart. But in my visits in the interior I never see the Chinese insulted.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you know Mr. H. K. W. Clarke?—A. I know him well.

Q. What is his position as a lawyer and a man?—A. He stands very high as a gentleman and as a lawyer.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I should like to call your attention to a letter which I have had in my possession since the commission has been in session, in reference to perjury. It is an extract taken from the Morning Call, and occurs in the report of a case held, I think, in your court in August, 1875. It is not signed by any one. I want to ask you as to its authenticity, and by reading it over you can judge. I will read it:

Mr. MURPHY. I state, as representing the people here with the district attorney, that the testimony on the part of the people, to establish the main facts, will be the testimony of Chinese witnesses. I also state that this is a surprise to me; that Mr. Flood does not draw the distinction perhaps as the law would, but he has a prejudice against the Chinese as a race; and it is a prejudice of the most vital importance when a man says he would not believe under oath ad entire race unless they were corroborated by another and distinct race. It is a prejudice of the utmost importance, not only against the Chinese while they are here, but against the due administration of justice.

Mr. QUINT. Your honor has heard enough of Chinese testimony to know that without some corroborating circumstances or testimony you feel it unsafe to render a judgment upon such testimony.

The COURT, (interrupting.) I feel it my duty as a man to state that I have never had occasion to come to such a conclusion. I know that the atmosphere is rank with perjury, not only of Chinamen, but of all classes; but I do not know as there is any reason to believe there is any more perjury among the Chinese than among others. God knows I hope not. The question now is only as to whether this juror is to be excused.—(Morning Call, San Francisco, August 12, 1875.)

This is the language attributed here to you:

I feel it my duty as a man to state that I have never had occasion to come to such a conclusion. I know the atmosphere is rank with perjury, not only of Chinaman, but of all classes; but I do not know as there is any reason to believe there is any more perjury among the Chinese than among others. God knows I hope not. The question now is only whether this jury is to be excused.

Q. That is my language with one exception. "Some others" should be there instead of "others." I said that there was no reason to believe there is any more perjury among the Chinese than among some others.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the behavior of Chinese witnesses on the stand?—A. They compare very well, I think, with our outside land-witnesses here. I would believe a Chinaman as soon as I would believe most of them.

Q. What do you mean by "outside land-witnesses?"—A. That is local; you, perhaps, do not understand it. They have witnesses here who are called professional witnesses. If you buy a piece of land where it will be squatted upon to-night so that you have got to commence an ejectment, you will be surprised to know the improvements that have been on the land for a series of years before you purchased it, although you may have passed it daily for years and not noticed them.

Q. That hardly answers my question. What is the general character of Chinese testimony for reliability?—A. Their testimony is very conflicting. I think they do not stand the test of cross-examination any better than any other witnesses.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Something has been said in regard to newspapers as representing public opinion on this question. I should like to ask you whether there is a difference between those who are opposed to Chinese immigration

and those who are in favor of it in regard to aggressive character.—A. I am not prepared to answer the question.

Q. Do you know whether those who are opposed to the Chinese carry their feelings to active opposition?—A. What do you refer to by active opposition?

Q, I mean that they decline to deal with people who employ Chinamen, and make an enemy of every one who opposes their views in that respect?—A. I have no knowledge on the subject. The only information I have is what I catch from the newspapers. I have seen in some of the newspapers that there are societies here that pass resolutions not to patronize persons who employ Chinese.

Q. Is there any disposition on the part of those who are in favor of Chinese immigration to proscribe those who differ from them?—A. Not that I am aware of. I trust not.

Q. If a newspaper here advocates views in opposition to this class of people, what would be the effect upon its patronage and circulation? What would be the natural result?—A. I do not know, except judging from the past. I think if there was a large population of one class of people and the newspapers opposed their views, they would naturally transfer their patronage to a newspaper that favored them.

Q. On the other hand, would that affect the patronage of the other class at all?—A. That I do not know. I cannot tell the feelings of other individuals.

Q. You cannot state whether there is any difference between these two partisans here in that respect, whether one is proscribed and the other is not?—A. I can only speak of myself; I do not know how it is with others.

Q. Would it make any difference with you whether a newspaper would advocate one side or not?—A. No, sir; I read all sides.

Q. Do you not think it would make a difference to those other classes?—A. Yes, I should think if our morning papers here would come out and advocate the influx of Chinese, very likely those people who are opposed to the Chinese would discontinue the paper.

Q. And by taking the other view they lose nothing?—A. I do not know how that is. I say I only give my individual opinion.

Q. It is your individual opinion that we want to get at?—A. I only speak for myself. I do not know how far other people's prejudices run.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you consider this matter with a view to its moral and political influences upon our State?—A. Somewhat.

Q. Do you express yourself as in favor of unrestricted Chinese immigration?—A. I have already answered that question. It is to be restricted when it becomes injurious, or is likely to become injurious.

Q. Up to the present time you think it has not been injurious?—A. I think not.

Q. You think that there has not been any inconvenience from it?—A. I have felt that we wanted producers and consumers, that we wanted population, and if we cannot get it elsewhere we want the Chinese.

Q. What is its effect upon the laboring classes in the community? Has it injured them and driven them away from their employment?—A. I think not.

Q. Then, generally, you are in favor of Chinese immigration as the thing now stands?—A. As the thing now stands I think it is absolutely necessary. If I am correctly informed our fruit would go to waste unless we have some one to pluck it, and our crops must be moved.

Q. In your opinion, have the Chinese prevented the immigration of eastern and European people?—A. I think if the question had not been agitated by the newspapers it would not prevent it.

Q. Which do you think would be the better class of labor for our State, white labor or Asiatic labor?—A. I should prefer white labor.

Q. Why?—A. Because they assimilate more to our ways, our customs, and our religion.

Q. Do you think that is desirable?—A. Altogether.

Q. Then, if you could obtain white labor, you would prefer it?—A. I should.

Q. Your views then are restricted by the opinion that we cannot obtain white labor from the East?—A. Not sufficient at prices to enable us to move our crops and gather our fruit.

Q. Then you are in favor, as a rule, of cheap labor?—A. I am to some extent, where we must have labor to gather our crops. If we cannot pay the prices demanded by one class of individuals, we must employ the cheaper class.

Q. As a rule, for what purpose do these Chinese come to this State?—A. Adventurers, I suppose, to make money.

Q. Do they come with the intention of remaining and becoming citizens?—A. I do not know.

Q. How do our eastern people come?—A. They come here to stay, as a general thing, or, if they do not come here in the first instance to remain, they generally return here.

Q. They generally become permanent citizens, a fixed people, upon our coast?—A. When I say that I do not know whether the Chinese come here to remain or not, my impression is that they do not, as a general thing.

Q. It is generally understood they do not bring their families with them, and that only adult males come, and they return?—A. That is my impression, I think.

Q. If it requires 50,000 laborers in the city of San Francisco to do the ordinary common work of our industries and mechanical employments, which do you think are most desirable, Chinese at a low price, or whites at a higher figure?—A. I should take the whites at a little higher figure, of course. I will tell you that personally my prejudice against the Chinese is very strong. I never employ them at all. Therefore I should prefer white labor.

Q. You have undertaken to give some idea of what popular opinion is in this State?—A. I said to the limited extent of my own observation.

Q. As between numbers, if it were submitted in this State, we will say in a judicial election, how would it be? Suppose a man to be running for judge who would avow that he was in favor of Chinese immigration, and another person of equal competency as an attorney, and of equally good moral character, opposed it, which do you think would be the popular position to take, for or against Chinese immigration?—A. If I were a demagogue I should take the popular side, against the Chinese.

Q. Then you think the popular side is opposed to Chinese immigration?—A. I think that the majority of the people in this city are opposed to the Chinese.

Q. How do you think it is in reference to the State?—A. From my observation in that part of the State where I have been, I think they would not be opposed to Chinese immigration.

Q. Judging from a proper field of observation, bearing in mind the fact that both our State conventions and most of the county conventions

of both parties have declared against Chinese immigration?—A. I would not want to take that as a standard. I know how easily platforms are made.

Q. They are generally made to catch the popular will?—A. You have more experience than I have in that business.

Q. You have been in office twelve years for one year that I have?—A. Allow me to explain. If I have said anything you have thought was intended to be personal or offensive to you, you are mistaken.

Q. Judging, then, from the fact as we have stated it, and as we know, that all the political conventions of all parties, county, State, and municipal, have passed resolutions against Chinese immigration, do you think that it indicates the popular opinion upon the subject or not?—A. I should think it did.

Q. It rather indicates that the parties are looking to popular favor by bidding against the Chinese, does it not?—A. Yes.

Q. Taking another test or indication of the popular feeling, do you know of any daily press that favors Chinese immigration?—A. No, sir; but I say I occasionally see a communication in favor of it.

Q. I speak of the editorial leanings, the opinions, of the daily press?—A. I do not know of any.

Q. The daily press is opposed to Chinese immigration, is it not?—A. Decidedly, I should judge.

Q. Do you know a single exception of any paper in the State that is not opposed to it?—A. I do not know an exception in any papers that I read.

Q. Then, judging from that, it would indicate that popular opinion was rather opposed to it, would it not?—A. Yes; I think it would.

Q. Do you know whether the delegates who were sent to the national conventions from this State, both republican and democratic, were pledged to introduce resolutions to oppose Chinese immigration?—A. My impression is there was some resolution instructing them to take action in regard to it.

Q. And the result is that in the democratic platform there was a resolution against it?—A. Yes, sir; and in the republican platform also.

Q. Would not that rather indicate that both parties are opposed to Chinese immigration?—A. If you take that, independent of other considerations, I think it would.

Q. Aside from yourself, do you know of any intelligent, disinterested people who do not employ Chinamen, and who make no money out of them, who are in favor of unrestricted Chinese immigration? That, of course, excludes the railroad class, those engaged in the reclamation of lands, the farmer who employs them, the mechanic who employs them, and everybody who makes money out of them. Aside from those people, what is your opinion of the disinterested intelligent popular opinion of the State?—A. I do not know. I talk with gentlemen who express their opinion freely, and they say that we want population here, and they favor Chinese immigration; but whether they are interested or not, I do not know.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. If this question were submitted to the people of this State, and divested of all other questions, political and otherwise, for the people of this State to go to the polls and vote Chinese yes, or Chinese no, what, in your opinion, would be the result?—A. I have no data upon which to form an opinion. I do not know what is the feeling of the interior except in those localities where my duties call me.

Q. In those localities is it pronounced on either side to any degree or majority?—A. I am not able to state. I have heard parties say they cannot get white labor, and that they must come to the city and get Chinese.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Mr. Pixley has alluded to the length of time you have held office. Please state by which party you were elected to office the last term. You were re-elected at the last term?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By what party?—A. I think I was on all the tickets.

Q. The election was unanimous, was it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You were elected by both parties?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Both parties put you on their ticket?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. A question was asked you in regard to anti-cooly or anti-Chinese organizations here. I understood you to say that they have passed resolutions, or by their by-laws are pledged, not to patronize in any business those who employ Chinese?—A. You misapprehended me. I said that I had seen in some of the newspapers that there were societies which had passed resolutions to that effect; but whether it is so or not, I do not know.

Q. You do not undertake to speak from any personal knowledge or observation?—A. No, sir. I do not belong to any society that is *pro* or *con*.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you think the complaint that comes principally from the laboring men is to be disregarded simply for that reason?—A. No, sir; I think they ought to be heard.

Q. Do you think it is answered by stating that they do not belong to the class of lawyers or employers, or that they are to be sneered at as being ignorant?—A. I should think not.

Q. If there is a serious discontent in the community, is it not the duty of statesmen to find out the causes of complaint even if it comes from ignorant classes?—A. I think that forms the duty of statesmen.

Q. You think it is not a sufficient answer to say that they are of the ignorant classes?—A. Certainly not.

Q. From your observation, do you feel like stating that the conscientious opposition to Chinamen proceeds entirely from ignorant men?—A. No, sir; I did not say anything of the kind, or make a remark implying that.

Q. I had in view the testimony of another witness and I was merely testing the line of your thought in comparison with his.—A. I do not know the gentleman you allude to, and I do not know that my line of thought runs parallel with his.

Q. In that particular, do you think, from your observation in the community, it would be safe to say that those who are opposed to unlimited Chinese immigration, who think that it affects our moral and religious future, are invariably as a rule ignorant men?—A. No, sir; I believe I have not used the word "ignorant men" in reference to any class of people.

THOMAS H. HYATT sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. I reside in Solano County.

Q. In what business are you engaged?—A. I am engaged in farming, somewhat.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that business?—A. Since I was a boy, I believe; since I can recollect, more or less; not all the time, of course.

Q. Have you been in China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity? What were you doing there?—A. I was United States consul.

Q. At what port?—A. At the port of Amoy.

Q. During what years?—A. I went out in 1853 and returned in 1861, eight years. I was home four months in the mean time.

Q. How long did your intercourse with that people extend?—A. I would say to the chairman of the committee, if it is not asking too much, that I have a little statement here which was published in April, in the Bulletin, in relation to my ideas on this question. It may bring my views before you so that you may all understand what I know about the question and what my position is.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you desire to submit that as your sworn statement?—A. Yes, sir; it would save going a roundabout way in relation to matters. Of course the article may seem a little excited in its tone. It was written during those exciting times in April, when everything here seemed running wild, it seemed to me. It is from the Daily Evening Bulletin of April 14, 1876:

The Chinese question honestly, philosophically, commercially, politically, civilly, impartially, and independently considered. "Give the devil his due."—*Old Maxim.*

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you supply the title to it?—A. Yes, sir; and signed my name to it. The intention of the article was to carry out that heading.

EDITOR BULLETIN: You people of San Francisco seem all to have gone stark mad with Chinaphobia. What a *furore* you have got into. The masses run wild, and the coolest heads have become so affected with the mania that they seem almost to have lost their common sense, if not their reason. Let us stop a minute and look the matter square in the face, calmly, coolly, and philosophically, and without prejudice.

Now, gentle reader, do not fly off in a tangent and say the writer hereof must be interested personally in having the Chinese come to California. Nay, he is not interested in any manner, either financially, politically, or religiously, and would be glad if there had never a Chinaman seen California. But they have seen California—they are here by the thousands and tens of thousands—and you, ye people of San Francisco, brought them here. You sent your ships and your agents to China and brought them here. You have used them, are using them, and will continue to use them for years and years to come, no matter how many public meetings you get up; how many speeches you make to buncombe; how many political demagogues may mount the whirlwind and seek to guide it to advance their political ends; how many honest, good men may mourn over this Chinese advent, and wish them all in heaven or the other place. Still, they are here; they will stay here, and more will come. You say you do not want them here, but you do. You pay them bigger wages than any State east of the Rocky Mountains pays to the white men; you pay to the Chinaman and the white laborer greater wages than is paid in any other part of the world. It is your own fault, and not that of the Chinese. How then are you to get rid of them? Are you going to do it by paying them such extravagant wages? Are you going to do it by revising or abrogating our treaty with China, and prohibit the Chinese from entering our State or country? You could not please the Chinese government better than to do this. Yes, I speak understandingly. I have resided some eight years in China, in the consular service of my Government, and I know the Chinese authorities do not want a single one of their people to come to California, nor to any other foreign country; nor would they allow it if they could prevent it. They would be but too happy to join our San Francisco patriots and abrogate all such conditions or treaty stipulations, and the treaties themselves. But if you do that, if you prevent the Chinese coming to California or the United States, you must prevent Americans going to China. It is a poor rule that won't work both ways. There is supposed to be something like reciprocity in all treaties. It cannot be all take on our part and no give; you will have to give and take alike, although we have greatly the advantage in the present treaty with China, and have had in all our treaties with that country.

AMERICAN LAW IN CHINA.

As an instance of the advantage we have over the Chinese in our treaty compact, we have only to refer to the fact that all Americans, whether residents or transient visitors in China, are under American law. I have had American sailors in China brought before me, as United States consular judge, for trial on charges of murdering Chinese subjects. The Chinese authorities could not even arrest them: could only notify the consul when such an event occurred, and the consul dealt with the accused culprit according to American law. Let a Chinaman in San Francisco or California do such a thing, and if he is not nabbed and lynched by the American mob before he is brought before the American court of justice, he is then and there tried and hanged, just like any American transgressor. Indeed, I found it almost impossible to get Chinese, in China, to come before our consular court, even as witnesses against an American.

ARE COOLIES ALL SHIPPED AT HONG-KONG?

To read the speeches, letters, statements, &c., lately made in San Francisco on this subject, one would be led to suppose all, or nearly all, the Chinese coolies were shipped at Hong-Kong, a British colony, and in British vessels. This is far from being the fact. During my official residence in China, from 1853 to 1861, I believe that nine-tenths of the Chinese coolies were shipped at Macao, a Portuguese colony, and at the several ports along the Chinese coast, at Swatow, Amoy, Foo-Chow, &c., as far as Shanghai, and very few were shipped shipped in British vessels—mostly in American, Portuguese, Spanish, &c.

HOW THE MANDARINS CRUCIFY THE COOLY-BROKERS.

As I have before stated, the Chinese authorities are strongly opposed to Chinese emigration; so much so, that I have known them to seize the cooly-brokers and nail them to a cross and let them there remain, beside the public thoroughfare, until they expired in the most dreadful agony, as may well be supposed. There is no crime that they punish more rigorously, or look upon as more atrocious, than that of kidnapping or decoying coolies into foreign ships for transportation to foreign countries. And yet this cooly-transportation business has been going on for the past twenty years, in spite of the efforts of the Chinese officials to prevent it. And I repeat, they will thank you, Mr. American, if you will drive these Chinese all out of California and back to China.

WHO WANT THE CHINESE AMONG US?

As I have said, I don't; and you, people of San Francisco, say you don't. But what say the great commercial and agricultural interests of the country? California, if all of one mind, is only one among forty States or thereabouts. Do you think those thirty-eight or thirty-nine other States are going to stop sending ships and merchants to China, with the products of our soil and manufactories, our trade and commerce, and stop importing teas and silks from China, on account of one plucky little State, however important she may think herself, and be in reality? Try it, if you like; I shall not object, for I can raise my own tea in California, if driven to it; and we can buy Chinese silks, as we do now, to a great extent, in France and England, after they have been worked over in those countries, so as to disguise their Chinese origin. So, personally, I have no objection to our people of San Francisco biting their own noses off, if they will. Let them stop the trade between China and San Francisco, if they wish to. Let them stop exporting grain, flour, cotton, and all our products to China, call back our merchants from the Celestial Empire, and drive these Mongols back to their flowery kingdom. But, first of all, let them stop paying these Chinese laborers such high wages as they do. So long as a Chinaman can get but $2 a month for his labor in China, and board himself at that, and you pay him $30 to $40 per month here, you may be sure they will come, if they have to paddle their own sampans or their crazy old junks all the way over the great ocean.

Now, Mr. Editor, I have hastily thrown out these suggestions so that our people may stop and cool off a little, and see where they are going to land, before they start off too violently in this Chinese crusade against the "Heathen Chinee." I have many more things I might say on this subject, but this, I think, will do for the present, if you will feel disposed to exercise your prerogative as an independent journal and give this publicity. A cause that will not bear discussion on all sides must have something lacking about it. I wish you to publish these suggestions, whether they all meet your views or not. I will take the responsibility of fathering them, and therefore add my own sign-manual, so that you may be relieved of the responsibility, according to the new law which didn't pass at the last session of the legislature.

Yours,

T. HART HYATT,
Eight years United States Consul to China.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is the class of men who emigrate from China to California?—A. I think they are usually of the lower class, what are called coolies.

Q. What business do they follow there?—A. Many of them are from up about Canton and Amoy. A good many of them are idle and a good many of them are sons of farmers from the adjoining country. Many of them come away from there to better their condition. Those about the towns are generally rather a rough, hard, loose set, but if you go back into the country among the agricultural population of China you find very respectable, reputable, and decent Chinamen. At the time I was residing there it was considered that there were eighty thousand Chinamen living in the waters of Canton, in their boats. They were born there, brought up there, and married and died there in their boats, and only taken on shore to be buried. Then up and down the coast every little inlet is filled with what are called Chinese pirates.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In your written statement you say that the Chinese immigration comes from other ports than Hong-Kong—from Amoy and other ports along the coast?—A. Yes, sir; the great bulk of the immigration is from those ports and not from Hong-Kong.

Q. At what time did you leave there?—A. In 1861.

Q. Up to that time was it the fact that the great bulk of the emigration was from other ports than Hong-Kong?—A. The great bulk of Chinese coolies were sent not to California so much as to Peru.

Q. I am asking about the Chinese immigration to the United States, not in regard to the coolies that go to Havana.—A. I know that very many were taken on the ships that were sailing from Hong-Kong to San Francisco, but the great bulk of them were engaged all along up the coast, and these vessels would go up and take them on. I saw the first breaking-up of the cooly trade between Amoy and these other countries by stopping these vessels that would go up the coast, American vessels, too.

Q. I am asking about the departures from Amoy and other ports along the coast direct to the United States.—A. They either went directly to San Francisco or to other ports. They did not go to Hong-Kong. At Swatow, which is near Amoy, and Amoy, and Fuhchau, and Chinchau, and little towns along up the coast, there were cooly stations where the ships went in. They collected coolies together, and the vessels went in and took them off; sometimes the vessels went to Hong-Kong and sometimes they did not, but they had everything prepared, their sailing-papers made out, and all, before they left these ports.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. They only sailed from Hong-Kong as a matter of convenience, as that is a great shipping-port, the same as Europeans sail from Liverpool?—A. Yes; I suppose so.

Q. They did not go there necessarily, but simply as a matter of convenience to ship from that port?—A. No; they cannot ship them from there as well. From Macao, the Portuguese port, a great many are shipped to foreign countries, more than at Hong-Kong.

Q. But these people that sail from Hong-Kong come from the interior of China to Hong-Kong for the purpose of shipping from there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are not residents of Hong-Kong?—A. No; very few of them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you mean to say that these persons who leave Amoy sail directly or go from there to Hong-Kong, and finally embark at Hong-Kong?—A. Sometimes a vessel goes to Hong-Kong to fill up the cargo or something of that sort, but those who go as cooolies generally go direct from Amoy. I shipped several vessels that have gone out in that way.

Q. To the United States?—A. To the United States or the South American coast.

Q. We are talking about the immigration to the United States; do they depart from Amoy directly to the United States without touching anywhere else?—A. There was not so much trade directly from Amoy to California, because most of the trade from China went out from Shanghai, in the northern part, and Hong-Kong, in the southern part, rather than through the intermediate ports. Of course they had teas and all that sort of thing that were shipped, and coolies, but they did not make a business of the coolie-trade to California so much as to the other countries; they did not charter the vessels exclusively for that purpose.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did the coolie-vessels leave Shanghai for California?—A. Very few vessels came to Shanghai for coolies, I think.

Q. Still some did?—A. Yes; but very few.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. When you were describing the character of the people who came here as the lowest boat-people, you began to speak also of a class of pirates.—A. The great body of those are up and down the coast of China all the while. They live there and make a business of it. No matter whether a vessel is American, European, or Chinese, if it is wrecked the pirates pounce upon it. They harbor around the island of Formosa.

Q. They live as thieves?—A. Yes; they are buccaneers.

Q. And from that class we get many of our immigrants?—A. A great many come off from there. They think they can better their condition.

Q. What is your opinion of the immigration of this class of people to our country, looking at it not as a money-making question, but as a moral and political question involving the future of our State?—A. If it had any moral effect at all I think it would be very bad.

Q. Do you not think to bring them here does have a moral effect?—A. I do as far as it goes; I will say that the worst race and the worst type of Chinese character I have ever seen has been in San Francisco, Hong-Kong, and such ports, where they mingle more with the sailors and the lower class of foreigners, because the Chinamen who come from the interior are different; they are a more respectable class.

Q. Then to the extent that that class emigrates from the port of Hong-Kong, regarding what they call the boat-people and the pirates, it would be a very undesirable immigration to our country?—A. I think so. I think it is an immigration we could do without very well, and that we would be better without them.

Q. And in the future of this State you think the immigration of that class of people had better be discouraged?—A. I think so.

Q. Would you regard as appropriate any proper legislation restricting them from coming here?—A. I think so. If we must have that population, if we have not laborers enough, let us send and get a better class—those rural laborers in the interior.

Q. Would it not be better even than that to send and get the better class of people from New England and our Eastern States?—A. I think so; but I will tell you my experience in that matter. I have not employed Chinese very much here in California; almost all my farming business is done directly or indirectly with white labor, and I prefer to do it in that way; but I know it is very difficult all the time through the busy season, either in the sowing season or the harvesting season, to get white laborers enough to do our work.

Q. Then in view of that scarcity of labor, do you not think it would be wise in us, as a new people, to make a larger effort to bring immigration from the East, to encourage and aid that immigration to come here, than it would to bring this immigration from the port of Hong-Kong?—A. I do. If we can get better conditions of people from the Eastern States or from Europe I would prefer them to these boat-men.

Q. Then would you favor any judicious legislation that would look to the encouragement of eastern and foreign immigrants instead of Chinese and Asiatic immigrants?—A. I would. I was going to observe in relation to this matter that I remember only this last week two young men coming from the East brought letters of introduction to me. They wanted employment, and they brought a letter of introduction from a friend in San Francisco to me. One of them had not reached San Francisco before he got employment, and the other the next day. There is no difficulty of white laborers in our region of the country getting employment; but there have been times when it was impossible to get any other than this Chinese help.

Q. We have a large commercial city here, and is there not more difficulty in obtaining employment here, and does not the immigration of Chinese labor affect labor more unpleasantly in a commercial city than it does in the country?—A. I think so, decidedly. I think the great trouble is in San Francisco.

Q. Then while Chinese labor would be very embarrassing to laborers here, it would be less so in the country?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I understood you to say that you had cleared ships from Amoy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For California—cooly-ships?—A. Not cooly-ships directly, because most of them had taken on cargo and some went to other ports to fill up; but the cooly-ship business, as I say, was mostly by American vessels transacted with foreign ports in South America.

Q. Do you know of your knowledge of any ship leaving any port, Amoy or Hong-Kong, bound for California with coolies on board?—A. One ship left there just before I arrived, the Robert Bowne; and although not more than three days out, not far from the island of Amoy, the coolies rose and murdered the captain and other officers and took possession of the ship. I cannot recollect now whether the ship was bound to California or South America. It was an American ship.

Q. What year was that?—A. It was about 1852.

Q. Do you not know that the Robert Bowne was bound for Callao?—A. I do not remember about that; but it was an American ship.

Q. You allude to the flag she carried?—A. Yes.

Q. I want to know whether it was ever within your knowledge, or can be found in the custom-house, whether coolies left any port in China for any port of the United States—a vessel with one cooly or five hundred coolies?—A. Yes; the ship I came over in in 1861 brought five hundred coolies from Hong-Kong direct to San Francisco.

Q. How do you know they were coolies?—A. Because they came as such.

Q. What is a cooly?—A. A cooly is an employed laborer who lives on his labor.

Q. Is there not a vast difference between those coming to California and those going to Peru?—A. I do not say he comes as a slave.

Q. Do you know under what circumstances they ship from Macao to Cuba? Do you know of any being shipped to California or the United States under similar circumstances?—A. No; I do not think they were. As I was going to observe, the contracts and obligations are different for those coming to California than those going to the Peruvian islands. After our Government took the question up and directed the consuls to look into the matter and see that the system was not carried on in an unjust manner, I stopped a vessel that came into Amoy, loaded up her cargo, and went 8 or 10 miles and anchored there. News came to me that she was filling up her cargo with coolies.

Q. Where did she clear them?—A. She was going direct to Havana. We went out, called the vessel in, and examined into the matter. We then had the contract read over. The report from the Chinese authorities to us was that these men had been kidnapped and taken off in an American vessel, and they wanted it looked into. I said to the Chinese mandarins, "You go on board of this vessel with me, and every man on board who says he has been taken on without his wish or authority I will discharge, and every man who wants to go I have nothing to say about it if you have not."

Q. Would the Rev. Mr. Williams, the secretary of legation at Pekin, be good authority, if he says there has not been a cooly shipped from China to the United States?—A. If he says there never have been any coolies here, he is not good authority.

Q. Shipped from those ports here. The same kind of coolies we are talking about that go to Peru?—A. We are talking about coolies, the lower class of laborers, not necessarily those who are bound to go to Havana or Peru for eight or ten years.

Q. They are a distinct class, have a distinct contract, and under distinct circumstances, are they not?—A. No; the lower laboring classes are all called coolies. Mr. Williams has lived at Canton and Pekin a great many years.

Q. Then you class these laborers on canals, farms, and ditches as coolies?—A. Yes, sir; as coolies, not slaves that I know of.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. They are not peons?—A. Not peons.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you recollect that in the case of the Robert Bowne, after they got to sea the coolies found that they were going to be taken to Peru and not to California?—A. I do not think that was the excuse.

Q. Did the ship return?—A. She returned back to Amoy, and the papers were all on record there.

Q. Where was she bound to?—A. I forget about that; but the matter was all settled up before I left.

Q. Do you not know that the Robert Bowne cleared for Peru?—A. I am not so sure but that she did. I know American vessels cleared from Amoy to Peru.

Q. In the investigation out there was it not proven that these men were kidnapped and enticed on board on the plea that they were going to the gold-hills of California?—A. I do not remember about that, but

these men on this vessel, when the mandarins had turned and gone off the ship, said, "Although we have been kidnapped, and all that, we would rather go than not."

Q. They thought they were coming to the United States?—A. No; they knew where they were going.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What do you understand by a cooly?—A. A cooly is a lower class of laborer in China.

Q. Do you mean simply a common laborer?—A. Yes; a common lower class of laborers.

Q. Do you mean that he is a slave?—A. Not at all.

Q. But that he performs the lowest kind of labor?—A. Yes; the lowest classes are called coolies, as contradistinguished from the upper class of mechanics or farmers, although a laborer on a farm may be called a cooly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What are the circumstances under which coolies are taken to Peru?—A. They were taken for ten years, and the contract appeared fair enough upon the face. They were taken at a settled price; I think at $5 a month for wages, and their living furnished.

Q. Do you know of any Chinese being brought to California under such contracts?—A. I do not. I had supposed, however, that there were a great many, but I never knew. Of course it was only such cases as this that we had anything to do with. We cannot go and ask a man to show us his charter.

Q. Have you any evidence to the effect that any of those pirates or river-thieves have immigrated to California?—A. I do not know them personally, but I know that that is the same class. All those idle laborers are made up of that class of people.

Q. What did it cost in those days to get here?—A. Not a very great deal. I do not remember now. After these Chinese got in the habit of coming here and found they could make money, there was a disposition generally to come here.

Q. Do you not look upon what you mean by cooly, what we have here and what you were familiar with as an emigrant from China to this country while you were a resident there, as a better laboring class than those forming the coolies that were taken to Peru and Cuba?—A. I know them to be of the same class as a general thing. There were very many men taken to Peru quite as respectable as those that came here.

Q. Were they not kidnapped generally for cooly service in Peru?—A. I was observing that these men had cooly agents, and they would go into the country and make arrangements to take so many men with such a contract, and get them to sign the contract, and advance them a suit of clothing and some money. These men kept watch, I think, and took them aboard of those vessels where they were to rendezvous. They kept them until the vessel loaded and was ready to sail. After these men had got the money sometimes they would complain that they had been forced to go. So far as we knew we never allowed a man to be taken off against his will; but it is possible some of these men may have been taken off in that way direct from Macao.

Q. Have you any knowledge of any kidnapped men being brought to California?—A. No.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you any knowledge of any men being kidnapped and taken from Macao to Peru?—A. Only from common report.

Q. You released them when it was brought to your notice?—A. When these men stated before myself and a mandarin that they had been taken against their will we discharged them.

Q. Was there never any complaint made of those coming toward California, so that you had to investigate those cases?—A. As I said, there was not such direct communication of coolies in that region of country. There was not such a surplus of them as there was about Canton.

Q. How did the coolies who came to California get the money to pay their passage if they belonged to this poor and worthless class?—A. When they were constructing the Panama Railroad they sent over agents. Eastern men, I think, Boston men, interested in building that road, sent over agents. I found some of them when I was there. They were sent over to engage Chinamen to come on and do that work.

Q. And these agents paid their passage?—A. Yes; they furnished the means and all that. They furnished the coolies there with means.

Q. Did they not make a contract with these coolies that they were to work a certain number of years to pay that out?—A. The persons who engaged them or the shippers?

Q. Either.—A. I do not know to what extent they carried that contract. I simply know that at that time they were getting men for that purpose and also for this overland railroad here. There were parties there in China engaging coolies to come over here and help with this work.

Q. They took men who had not means to pay their passage?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There must have been an agreement that that money was to come back somehow, with interest, was there not?—A. I will tell you how they manage these things. Suppose any one here wants to send to China to a reliable establishment there. They say, I want you to send me over fifty Chinamen, so and so, or such and such Chinese, and I want your guarantee that they will carry out their contract. If that house makes the contract they will carry it out, and they will advance the money, do everything they agree to do, and send them over here, and bind themselves to see that they fulfill their contract.

Q. Then the house so contracting and furnishing the Chinamen must have some contract with the Chinamen themselves?—A. O, yes; every cooly has some tie that binds him back to China, and he does not go and violate that contract, because in China they take a brother, or they will take the father, or any of the family, to make up for what the other man may refuse to do.

Q. As security?—A. If a man steals there and runs away, they will take the next of kin and hold the man in imprisonment until it brings back the thief; and so with the contractor here. If he makes a contract in this country, they hold that drawback on him that prevents him violating it, except it is in a very extreme case.

Q. Then in the case of the contract being thus made with the cooly for his labor, and he being brought here, they will take as security some of his relatives?—A. Yes.

Q. And how do they enforce that security against the relatives?—A. As I say, in that country they take them for anything; they can imprison the next of kin for anything else, for debt.

Q. They will take this relative, then, who is security?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that a pretty powerful influence upon the mind of the coolies?—A. I think it is. I think very much less thieving and all crimes are done there on that account.

Q. On account of the vicarious feature of their punishments?—A. Yes; because their parents or friends are held for their good behavior.

Q. Is there any such thing as a sale of the persons who are security?—A. No; I do not think there is, any more than to agree that they will work so and so to fulfill the contract.

Q. Suppose they give as security a brother or father, can they enforce the contract against that security except by imprisonment as a plea for debt?—A. By imprisonment, or if they have property they will take it and embarrass them.

Q. Your observation in China leads you to know whether they ever make a sale of human beings of any kind, male or female?—A. I think they do. I have had mothers offer me their girl babies for two bits; they would offer to sell them to me.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. For how much?—A. Two bits—25 cents. Among the poorer class they do not regard girls as worth anything, and they want to sell them or give them away, anything of that kind.

Q. These persons who offered them were in extreme misery?—A. They were poor. I do not think they were absolutely vicious. I do not think they considered it a crime. They thought it would be a benefit to the child.

Q. What did the mother suppose you would do with the child?—A. She supposed I would take good care of it, probably.

Q. Do you know of their being sold for prostitution?—A. You can call it selling, if you please. This is the way it works. I know a case right in my neighborhood in Amoy. There was an English captain running a vessel for a Chinaman up and down the coast. When I first went there I had to take what kind of a house I could get, a merchant's house. This English captain had a Chinese woman; he bought her. They pay twenty-five or thirty dollars for them; but they consider themselves wives. Really I do not think they have the idea of degradation that prostitutes have. They consider themselves the wives of these men. Sometimes this captain would take her aboard his ship with him, and whenever he stepped ashore she was there. I know he tried to transfer her to some one else when he went away, but she would not be transferred.

Q. Do you know of their sale for promiscuous intercourse?—A. There are such houses kept.

Q. I mean the sale of daughters for that purpose?—A. I do not know an out-and-out sale for that purpose.

Q. You said, if I understood your written statement, that the Chinese government were opposed to the emigration of their people, and would like to have it stopped?—A. Yes, sir; and you will recollect, Mr. Sargent, that when we undertook to open intercourse with China how they fought against it. As they said to the English people, "You come here with your ships; you bring cannon on your decks, missionaries in your cabins, and opium in your holds, and you force these things on to China."

Q. Were they all equally objectionable?—A. Yes; they looked upon them all as co-operative.

Q. Do you think the Chinese government at the present time desires that its people shall stay at home?—A. I think they do. I think they are very much opposed to their people going away.

Q. You think they would not look with much disfavor on legislation to assist in that object?—A. I think not.

Q. Do they really desire to exclude all foreigners?—A. They have wanted that, but I think it has died away a good deal. I think they find it very profitable for foreigners to be in their ports, and the better class of Chinese merchants encourage it.

Q. You do not know anything about the Chinese here?—A. Take the better type of the Chinese merchant. He is an elegant man and a courteous man; and so with the officials there.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If the Chinese government is opposed to the emigration of their people here of any class, and would not look with disfavor upon legislation that would assist in that object, why would they retaliate against us by refusing commerce with us?—A. The reason they do not want their people to come here is they do not want anything to do with us if they can help it.

Q. They want to sell tea to us now. You say the presence of foreigners there is not so disagreeable because they find it profitable?—A. They would do a great deal of their trade through Singapore and other islands where there are English and Americans, if they did not trade directly with us.

Q. Why would they refuse to trade with us?—A. I do not know that they would.

Q. I understood you to say in another part of your statement that we would lose this trade?—A. I take it for granted if we stopped trade with them they would stop trade with us.

Q. I am not speaking of stopping trade with them, but restricting immigration, which, you say, would be a favorite maneuver with them?—A. I do not know what the arrangement would be, but that is the presumption to go upon, that there is a reciprocity in all trades, and we cannot ask what we do not give.

JOHN STUART sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you lived in this State?—Answer. Since the 4th of July, 1865—over eleven years.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am employed in the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

Q. How long have you been in their employ?—A. Since 1865.

Q. What is that employment?—A. My particular part of it is the freight business of the line.

Q. You are the head of that department, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State to the commission what your experience has been in dealing with the Chinese in that capacity, and how you look upon them for integrity and honesty in dealing, &c.—A. I do not think that they can be very well surpassed for integrity and honesty in dealing. In the nine years that I have been dealing with them I have always found them very correct, very honest, very straightforward, and reliable. In many cases I should prefer to do business with them than with our people. I mean shipping business.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You refer to the merchant class?—A. I am referring to the merchant class.

Senator SARGENT. We admit that. There never will be any contest

that the merchant class are honorable. Besides that, you have proved it conclusively, even if anybody saw fit to deny it.

Mr. BEE. I want to show that this class which is so honorable sprung from the very class the last witness spoke of as coolies.

The WITNESS. I say there are certain Chinese engaged in business here very extensively who can scarcely be classed among the higher merchant class of the Chinese, and I have found them equally honorable with the others. They are very intelligent; they make out their papers, and once shown they always know how to do it. It is not always so with Americans. It is much easier to deal with the Chinese than with the Americans of the same class; that is, those who are not constantly in the habit of shipping.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You find less difficulty in collecting your freight-money?—A. We have no difficulty whetever in collecting freight-money from them. When money is due from a Chinaman he has it right on the nail.

Q. That is not the case generally with the white shipper?—A. I would not like to say that at all, but I have no trouble whatever with the Chinamen.

Q. Since you have been in that position has the trade and commerce between China and this country increased?—A. I think it has.

Q. Is it increasing to any certain extent at the present time?—A. It varies in a great measure; some years it is greater than others, but for the most part, on the whole, it is increasing. We are exporting more largely of flour year after year. I think they are consuming greater quantities of flour and potatoes, fruits, and other things, than formerly.

Q. We are shipping dried fruits, I believe?—A. We do not ship dried fruits to any great extent, but principally green fruits—apples, for instance—and large quantities of potatoes. Flour is the principal article, the staple article.

Q. What is their condition as to cleanliness when they come off the ships on your line?—A. They are as cleanly as any other nationality I have seen come off an American ship; rather more so than otherwise.

Q. Is there much disease among them?—A. No, sir; very little indeed. There are very few cases of sickness on the voyage.

Q. In your contact with Chinese merchants have they evinced any disposition to return to China these prostitutes and prevent their coming here?—A. They have always in their conversation with me appeared to be opposed to the coming of Chinese prostitutes.

Q. Did you see those who were shipped back called the lepers?—A. I did not see them; I only heard of them.

Q. Have you anything you can think of that you would like to state to the commission bearing on this question?—A. I will state, with reference to the immigration of Chinese, that, in my opinion, it never will assume proportions that will interfere with the morality of the State to any extent. There are some eighteen provinces in China, and all our immigration comes from one province in the vicinity of Canton. There is scarcely ever a case of the immigration of Chinese from the northern provinces.

Q. About what number is arriving now on the steamer?—A. From one to two hundred a steamer.

Q. How many are returning?—A. From four to six hundred a steamer. I would state that there are regular seasons for them to arrive and to return. In the early portion of the year, from March, they usually come here in larger numbers until May or July. Commencing with August un-

til the beginning of the new year, there are much larger numbers going from here than coming.

Q. From your acquaintance and business relations with this merchant class, do you think they are a distinct class who come here?—A. I am inclined to think that they are not altogether a distinct class. It is very much as with ourselves.

Q. They build themselves up?—A. They build themselves up.

Q. These coolies that you heard about to-day, in your opinion, are the mercantile class that we have?—A. Many of them. I have known some who came over here as laboring men who are now doing a large business.

Q. How does their character stand for credit?—A. Very good, indeed. I have not discovered any laxity among them. I will say in reference to coolies that, as I understand it, the term cooly is applied in Hong-Kong to the laborers there. They have no horses in Hong-Kong, and all the cargo which is shipped, and all that is landed, is carried on poles by men. They do not use horses. The island, as I understand, is so hilly that they could not use horses to advantage. Even passengers are carried in chairs swung over the shoulders of coolies, and all the merchandise is carried by men in that way.

Q. Laborers in our own race rise to be merchants, do they not?—A. Very frequently.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What nationality are you?—A. I am an American now.

Q. That is not an answer. Where were you born?—A. I was born in Canada. I am Scotch.

Q. What is your employment?—A. I am clerk of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

Rev. MARTIN C. BRIGGS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. I am a minister.

Q. What in your opinion is the prevailing sentiment in reference to this Chinese question throughout the interior of the State?—A. So far as my observation has extended, there are but two classes whose opinions are entirely different. To give a specimen, I suppose we have fed at our house during the year one hundred persons, all of whom, or nearly all, claimed to be in want of employment, and declared they could not get employment because of the Chinese. They came in such numbers that I took pains to make myself acquainted with places which men were needed to fill in order to find labor for them, and directed a considerable number of these men to places where they could find employment. With three exceptions, I found either that they could not do the labor or that they did not want the labor to do, but wanted their food. Then we have a considerable addition to this class of a better grade of people. I refer more especially to the Irish people generally in our community, who seem to be strongly and violently opposed to the Chinese in every way. So far as I have inquired, and my inquiries have been somewhat extensive, for I have felt a great deal of interest in the subject, I have found that people who have some permanent interest, persons who are engaged in labor and persons who wish to employ labor, do not entertain the same feeling, and do not sympathize with that view. Very generally, though not universally, I have found such persons not only not to wish the removal of the Chinese, but they judge that it is on the whole better for the State that they should be here. I have taken pains also

to inquire with regard to any contingency of greater numbers. Of course, I found generally that our people would prefer white labor if they could get persons who would be quiet, industrious, temperate, and well-behaved. They employ Chinese because they are more docile and pursue their work more steadily. If it were a question which they should employ with equal facility and equal skill, I judge that a majority of them would employ white labor; but as they cannot find that labor, as the labor-market is not stocked with that kind of labor, they employ Chinese.

Q. Your acquaintance is quite extensive among the farming class?—A. Considerably so.

Q. What is the prevailing sentiment, if any, on this question among that class? I mean a small farmer; a man who raises a fruit-orchard, or a small farmer, the men who have the best interests of this State in view.—A. Very generally, I judge that they are inclined to look with patience, and a large majority of them with favor, upon the presence of Chinese here.

Q. Do you think it is necessary or desirable at the present time to limit the immigration of these people in view of the numbers which have arrived here in the past twenty-five years and our increase of population?—A. I do not think it necessary at the present time. We shall never be able again to present as strong inducements as we have presented in the past, and the numbers have not grown upon us in such a degree as to excite a feeling of alarm in my own mind or in the minds of a large majority.

Q. Then in the future, you think that we will not have as many inducements for the Chinese to come as in the past?—A. The relative number I think will decrease. Their provincial prejudices are strong. Most of the Chinese are from one province, and they are very jealous of others, so as to make it uncomfortable when they come from other provinces.

Q. Then you do not think there is any necessity at the present to restrict this immigration?—A. No, sir; my judgment would be that that question should be left to the future. If they should come in overwhelming numbers it is a question which could be settled wisely at the time.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Twenty-six years.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where do you reside?—A. Sacramento.

Q. What is your profession?—A. A minister.

Q. In what church?—A. The Methodist Episcopal Church.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 16, 1876.

WILLIAM W. HOLLISTER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a farmer.

Q. How long have you been a resident of California?—A. Since 1852, twenty-four years.

Q. In what portion of the State are your farming operations?—A. At present, chiefly in the county of Santa Barbara.

Q. To what extent are your farming operations?—A. I suppose that I would be called a large land-holder; perhaps not so large a farmer.

I own a good deal of land devoted to sheep culture and the growth of wool.

Q. How much land do you own?—A. I think I own not far from 75,000 acres.

Q. How many sheep do you own?—A. I should say about 50,000, more or less.

Q. The commission are here for the purpose of inquiring particularly into the effect of Chinese labor upon the several interests of this State and upon the population of the State. I suppose it would be desirable and more satisfactory to the committee for you to make your own statement and give your views in your own way. If you choose to do so without being questioned, you have that privilege.—A. So far as I am concerned it does not make much difference to me how I give such testimony as I am able to give. Perhaps it would be better to call out such information as you want by questions. I think I am ready to answer anything; that is, I can give my views as I entertain them upon all these subjects.

Q. We would prefer to have your views, and then the commission and the gentlemen on the other side can question you as they see fit. Please state your views as to the effect that Chinese labor has had upon the interests of this State, its material interests, and otherwise.—A. Of course, the question becomes one of labor. The Chinaman occupies a position in this matter simply incidentally. I look upon the whole question of labor as involved in this investigation. I can see it in no other light. In other words, it becomes a question simply whether we have enough labor or not in California. My own conviction is, from my experience in this State for twenty years, that we never have had a sufficient amount of reliable, patient, kindly labor. The field of labor is so enormous that I do not see when the time will come when it shall be fully filled. My opinion is that there is not a tithe of the laborers in California that ought to be here now, of any and all nationalities. With me and my labor it does not matter a straw. I am entirely regardless of the color or complexion of the man who does my work, white or black or parti-colored, or any complexion, simply requiring that the man shall work patiently and kindly. I ask nothing more from him. As to the character of the labor of the country, my experience in this State makes me put Chinamen entirely ahead of all others. The character of the man is better. His willingness to perform what the proprietor wants done is beyond question better than that of any other man. I can remember a time, forty years ago, when the American, that is, the laborer, in the country was a kindly working man, when he was willing to perform his labors in a kindly, submissive, good way as a member of the family. To-day we are very far from that condition. There is no such man in the State of California that I know of, with very few exceptions. Of course, there are some good Americans, first-class, for they are the best men in the world when they are good; but there is no man who performs the labor of this country in a kindly way to suit and does his very best for the proprietor like the Chinaman. I have never seen a better laborer any time in the course of my life. The quantity of labor, of course, is utterly insufficient. The character of the labor generally in California is very bad other than that of the Chinamen. What has contributed to make the American laborer so good for nothing? I mean all I say when I say that, for he is literally good for nothing. I do not know. Perhaps labor-leagues have had something to do with it. Perhaps the general disinclination to work which has grown out of the war may have had something to do with it. At any rate, the

fact is patent that the American to-day has made up his mind to live off his wits and not work. I do not see how the industries of California can be possibly carried on if there is not more labor, instead of less, to carry them on. I cannot see how I can myself carry on my work as a farmer. I know more about my business than I do about any other man's business, and, as a farmer, I cannot succeed with the labor I have to-day, even including the best of Chinamen, with the most I can get out of them, for the simple reason that the price of labor is nearly double what any employment of labor on a farm will justify. To-day the price of labor in California precludes the possibility of success in any work.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What would be the result if you did not succeed?—A. I suppose the result would be precisely as in all countries where business fails; we would become a set of bummers. If labor is not performed I think the country is gone up, and is not worth living in. You would not live in it.

Q. If we had a number of men with 75,000 acres of land and they did not succeed, I think it would be a good thing.—A. I have worked for fifty years like a slave. I have done as much work as any Chinaman. I came before the commission with my hands dusty from putting up sweet-potatoes. It was that which made me declare to you that I did not know whether I could possibly get here or not. I am a workingman. If I have any sympathies at all it is with the workingmen of the country. If the California laborer or farmer has a friend in this State, that friend is myself. Twenty-five years of my history will prove it, if you will simply go over that history and see what it has been.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the business you carry on; what kind of farming?—A. For the most of these years I have been a grazier; I have raised sheep. I started very early in the opening of California in sheep-husbandry. At that time, farmer as I was, with all my tastes and education leading me to the farm, knowing that farming was an impossibility for me, I took to grazing because I could see in the future, as I thought, something in that occupation that would make me a living or more. I followed grazing up to within the last ten years all the time, though, leaning to my first love, I have been farming some, experimenting, working up the soil of the country, proving its capabilities, &c. Latterly, I have been farming more extensively at Santa Barbara.

Q. What do you produce on your farm?—A. The ordinary farming crops of the country. I raise wheat, barley, corn, potatoes. I have planted experimentally many fruit-trees of all descriptions. I have fine orchards of almonds, of walnuts, of oranges, lemons, and limes. I am experimenting a good deal in every direction at very great cost, and at a loss. I find that it is almost impossible to carry on my farming with the cheapest labor I can get. With the minimum paid for farming-work, say $25 a month and board, I find that it is impossible to live. I pay out five dollars for every four I get, and have done it for ten years so far as farming is concerned; and yet I claim to be a good farmer. It is not my fault, it is not the fault of the soil, it is not the fault of the climate, but it is the fault of the price of labor. My own conviction is, from what I know and have seen, from my own experiments and what I have seen of my neighbors, that there is not a farm in the State scientifically handled, handled well, with a view to the perpetuity of the soil, with a view to its permanency, without exhaustion, restoring as we take away, that will survive at $25 a month for labor. A farmer cannot

survive on the payment of a minimum of $25 a month and board. The farm will not pay the labor. Any one can see that if you pay a man $25 a month it is $300 a year, and board, and incidental losses of time and so on will go to make up the whole amount at about $500 a year. Every 160 acres has to turn out $500 in gold to pay the help before the farmer gets one dollar. No farmer in the State can farm at that rate.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What effect has the course of agriculture which we pursue here upon the productiveness of our land?—A. It is very apparent that we are simply leaving a desert behind us. That is the history of California farming. We are taking every pound of bread out of the soil and sending it to Europe. There are only so many pounds of bread in an acre of land, and when you take it out there is no more; you have got to restore the elements. That requires labor and an expenditure of money. To-day, it is a simple drain all the time. It is a draught upon the bank to pay this exorbitant labor. The farmer will not stand it, and no man in the world can stand it. I have seen myself twenty crops of wheat taken off, and that is a fact without a parallel anywhere else on the face of the earth, I think. Yet that land is all going. I have seen here, almost in sight of this town, eighty bushels of wheat produced to the acre. I have seen the same land years afterward when you could run a dog through it without striking a stalk. That is poverty; that is failure; and when your soil is bankrupt your farming is bankrupt; and when your farming is bankrupt commerce is gone.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You state that these lands are being exhausted here?—A. Very rapidly, indeed. Some lands will bear but few crops. Take the great San Joaquin Plains, and my opinion of them, as a farmer, is that they will not stand many crops. Your fertile lands of the coast counties will stand more drain than I ever saw in my life anywhere; but they are going, and they cannot help but go. There is no restoration. There is not a deposit of one dollar in bank, whereas we are taking out, all the time.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are any of these lands so exhausted now that they will not produce a crop sufficient to pay the cost of cultivation?—A. Very many of them, in my opinion, certainly. I do not go around very much; but I have my eyes open when I do. I know very many lands in California, once very fertile, which to-day will not bear a good crop at all.

Q. I understand you to say there is not an excess of Chinese population in the State now?—A. There is not half enough, and the producer here will pay twice what they are worth. The fault is that we have to pay all labor so high that every proprietor is bound to go to the wall, unless he is simply intermediate, living in town and getting his commissions, so that it does not matter. He has a farm, but whether the farmer lives or dies he survives and has a hope until his commissions are entirely gone. If there is no farming there is no commerce and no commissions. The farmer is at the bottom of everything.

Q. Would it be wise, in your opinion, to put a stop to Chinese immigration?—A. No, sir; I would open the door and let everybody come who wants to come. When the price drops down, when farming becomes possible in California and you stop the demand, the supply will fail to come. The thing must regulate itself like all other laws. The only inducement for the Chinaman to come here to-day is the great

wages paid. We are under the necessity to hire him or do nothing. We cannot do nothing. I do all I can, but we cannot do much. If you throw back the agriculture of California upon those who do their own work, you cannot bread this State. I think it would be better not to send out a bushel of grain.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is it not the fact that a large portion of the farmers throughout the State do their own work?—A. It is the commonest thing in the world wherever I have been.

Q. Is it not another fact that our savings-banks have larger deposits and more of them from the laboring class than any other State in the Union?—A. I suppose that is chiefly in cities; but very few of those in the country save anything at all. It generally goes down their throats in whisky.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is that the case with the Chinese?—A. I never saw a drunken Chinaman in my life.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are there not savings-banks all over the State in all the little cities?—A. There is not one in the town where I live. It would be very poorly patronized if there was one there.

Q. How large is the town?—A. It has a population of about six thousand.

Q. Is it an American population or Spanish?—A. Mostly American; I believe, if my memory serves me rightly, there are about four hundred Chinese in the entire county.

Q. Are the inhabitants of that town universally so much addicted to whisky that what they make goes down their throats?—A. I think it is true of all that community.

Q. Do you observe in that town that the great mass of the people drink up all they make?—A. The great mass of the working population unquestionably. I found it very hard two years ago to find a man sober enough to drive my team ten miles to town and get back safe.

Q. In a town of six thousand people?—A. Yes, sir; I had to make an arrangement with the livery-stable keeper to take charge of my team in the event of my man getting drunk, for I always anticipated such a thing. I had a common understanding with livery-men in Santa Barbara that they should take my team in such a case and take care of it until the driver was sober.

Q. And you got the best driver you could?—A. I always get the best driver I can; in fact, he was the best driver I could get.

Q. What is the name of that town?—A. Santa Barbara.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. It is the county-seat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the moral condition of this Chinese population?—A. So good that I think out of the whole 400 Chinese population there have been but five arrests in the course of a year. Two of them were dismissed; two cases were for petty larceny, stealing vegetables, or something like that, from their own people. I never saw a better population in my life.

Q. How does this immigration compare morally with other immigration of the same class of people?—A. So much better that if the teachings of paganism make honest men as I find the Chinamen to be, I

think seriously of becoming a pagan myself. I believe in honesty; I believe in honest men.

Q. What is their physical condition as to health, &c.?—A. Those who are skilled in labor and understand our work, having had some experience, are the best workingmen I ever saw. I do not think as an average the Chinaman is quite up to the average of the white population in physical strength, though I see exceptions where they are very strong and very good. They are not very strong men, but they are very earnest, good men. They work up to their power as I never saw any other people work in my life.

Q. What is the condition of their health?—A. First rate. I rarely see an invalid Chinaman.

Q. Have you noticed among them any predisposition to skin-diseases or eruptions, or anything of that kind?—A. Not a bit.

Q. What are their habits in regard to personal cleanliness?—A. Better than that of the whites. My men are the cleanest men I ever had about me in my life. They was hevery day of their lives. They shame our own population in that respect.

Q. In your intercourse with them have you formed any opinion as to whether these Chinamen who are here are free or not?—A. If there was ever a slave among them I never knew it. I treat with my men severally and individually. I have no go-betweens. I say to a Chinaman, generally one who has been a father among them and understands the language well, "I want two more Chinamen; get good men, the best men; go bring them on and I will give them so much."

Q. You employ him merely as a Chinaman to get the men?—A. I take simply any one of them who understands the language and can talk well. I never supposed or believed that there was a particle of peonage or slavery among the Chinamen of California; and I do not believe there is to-day.

Q. Have you seen any evidence of any control exercised by any one Chinaman over another?—A. Not a particle.

Q. Do these Chinamen come here with the intention of remaining or with the intention of returning?—A. I think very few of them come here with the purpose of staying. I think very few indeed ever think of such a thing as staying here permanently. I have had some of them employed as long as ten or twelve years without intermission, that is, without leaving me permanently. I have had them go home to China and take all the money they had earned, buy homes for the old folks, fix them up snug and nice, and return without a penny, even borrowing money of somebody, probably of the Chinese companies of California, and returning without a dollar and beginning anew.

Q. Does any great number of those who remain declare an intention to stay?—A. I have not seen a single instance where a Chinaman has desired to own property and stay. All they seem to want is a place to work and to get our money, be properly treated, and go home when they get enough money.

Q. They retain their intention of returning to their own country?—A. I think every one of them does.

Q. If the right of the elective franchise were open to these men, what percentage of them would avail themselves of it?—A. I do not believe any of them care a straw about it to-day. What they might wish in the future I do not know. So far as I know them to-day, they do not care anything about it. They simply want to work and earn some money, apparently to go home and fix up the old folks and better their condition. We want muscle and not citizens. I want work. I do not care

where it comes from, or where it lives. I want the muscle of white men, Chinamen, mules, or horses. I do not care what it is, so that it does the work.

Q. Do you think there was any impending peril that made it necessary to exclude the Mongolian from becoming a citizen?—A. No, sir; I do not see any reason at all for it. I do not see why a Chinaman is not just as good as any other man, so far as citizenship is concerned, if he chooses to avail himself of it. If he is the best workingman I can find, I do not see why he should not be the best citizen.

Q. Do you think they would avail themselves of it in sufficient number to make it of any consequence politically?—A. Not a particle. I do not believe it.

Q. What kind of labor do they perform in the country?—A. Everything almost that is done on farms or in the household. They are not skilled as horsemen. A Chinaman very rarely, at twenty-five years old, knows as much about a horse as your little son at six. They have got to learn, and when they do learn I suppose they will be as good horsemen as anybody.

Q. They have to learn everything, do they not?—A. They have.

Q. Then why can they not learn to manage horses?—A. I do not say they cannot. There are so many fields for their employment that they have not been called into requisition as horsemen; and then I suppose it is the desire of most proprietors, as it is my own desire, to employ our own countrymen. I prefer the American to anyone else, because he knows the most and is best able to do what I want generally, if he is good; but if he is a vagabond, I do not want him at all.

Q. You have said that you have never seen a Chinaman drunk. Have you seen them under the influence of opium so as to incapacitate them for work?—A. Not on my place. I think I may have seen in the course of my California life a few instances where Chinamen have been under the influence of opium. I have not seen it, and I do not know much about it.

Q. To what extent do you think the use of opium interferes with their capacity for doing their daily work?—A. I have not seen that it ever did any harm at all. I do not know that it ever did of my own knowledge, or ever kept them from work. I do not know anything about what you are having done here in cities. I speak of what I know.

Q. At what time of the day do those who smoke opium use it?—A. Indeed, I scarcely know that they smoke it at all at my place.

Q. Of those you have there what proportion use opium?—A. I cannot say that one uses opium. I do not know it if he does.

Q. Have you selected them on that account or taken them without regard to that?—A. I take them as I get them. I have never seen much difference in Chinamen. They are generally willing to work, and that is all I want.

Q. You have seen Chinamen smoking opium, have you not?—A. I suppose I have. I have seen them with pipes smoking opium or tobacco. I have seen them with pipes.

Q. At what hour of the day, or time?—A. I have said I do not know that they smoke opium at all.

Q. Have you seen them smoking while at work?—A. Never; I have never seen a Chinaman take a pipe in his mouth when about his business.

Q. They smoke when they are not engaged, or at night?—A. I have never seen them smoke at other times.

Q. So far as your experience goes, it is by no means universal?—A. Not by any means. I know that a great many of my men do not smoke anything at all.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Is there or not strong opposition to the Chinese among the agricultural people of the State?—A. As to the proprietors, I think there is a common sentiment and feeling in favor of the Chinamen. They are our last resort. They are the only thing that the farmer can rely upon at all. The feeling is common with all of the farmers except possibly a very few who are utterly unable to hire anybody at all. There are some men, you might say, who do not want Chinamen, but I do not know them. The feeling is common among the proprietors of Santa Barbara, I know, of very great favor to the Chinamen. In fact, they are doing all the work of that country. There are about four hundred of them there, almost all out in the country variously employed, some of them chopping wood, some of them in-doors, some of them serving families. Generally, they find such work as they are best fitted for with the farmers of the country there. They are very handy with the bean-crop of the country and with the barley. They do the greater part of the work. They adapt themselves to all work because the others will not do it at the price at which they work.

Q. Is there opposition to the Chinamen among the people of Santa Barbara, a town of about six thousand people?—A. The bummer always goes against the Chinaman, and he is there as well as everywhere else. I never heard anybody else complain of them. The bummer is a man who does not work and does not want anybody else to work. If the Chinaman got $5 a day I suppose the bummer would go for his place and get it. That is about the reason I suppose why they oppose the Chinamen, because nobody can afford to give such wages. The man who demands big wages is simply running against himself; he breaks down all employment and nobody can hire him.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Could you raise wheat here and export it without Chinese labor?—A. I think not. They are useful in very many places in the field. They are not very skillful planters, but in gathering the crops and handling them in other ways they are very important, so much so that farming crops would have been failures entirely if it had not been for the Chinamen to gather them.

Q. Are they employed as house-servants generally in the country?—A. There is nothing else we can employ. I have been in Santa Barbara seven years, and I have sent as many as ten times to San Francisco for women. They come and stay about two weeks. I pay their passage down there—ten, fifteen, or twenty dollars. There are various changes in the rate. We cannot do anything with them after they come.

Q. What is the objection to going there?—A. It is in the country, and they are not quite near enough to the cities and towns. It is an objection with the religious, I suppose, on account of going to church, and I suppose they do not have as many sweethearts as they like. I cannot say what their motives are. I only know the fact that they will not stay.

Q. As a matter of fact, they are not willing to go into the country as house servants?—A. No, sir; there is no use talking about it; they will not stay at all. It is Chinamen or nothing.

Q. What would be the effect upon the country population if they were deprived of Chinamen as house-servants?—A. It would be very

disastrous. I cannot tell how we would get along. I think the thing would result in about this, that every farmer would cease hiring labor and the family would do just what it could do.

Q. What would be the effect upon the bringing of other families out here to get farms in the country?—A. If the immigrant to California has a bit of sense, the Chinaman is the best inducement in the world to bring him here. If he knows anything about what ought to be in the country, he will easily know that there is somebody here to do the work, that kind of work which he cannot do or does not want to do.

Q. If there were no Chinese servants in the country, what effect would it have upon the immigration of white families from the East?—A. If they were equally sensible in the other case, they would stay away.

Q. What would be the tenor of the advice from those who are here to their friends at home?—A. It would be, stay away. Without work you are not worth a cent. It is the key-note to everything.

Q. How much do you think the average Chinaman adds to the wealth of the State out of his earnings? What proportion of it does he take away?—A. Just in the same proportion as the labor adds to the wealth of a country a Chinaman adds to the wealth of this State.

Q. What proportion of that wealth does he take out of the country?—A. He does not take any of it; not a dollar. If I hire a man and pay him a dollar, I get an equivalent for that money in the labor performed. If I am not a fool, that labor is worth more to me than the money I pay. I am a fool if I pay more than the man is worth. If I get an equivalent in his labor, I am better off for the employment, and I do not care what he does with the money. It is none of my business.

Q. I want to know what he does with it. I want to know what percentage of his wages he can save to take back to China.—A. Not more than a white man, if a white man is equally industrious and economical. I do not see why he should. I do not think any Chinaman could save more than I saved forty years ago, when a young man working myself. I have worked for three bits a day, and saved it, too. I know very well that on my father's farm, forty years ago there were six of us, four boys and two girls, and we worked all the time on two thousand acres more of land, andwe could not lay up in a year than I pay to my Chinamen. The country thrived then. It thrived by the labor performed. Everybody worked. It was as rare then to see a bummer as it is now to see an industrious man.

Q. As I understand you, the Chinese do all the labor in the country; they are employed in all sorts of labor, except the management of horses.—A. Some of them learn to drive horses, and they are very good drivers when they do know how. The Chinaman is good in everything, I do not care where you put him; and owing to the demoralized condition of American labor, he is the best man in California for work.

Q. How do they compare for honesty?—A. I have yet to see the first thief among them. I have never lost a pennyworth in all the twenty-five years I have employed them. My money has been left lying around in my vest-pockets hundreds of times, and when my vest would be taken away or my pantaloons removed the money was never touched. I recollect only recently my fine diamond brooch went with my clothes in the washing, and was carefully brought back by the Chinese washerman to my sister. It is not everywhere that such things are done among white people.

Q. What do you say about their truthfulness?—A. They do not lie to me; I never hear them lie.

Q. How is it in regard to their faithfulness in performing their work

when you are not watching them?—A. Very much better than any other labor. The long and short of it, so far as my experience goes, is that a Chinaman desires to do his level best to earn his money; and if he knows he pleases you, he is all the better pleased. I have never seen men more willing, more truthful in my life than the Chinamen are.

Q. How is it in regard to keeping their contracts?—A. I have never had a contract broken by Chinamen yet.

Q. How has your experience in that respect been between them and white laborers?—A. I do not make a contract with the American at all any more, I may say. I do not say to him, "You shall work six months, or I cannot employ you." If I want them at all, I say, "There is the work to do, I cannot make any contract, for I know you will leave just when you get ready." It is no use to say a word about contracting; I know what they will do. I had them leave me in twenty-four hours after contracting for a year, without any provocation at all.

Q. Have you brought white laborers out at your own expense?—A. I made one attempt to bring white labor from Sweden. I employed a man in San Francisco, who was going, to be an agent to bring on that class of labor. He was to bring me five Swedes. I gave him $500 to bring them here. He reported when he returned that he could not make contracts with them there to come; and I believe, as my memory is now, that they could not get the securities for coming here to fulfill contracts of labor at $25 a month. He came back as far as New York and got two; I suppose they were New York bummer Swedes. That was about the amount of it. He brought them on here. They cost $140 apiece. One stayed just twenty-five days. He went away, and with him the rest of the money. Although the other stayed and worked the year out, I would not have given him $10 a month if I had been asked to hire him.

Q. How does the employment of Chinese affect white labor?—A. I do not see how it can affect white labor whatever, though it may be so. The Chinaman opens two doors to labor where he closes one. There is nothing that is exhausting the fields of labor in California. If you have labor enough to do what is to be done to-day; to-morrow you want twice as much labor. It is simple folly, it seems to me, to talk about overflowing or too greatly filling the fields of labor in California. I cannot understand such a proposition at all.

Q. Do you think the establishment of one industry creates another?—A. Unquestionably.

Q. And that another?—A. Unquestionably. A great many of our industries would not have existed to-day but for the presence of the few Chinamen who have made the undertaking possible. Take the Mission and Pioneer mills here; I know something of the history of those establishments; I know, so far as I know anything at all from information and from my own reasoning on the subject, that but for the Chinamen there would not be work for the Americans there, from 25 to 50 per cent. of the employés in those establishments at all. If the Chinamen do not open very large fields of labor for white men, I do not understand anything.

Q. Do you think it prevents the immigration of white labor to our coast from Europe and the Eastern States?—A. No, sir; I think it is a strong incentive for labor to come here.

Q. What has been the effect of the building of the Southern Pacific Railroad through the Salinas Plains?—A. To open a very fine agricultural country and to employ a vast amount of labor.

Q. What was that country, how used and occupied, before that railroad was built?—A. It was used mainly for pasturing sheep and cattle

up to the time of the building of the railroad, a very small product compared with what comes from it now—one dollar to five, and possibly ten. I think the labor applied to the plow or farm is $5 or $6 to one that is derived from a pastoral condition. Grazing will make $1 where the plow will give $5 to the commerce of the country.

Q. How much would that land rent for per acre as pasture-land before the road was built?—A. It rented for a mere nominal sum; I have known land rent there as low as 10 cents an acre, and from that, as the demand increased for sheep-husbandry, up to about 25 cents an acre.

Q. How many inhabitants were there to the thousand acres on that plain?—A. I suppose there was one-half of one inhabitant.

Q. What is the condition of it now since the building of the road?—A. Very populous; very much plowed up; the country alive with industry.

Q. How many towns are there upon that plain?—A. Only one town of any considerable importance. There are two or three places or centers that do not amount to much. One town, Salinas City, is quite a place.

Q. That is the county-seat now?—A. I think so.

Q. What is the number of inhabitants?—A. I do not know exactly; I should think probably about 3,000; I only estimate it from the appearance of the place.

Q. How many are there in Castorville?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you know Natividad?—I have been by it.

Q. What place is there between Natividad and Salinas City?—A. I have been by there very little; I think they are unimportant little places.

Q. How much is that land worth per acre now? How much does it rent for?—A. It rents very high; some of it, I think, as high as $10 an acre.

Q. And how many inhabitants do you think there are on that plain to the thousand acres now?—A. I do not know just how many thousand acres there are; I should say there are 4,000 or 5,000 people in that valley now.

Q. Four thousand or 5,000 people have taken the place of how many people?—A. Two, three, or four families.

Q. What has been the effect of the building of that railroad upon the population of the State? In other words, is a part of the immigrants who have come in there from abroad?—A. Yes, sir; very largely. The population is made up from citizens coming from all parts of California, and a great many from abroad. Of course, the road has opened a new field for settlement.

Q. What has been the effect of building the Southern Pacific Railroad down the San Joaquin Valley and on down to Los Angeles upon the population of the State?—A. I think that is very apparent to everybody. It has simply made possible the settlement of a country that otherwise was impossible. Nobody could live in the country except a few graziers with herds of cattle and sheep.

Q. Has the change been similar in character to that you have spoken of in the Salinas Plains?—A. Unquestionably; the same causes produce the same results everywhere.

Q. How has the increase of immigration from the East kept pace with the building of those railroads?—A. I think immigration from the East has been greatly increased by the building of the roads. I do not know enough about the statistics of immigration to give you any other answer than that.

Q. Before the building of those roads, was the incoming of white pop-

ulation from the East as rapid, or how did it compare with the increase since the railroads have been built?—A. The immigration has very greatly increased. I have occasionally seen statements of the number of passengers, and I judge from that that the aggregate has considerably increased over what it used to be.

Q. What has been the fact in regard to the increase of population in the southern portion of the State since the commencement of the building of those railroads?—A. I only know from what I hear, that the population of Los Angeles and that vicinity has very greatly increased since the opening of the road to that point, but I think it has correspondingly diminished in Santa Barbara. I think we have had less immigration and Los Angeles a great many more.

Q. Have you any railroad communication to Santa Barbara?—A. None at all. The nearest point is about a hundred miles.

Q. I am not very familiar with that part of the country, but I have the impression that a number of towns have grown up there within the last few years?—A. Yes, sir; they have been gradually growing. Santa Barbara has grown within the last six years almost its entire growth.

Q. Is there not a town called Riverside growing up there?—A. That is at Los Angeles. I think very many little towns are springing up all over that great plain at Los Angeles. The railroad has given new life to that whole country.

Q. In your opinion, would those roads have been built without Chinese labor?—A. I do not see how they could have been built. They might have been built, but at such an expense that they would be almost worthless. I do not see how a bushel of wheat could have been carried over the road; it would have cost more than the wheat was worth to transport it. The road has been built at twice the expense it ought to have cost anyhow. The Chinamen ought to have had no more than four bits when they got a dollar. I do not think the country can stand such prices. The great trouble with us in California is the high price of labor. I do not see any way of getting out of that trouble but by bringing more labor into the State. I do not think we can hasten the advent of white labor here one particle if we stay where we are, drifting along in this same way. If wages are maintained at present prices, I think every proprietor will make up his mind that he is gone up, and that there is not a dollar in the business. I will not undertake to do anything more with wages as they are. I have made up my mind in the past year that with the present price of labor it is utterly impossible for me as a farmer to live, and I shall dismiss what labor I have and turn my fields back to grass, and let sheep and cattle take them, as losing the least, if I must lose in any event. I do not propose to pay for the privilege of farming much longer. I pay, and pay pretty heavily, for it now.

Q. How much does the commerce and general business of the State of California depend upon the wheat exported?—A. Unquestionably it has been very great. I do not know the number of millions of dollars, but I do not see how any one should fail to see the importance of wheat-growing to the State. It is one of the great things to the State. The only regret I have is that the production is not legitimate. It has cost somebody a great deal of money to send that wheat into the market. Generally it has cost the proprietor very heavy sums, and it certainly has cost the soil almost its very life. It will impoverish the land to such an extent that it will not be worth anything. Literally we leave a desert behind wherever the plow strikes a furrow. That is a question of the future. I do not say that it is coming to-day

or to-morrow, but it is, nevertheless, the fact, that if this course is persisted in, the time will come when the land will not be worth one dollar, because it will not have a pound of wheat in it. Nothing but a cheaper labor, and labor that will admit of scientific farming, where restoration is equal to the exhaustion, where the deposit is equal to the draught, will save California or any other State. The way we are farming now is, as I say, just making a desert. Lots of farmers do not make a penny on a whole year's crop, and the reason of it is not the fault of the soil, not the fault of California, but the simple fault of labor, the inexorable, tyrannical demand labor makes upon every industry.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Because labor is more than fifty cents a day?—A. Labor is twice what it is worth; it is a dollar a day and board.

Q. Then you think it ought to be fifty cents a day?—A. All the great leading industries and the production of the great staples will not stand it. There is not an industry in the State nor a farm in the State that will stand over fifty cents a day.

Q. Then for the laborer to get more than fifty cents a day is tyrannical?—A. Of course labor is so scarce, there is so little of it, that labor says, "Give me a dollar a day, or I will not work at all." Take the Chinamen away, and they will say, "If you do not give me five dollars a day I will not work."

Q. Can a white man sustain his family on fifty cents a day?—A. It does not lessen the opportunities of a man to support himself by lowering the plane on which we are living in California. The minute you drop down the price of living and work cheaply you can live cheaply. The laborer can live better when he gets four bits a day and the cost of living is lowered than when he works for three dollars a day and pays three dollars for a sack of potatoes.

Q. I still ask, can a man sustain a family and educate his children on fifty cents a day?—A. Yes, sir; I have done my work for less.

Q. I do not ask what you did forty years ago, but with the surroundings in California, can a man sustain his family on fifty cents a day?—A. It can be done to-day just as well as it was ever done, but it presupposes honesty, economy, persistent industry, and all that; the very virtues practiced forty years ago.

Q. Do you not know that everything is a great deal higher than it was forty years ago?—A. What makes it? The price of labor. Nothing but that has brought about this abnormal condition in which we are living. A golden dollar to-day is not worth half as much as it was forty years ago.

Q. Could you buy those elegant brooches that you leave around so carelessly in your washing by working for fifty cents a day, or do you want a different scale of living for the employer from the employed?—A. I do not think that the wealth of the country was ever lessened by earnest labor and cheap labor. There were as many rich men in the world when labor was four bits a day as there are to-day, and more, too.

Q. You say that this system of cultivating wheat exclusively, &c., is impoverishing our soil and leaving it a desert?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And there ought to be no exportation of wheat abroad, you think?—A. Not a dollar's worth. I would not send a pound of bread outside of the State.

Q. Is not this excessive cultivation of wheat facilitated by Chinese labor? Would a man be able to cultivate a thousand, or two thous-

and, or five thousand acres of wheat year after year and strip the soil without that labor?—A. No, sir; I do not think farming could be carried on to the extent it is without Chinese labor. I do not say the Chinese labor is saving us at all, because Chinese labor to-day is twice what it is worth. If you will give me Chinese labor at four bits a day, and American labor at about the same, I will fertilize and keep the land forever good. I will keep it fertile and do a great many good things.

Q. Are the facilities given by Chinese labor tending to encourage that system in stripping our fields?—A. No, sir; I do not think so.

Q. Do you not think it is easier to raise wheat with Chinese labor at $1 a day than with American labor at $1.50 a day?—A. So far as the production of quantity is concerned, the Chinamen occupy a very small place. The American laborer puts in the crop and the Chinaman helps to gather it in some cases.

Q. Then the Chinamen are not of much value to the men who raise wheat?—A. I can make Chinamen valuable anywhere.

Q. Are they to any considerable extent employed in raising wheat?—A. They are not employed in wheat-raising to the extent that American labor is employed.

Q. If either are employed or not, I want to know whether the cheapness of their labor stimulates the production of wheat or not.—A. I think it does.

Q. Then does it not stimulate a system that makes a desert of our State by your own logic?—A. Yes, sir; I suppose I will have to admit that.

Q. Then that is an objection, you state?—A. I do not see that that is an objection to the Chinamen.

Q. Is it not an objection to make our State a desert? I am referring to your own logic.—A. I would not make a desert of it if you give me the labor I want.

Q. I speak of things as they now are and as you see them.—A. That is the fault, not of the Chinaman, but of the price paid the Chinaman.

Q. But if the prices paid the Chinaman were one-half what he now receives, would it not stimulate the production still more, and still more leave the State a desert?—A. Then I would have the power to fertilize and keep my land forever good.

Q. That is what you could do; but could other and smaller farmers do it?—A. I think other farmers are just as smart as I am.

Q. Do they seem to care about anything except stripping the soil?—A. I think all good farmers care for the land. I think they all care for it.

Q. You are an employer of men largely, are you not?—A. Yes, sir; I employ a good many men.

Q. Do you make money out of it, or lose money?—A. I think my whole business life in California, so far as the employment of men is concerned, has been a failure. I am like other men, a speculator. I bought lands early and cheap, and the enhanced value of the property of the country has made me some money.

Q. Is not the employment of labor upon seventy-five thousand acres of land an attempt by one man to hold so much land and use it, and does it not have some effect upon the question of how much money you can make?—A. A man may get to be very poor by having too much land.

Q. Does not this enormous amount of land which you hold and attempt to handle tend to make your labor experiments a loss to you?—A. It is very certain that I do not make now any money out of my

lands. I have covered them with sheep and cattle, and I am doing the very best I can; but with the enhanced values from the progress of settlement on the coast, high taxes, and interest, and everything, which is a set-off against what I can make, I think it is gradually using me up.

Q. Does not the immense amounts of land held by a few persons in this State do more toward retarding immigration to this State than any other cause?—A. No, sir; the lands are ready for settlement when anybody comes here and wants to buy them.

Q. Would it not have been better for this State if all the lands which went in Mexican grants, the enormously great quantities which you and others have secured by means of those Mexican grants, had been held by the Government at $1.25 an acre, or by homesteads, and drawn settlers here, instead of purchasers being compelled to pay the speculative prices which large land-owners hold on to?—A. It might have attracted mere people here, because our people generally in the old States knew nothing of any other system than that of the Government lands; but that it would have been better for the settler I should say, emphatically, no. There never was such an opportunity for the farmer as occurred in California twenty-five years ago; and that from the very fact of the existence of these grants. There never was a greater opportunity for men to buy land cheap than occurred then.

Q. Were they not very slow in selling these large grants in little parcels? Did they not prefer to sell them in great quantities to men who could buy them?—A. Yes, sir; because there were no small buyers. From conditions that grew up in the country, the grants of the country aggregated in the hands of a few. There were the fence-laws. You know the fight we had here over those very lands. Those laws not only forced the lands into the hands of graziers for a special purpose, but fastened them there like a vise. The buyer, under the operation of the fence statute, insisted on his right, and turned animals out and grazed the proprietor's land. I could sell one hundred and fifty acres of land to a man for a dollar an acre, but he would turn cattle out on to it the next day to roam over my lands. This country could have been settled cheaper to the farmer than any other land over which the flag waves, if the farmer had done right. He came here and wanted to squat; he did not want to buy land. A few men owned it all. They sent men to Washington to fight this bill; but you tied the lands up in the hands of the old proprietor. How could a farmer buy; how could he go off to Santa Barbara and carry rails forty miles and build inclosures to keep off the mustang cattle?

Q. Have you answered my question, whether the holding of these immense tracts of land in the hands of a few men at high prices does not tend to retard the settlement of the State?—A. If it did, is the proprietor to blame?

Q. I am not arguing the matter, I ask the question?—A. I answer it in that way.

Q. Does it, or does it not?—A. I do not think it does. I do not think there is cheaper land in the world to-day, considering the value of it. I can show you thousands upon thousands of acres of land—not a grant, but farms—to be bought at three, five, and ten dollars an acre.

Q. Will you tell me what incentive there is to the eastern or European laborer to come here, provided the proprietors tell them they do not want to contract with them, have no confidence in them, and that Chinamen are better laborers than they are?—A. Until the people come

here and become utterly worthless bummers, we do not say any such thing.

Q. You told the commission that when a white man applied to you to contract, you said, "I do not want to contract with you; there is work, you can go and do it, but I will not contract with you?"—A. I know there are as good white men as anybody else in the world; I would hire them quicker than anybody else in the world, because I know the American is the best man out, if he is good.

Q. Would you give them the preference over Chinamen?—A. Yes. I hire Chinamen for $15 a month, and I pay $30 a month to Americans; and the Chinamen are doing just as much as the Americans.

Q. Is it your interest to do that?—A. I cannot help myself. I must either stop farming or hire the others.

Q. Or hire the Chinamen?—A. Certainly.

Q. Then your necessities compel you to employ white men, and your inclinations compel you to employ Chinamen?—A. Not a bit of it. I have not said that. I say I would hire an American quicker than any other man in the world, because he is the best man if he is a good man. If he is a bummer, I do not want to have him at all.

Q. Can you make profit out of him by paying these wages?—A. Not a bit. I am losing money all the time.

Q. Do you make any money out of the labor of Chinamen?—A. When I get them at prices low enough, I do. I do not think men make much out of Chinamen at $15 a month. I do not think the farmer in California who does his duty by his land can make money if he pays more than ten or fifteen dollars a month.

Q. You make it a matter of complaint that white women do not want to leave the city to go out into the country to work at all?—A. I say they will not do it. It is very hard to get them at any price. I paid a woman $70 a month to come down and nurse a child for me three months.

Q. Did she go?—A. Yes; and stayed.

Q. It has been testified before this commission that there are a thousand white laboring-women in this city who desire to work. I do not say that they desire work on your farm; perhaps they do not want to work beside Chinamen; but it has been testified that there is that number who cannot get employment. Is the money which you can make in employing Chinamen of more value to the State than it is loss that a thousand willing women have no employment in this city?—A. They can all get employment if they will work at prices that will justify employment, and beyond that they have no right to ask it. There is not a woman in this town who cannot find employment at what the proprietor can afford to give.

Q. These women have testified to us that the avenues of employment that they heretofore have had have been closed to them, or put down to such prices that they, some of them widows, cannot possibly support themselves and their children?—A. I expect to see some hardship in this revolution from high to low wages. Everybody has got to expect it. We have been living too fast and too high, and we have got to get down. In the process of getting down you have got to see some suffering, you cannot avert it. But these women can all find employment; there is no use talking about it.

Q. They testify that they cannot get employment in this city at wages that will enable them to support themselves and their children?—A. I should simply get out of the city and go where I could get it. If they want to stay here and starve, it is their own fault, for there are plenty

of openings in the country everywhere. We beg them to go to the country. We come here in distress for them sometimes, and not one of them will go. I know how it is.

Q. There have been before this commission white American women, Protestants, who have given such testimony, who are not tied to the sound of a church-bell. Do you make your remarks apply to them also?—A. About every one of them who does not go out of the city when she has an opportunity, I make the same remark.

Q. Then you think that answers the whole complaint?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. I understood you to illustrate your ideas by your father's family and work in early times?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was American labor then reliable?—A. Yes, sir; I made the statement that at that time it was as rare to see a bummer as it is to see an industrious man to-day.

Q. Then to what do you attribute the increase of bummers among Americans now, if it is not owing to cheap labor?—A. I have not gone far enough into the question to give you a solution of all the problems. I suppose that very much of it has grown out of the war, the breaking down of values or the changing of the values on account of the issuance of a great many greenbacks. The Government had to have money. The money depreciated and the price of products raised as a consequence. That was the relative condition of affairs. Then men got big wages or they could not buy their flour, and they have kept big wages up to this time. Now the times have changed, and they insist upon big wages, and they work about half the time, and burst out the rest of the time, and become bummers in that way. I do not know how these waves come over the people.

Q. Do you see nothing in the introduction of Chinese labor to produce that state of things?—A. There is just as big a complaint on the other side of tramps as we have here. They have instituted all sorts of processes in the East to put a stop to pauperism and vagrancy. I suppose it has been there about as it is here.

Q. So that you attribute nothing of this pauperism to the introduction of Chinese labor?—A. Not a bit of it.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Of what State are you a native?—A. I am a Buckeye, from Ohio.

Q. The son of a farmer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A wealthy farmer, or a poor farmer?—A. There were times in the course of my father's life when he was poor, and at times he was wealthy. He was considered a good farmer.

Q. What time did you come to California?—A. In 1852.

Q. You were wealthy at that time of your life?—A. I came to California I suppose with about $25,000.

Q. Since your residence in California, you have stated, I think, that you have been a speculator in lands?—A. In the same sense that every man who bought land was a speculator.

Q. Since your residence in California, in your own right and with copartners, how many acres of land have you owned?—A. Altogether?

Q. Altogether, in round numbers.—A. Associated with my partners, Messrs. Flint, Bixby & Co., I think we had one ranch in common, and that was San Justo. There were 30,000 acres of that. With the brothers Diblee and my brother we owned 47,000 acres, known as Lompoc. If you will put down the figures, you can aggregate it. Then 38,000 owned with others; not all my own. Then say a hundred thousand

acres owned now by Diblee and myself; 28,000 acres of land owned by Jack, my nephew, and myself; and 75,000 acres owned by me where I live.

Q. I will ask you whether or not the character of lands that you have owned yourself and your purchases are not the richest and best of the valley-lands of California, in your judgment?—A. I think we would have been great fools if we had not bought the best, when we had the opportunity.

Q. Do not answer in that way.—A. I prefer to make it emphatic. I would have been a fool if I had not bought the best land. I bought the best land I could get.

Q. Three hundred and eighteen thousand acres, then, of the choicest and best of the richest valley-lands you have been proprietor of?—A. Part proprietor.

Q. Do you know the area in acres of lands in the entire State of California that compare in value with yours?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Have you made a computation of how many citizens the State would hold, proprietary land-owners, if each had owned as much as you?—A. I have not made any such figuring. I leave the people to settle for themselves.

Q. Can you give an estimate of the value per acre which these lands cost you in their original purchase?—A. They cost variously from a dollar to a dollar and a half; I think some few ranches cost as high as four or five dollars.

Q. What would be a fair average of the cost of your lands that you thus purchased?—A. The cost of the lands primarily or now?

Q. Primarily; what they cost you when you bought them.—A. I should say about a dollar and a half an acre.

Q. Did you own any part of that estate near Los Angeles? Is that not a hundred-thousand-acre tract?—A. No, sir.

Q. I refer to the one that Messrs. Flint & Bixby owned?—A. I had nothing to do with that.

Q. Do you know the extent of that ranch?—A. I think the San Joaquin is about 48,000 acres.

Q. That belonged to your partners, Messrs. Flint & Bixby?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. The other ranch adjoining is, I think, not far from the same amount?—A. What is that, the Coyote ranch?

Q. No, the San Diego. That also belonged to your partners who formed the old firm of Flint, Bixby & Co.?—A. It belonged to Flint, Bixby & Co. Hollister never had anything to do with it.

Q. Your occupation originally, in this State, was sheep-importer and wool-grower?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From what State did you import your sheep?—A. Mainly from Illinois.

Q. From what place did you import your better class of rams?—A. They came very generally from Vermont.

Q. When you commenced the importation of sheep, did you then employ Chinese labor?—A. I have employed Chinese labor ever since I have been in the State to some extent, more of it latterly, because my business admits of it.

Q. Then, in your earlier operations and speculations in land and the importation of sheep and the growth of wool, you employed but limited Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir; we employed it wherever we wanted it; we did not want then as much as we do now.

Q. From what sources has your present wealth been acquired?—A. I think I have stated mainly that it was through the sale of lands.

Q. You also embrace sheep?—A. I do not think there has been very great profit in the sheep-business. Enormous amounts of money have been paid out to produce the fiber. We have to pay very heavily for herders, from thirty to forty dollars a month.

Q. Your wealth has been acquired without reference to Chinese cheap labor?—A. I think it very safe to say that my property has nearly all been acquired by the purchase and sale of these lands. I think that is so. I tell you I have not made much money by working-men of any kind.

Q. What do you think would have been the difference in relation to the condition of those valleys to-day, if, instead of 318,000 acres that you owned, there had been a proprietor to each hundred acres of valley-lands? In other words, if there had been 3,100 white eastern immigrant proprietors with their wives and families, what would have been the relative condition of the State to-day, with that immigration, as compared with it to-day by your purchases?—A. Could you prove that they would have been here?

Q. Assuming that they would come?—A. I do not assume that they would come. I know that they did not come, and they would not have come.

Q. Assuming for the purposes of this investigation that they would have come?—A. So far as that is concerned I agree with you. I do not argue for the grazier. You know my whole history here. You know that if I fought for anything I have fought for the plow. I followed my business where it led; that is all.

Q. If 3,100 proprietors had come to the country, industrious working whites, heads of families, those comparing with the same character of farmers in Ohio, your native State, what would their families have consisted of; in other words, what is the averge number of a farmer's family in Ohio, owning, say, a hundred acres of land?—A. O, five, six, or seven. I do not know.

Q. Would it average five?—A. It would be owing to how prolific the stock was.

Q. I am talking of the average. Will you say five?—A. I should say about five.

Q. Then there would be 15,500 occupying those lands there?—A. I suppose there would. I have not figured it myself. I do not presume the people would ever have come here.

Q. What would be the effect, in your opinion, upon the morality of the country and its development in a moral and Christian and in a civilized sense, in the building of churches and schools, as compared with the presence of the Chinese here?—A. If they had not acted better than those did who came here, they had better have staid away for the morality of the country.

Q. What is your opinion of the 15,500 people who might have come, of the average of those in Ohio, and of their effect upon our civilization and morality in the building of churches and schools? Do you think it would have advanced the moral interest of the State?—A. I suppose the State would have been very much as it is now, and you know what it is now as well as I. I do not suppose the advent of a thousand or a hundred thousand other people would have changed our condition, so far as morality is concerned.

Q. I confine myself to land alone, and in the place of your sole proprietorship I introduce the proprietorship of 3,100 lesser proprietors.

Would it or would it not have been better if that condition of things had been brought about?—A. I suppose if this country had been occupied by the best kind of people entirely, it would have been better than it is now. It is not worth while to make a supposition, because they did not come and they would not come.

Q. Do you know that many thousands of New England and eastern people have come here with a view to obtain homes and settlements and have returned to the East?—A. No, sir; I do not believe it.

Q. Have you ever heard anything of that kind?—A. I have heard a good many things that I did not believe. It is not the fault of the country if they did not stay. If they came here expecting to have money jump up from the streets and light in their pockets without working for it, they had better have gone home.

Q. You say farming has been unproductive in this State?—A. I say it generally has been.

Q. Have the smaller farmers as a rule been unprosperous?—A. No, sir; because they got the wages. The wages were sufficient to build them up.

Q. Then, because they have been able to get the wages that now go elsewhere, the small proprietorial farmers, the heads of families, are a prosperous community?—A. Yes, sir; I could be prosperous myself, if I could do all my work myself.

Q. Why is it that California with its soil and climate cannot have eventually as desirable and industrious a population as Ohio or the New England States?—A. I do not see any reason why it should not have as good as any other country.

Q. Do you think we would have such a population if the lands were divided and segregated up into smaller parcels and settled by the class of people to whom I have referred?—A. I do not see any objection to their coming now. The country is ready to disintegrate.

Q. Speaking of the exhaustion of the soil and leaving a desert behind, does that apply to the small farming done by the individual owner or to the great farming done by agricultural implements?—A. The difference is just this: the great farmer running his machines does all he can to make all the money he can, and he does not care whether the land goes to waste or not. The little farmer lives on a farm, fertilizes, and he can on a small scale do something; he can keep his farm good.

Q. Then the exhaustion of the soil comes from this occupation by large landed proprietors, and by the working of machinery for the purpose of speedy money-making to the benefit of the large landed proprietor?—A. Very generally where the land is grazed there is no impoverishment. My land is getting better every day.

Q. In your opinion, would the large landed proprietor impoverish the soil sooner by Chinese labor that was cheap than by white labor that was dear?—A. Of course he will impoverish his soil in proportion to the draught he makes upon it.

Q. With cheap labor he can make more money?—A. With cheap labor he can fertilize and make deposits, and without cheap labor he cannot.

Q. He might or might not restore the soil by the use of cheap labor?—A. I do not think that any farmer is fool enough to draw money out of bank if he is able to make deposits, and with cheap labor he can make deposits.

Q. You have stated that the great bulk of the large landed proprietors do exhaust their soil?—A. Very many. There are very few who do restore it. It is very rare that a man can do all his own work.

Q. Do we understand you to say that you are in favor of the absolute, unrestricted immigration of the Chinese?—A. I say, fully, freely, and emphatically, that the Chinese should be allowed to come until you get enough here to reduce the price of labor to such a point as that its cheapness will stop their coming.

Q. Enough for whom? Enough for the great proprietors, or enough for the small farmers?—A. Enough for everybody. The small farmer wants them as well as I do.

Q. Does the small farmer employ Chinese?—A. If he employs anybody at all he does.

Q. Does the farmer who is himself an industrious laborer, who has an able wife, a laborer in her sphere, and sons and daughters coming up who are laborers, as a rule, employ Chinese at all?—A. They employ them if they employ any, because they get them the cheapest.

Q. Do they employ any?—A. Sometimes they do not.

Q. As a rule?—A. As a rule, they do almost all employ labor, and the Chinese they can get of course.

Q. Do you say the small farmer throughout California employs Chinese?—A. If he employs anybody, he does.

Q. Does he employ anybody?—A. Go and find out. I do not know. I have not been to all of them.

Q. What door of labor have the Chinese opened that white labor would not also have opened?—A. We have not had white labor, and so the door was not opened. We have had Chinese labor, and it was opened.

Q. You do not think Chinese labor has prevented white labor from coming to the country?—A. Not a bit.

Q. You have stated very broadly that the money paid for white country labor goes for whisky?—A. That is my experience all over the State.

Q. Does that apply to the great bulk of small farmers?—A. Everywhere.

Q. Does it apply to proprietors of small farms in the State?—A. There is not a more common thing in the world, and I suppose nobody knows it better than yourself, than that every white laborer in the country who gets a half dollar spends it in drink. There is more money wasted in whisky and idleness than would pay the national debt if people would only stop whisky one year.

Q. I ask you if you make any discrimination between the small proprietorial farmer and the class of people around towns like Santa Barbara whom you designate as bummers?—A. Of course, there are some good men everywhere all over the State, who work savingly and carefully, and who accumulate money, not by the hiring of men, however, but by doing their own work.

Q. You speak of "some" as though it was exceptional.—A. I think it is exceptional. I think if there ever was a country in the world given up to bummerism, it is the State of California.

Q. And that extends to all the small farmers throughout the whole commonwealth?—A. Everywhere. I drink a heap of whisky myself, and I smoke ten cigars a day.

Q. Are the cigars made by Chinese?—A. I do not ask who made them. I buy the cheapest I can get if they are good.

Q. Is that three for five cents or five for three cents?—A. If you will inquire of Parker, Wattson & Co., they will show you; and if you will come to my house, I will open a box for you.

Q. Parker and Wattson have been out of business for some years.—A. I mean their successors.

Q. I understand you to say that, without exception, almost all the population of Santa Barbara are drunkards?—A. Understand me; I say that the rule for American laborers to-day is to be drunkards. They are bummers.

Q. By laborers you mean the whole broad field of labor?—A. I do not say they are all bad men by any means, because there may be a great many good ones.

Q. But the rule is in regard to all labor—agricultural and mechanical industries of all kinds—that the laborers are drunkards?—A. Demoralized.

Q. Have you made any efforts to arrest drunkenness in your town?—A. No, sir; I get tight myself sometimes.

Q. As between the white man, Chinaman, mule, and horse, it is all about the same, so far as the settlement of the country goes—all you want is their work?—A. Not so far as the settlement of the country goes, but so far as the application of their labor to my industries is concerned, I make no difference between the muscle of a horse, the power of a steam-engine, the power of a Chinaman, or the power of a white man, or any other man employed by me. The object is to accomplish something, and I employ them for that purpose.

Q. I will ask you if that is not a somewhat slavish view to take with reference to the future development of the country?—A. My plan is to build up the citizen, and as fast as you have built up the citizen you have made a country.

Q. Then it is your opinion, if I am correct and follow your logic, that a country filled with mules and horses and Chinamen would be just as desirable a country as if filled with white labor?—A. You can draw your inferences. I have not said any such thing.

Q. You say that all this labor is about the same; that all you want is the work, and it makes no difference as long as you get the muscle who does the work?—A. So long as I get the work performed, it does not matter to me whether it is performed by white men, black men, or Chinamen. It is all the same to me if the man is good.

Q. To you it is the same. It makes no difference to you. What is the difference that it will make in the future building up of this State?—A. Tell me the future of the Chinaman and I will tell you. I do not say that he is a good man; I do not say that he is a bad man. I have not gone into the history of man enough to understand whether he is going to be a better man than I am.

Q. Then do you think that the future welfare of the State is involved in the introduction of Chinese?—A. I think the wealth of the country will be due to the advent of cheap labor.

Q. I do not say the wealth, but the welfare.—A. Grub comes before everything else in the world. You have got nothing until you have got that.

Q. How do you apply that to the poor laborer who is thrown out of employment in San Francisco, if grub comes before anything else?—A. You have not thrown him out; he has thrown himself out. It is no use to talk about the fields of labor being exhausted, and that there is not a place for every man. There are too many places for everybody; that is the trouble. Too many competitors for every workingman in the State. That keeps the prices so high that nobody can afford to give them.

Q. You state that in your opinion the Chinamen do not take any wealth out of the country?—A. I say, if they take wealth out of the country, they leave an equivalent, which is better.

Q. Then, independent of that, do they, or do they not, take wealth out of the country that they have earned by industry?—A. I do not call gold and silver wealth that is paid out for labor.

Q. It is gold and silver, after all.—A. Then let it go.

Q. Do they take out of the country wealth that is the result of their labor?—A. They take out pay for their labor; it may be wealth to them; it is nothing to us.

Q. You usually pay the Chinese laborers in silver coin?—A. I pay them just as I pay everybody else.

Q. You pay them in coin?—A. Certainly, I do.

Q. And does, or does not, what they earn, less what they expend, go to China?—A. I do not know where it goes. Suppose it does go to China. I would a great deal rather pay it to them than to pay it to some others.

Q. You state that the Chinaman does not save any more than the white man?—A. I do not know that I stated anything in regard to that. There is not much difference. I think that a good white man will save just as much as a Chinaman will.

Q. Then a good white man saves his money and expends it here in the State, does he not?—A. Sometimes, and sometimes he takes it away. I suppose as much has gone to Europe as ever went to China, and a thousand times more.

Q. From this State?—A. From all parts of the country. I do not know how much has gone from here to China. Probably a great deal has gone from here; but that is nothing; that is all right.

Q. You, as I understand, were one of four sons and two daughters who were compelled to work for a living in your early life?—A. Yes, sir; and never forgot the habit.

Q. What was the rate of wages at that time in Ohio?—A. I told you I worked myself for about three bits a day. The wages at that time were $8 and $10 a month.

Q. And you were found?—A. Yes, sir; it was on a farm—farm-life.

Q. Did your brothers and sisters all work?—A. Yes, sir; they all worked.

Q. Then, suppose, that in this State we could have, instead of 100,000 male Chinese laborers, the same character of labor introduced as composed your father's family, is it not your opinion that it would be more desirable for the present and future welfare of the State, or are the Chinese better?—A. I do not suppose that you can get too many good people here. I do not think you can get too many, either Americans or Chinamen.

Q. Are you willing to admit, then, that 100,000 members of families like that of your own father's in Ohio, would be better for the future of this State than 100,000 Chinese, such as are now here?—A. I should think that I am a little better than a Chinaman; I am a little better citizen. I am capable of doing a little more than a Chinaman in developing the industries of this country.

Q. You think, also, your brothers were better than Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think your sisters were better than Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir. There is room for all of us, and I do not see why we should exclude any.

Q. Do you think your neighbors in Ohio were better than Chinamen?—A. I think so. I think the white man is better than any other man.

Q. Do you think your neighbors in all the New England States are better than Chinese?—A. I think so.

Q. You think it would have made a better future for this State had they come here instead of Chinese?—A. I do not think the Chinamen have hurt us. I think they have rather elevated us. Their morals are good; they are industrious; and their example is good.

Q. Do you think the morals of Chinese superior to the morals of the American citizen?—A. I have seen less bad in them than I have seen in my own countrymen.

Q. Then they are better people than the Americans?—A. In that respect, I suppose, your conclusion must be just.

Q. Then I cannot quite understand you. You answer that it would be better to have 100,000 people like your own father's family and your own neighbors in Ohio and the East than the 100,000 Chinamen, if the Chinamen are less bad than the whites.—A. Our own people are a little more capable, they are a little stronger, they are quicker-witted, perhaps, and a more powerful material; they are better people, I think, for the wealth of the country.

Q. Are you not after all considering this question purely and solely from the material stand-point—the stand-point of money-making?—A. Possibly; grant it. As I said, grub comes before everything else. Give me a prosperous country, and I will show you a moral country; give me a lazy population in production, and I will show you vicious people all through. If you want a country moral, make it prosperous; and nothing but unflagging industry will do that.

Q. What, in the abstract, is better, cheap labor or dear labor, for the development of the country? I now speak in regard to the moral tone and political welfare of the people.—A. Before there can be any progress at all there must be labor cheap enough to justify employment. Society is a machine that has got to be run fairly.

Q. Did Ohio prosper better, you think, when labor was less than it does now?—A. I think so; I think there was more progress in proportion to the population, forty years ago, than there is to-day.

Q. Do you think those countries are more prosperous and better where cheap labor prevails, as in Spain, Italy, Belgium, and other cheap-labor countries, than in America?—A. Conditions have a great deal to do with that. In the United States we have plenty of chances for spread; there is no use of jostling. There is ample room for every man to work; and if he works, he cannot grow poor.

Q. Assuming conditions to be the same here, are the cheap or dear labor countries more or less prosperous, in your judgment?—A. I do not understand cheap labor as you do. I say labor cheap enough to justify employment is a necessity for social progress. There is no other way for it. If I employ a man at a rate that I cannot afford to pay, I am soon "busted," and there is nobody to pay anybody at all. Work must be obtained, and it must be obtained at prices which will leave a fair margin for brains and capital.

Q. If you, to use your own somewhat inelegant expression, were "busted," and if your 75,000 acres of land in Santa Barbara were divided into 750 parts of 100 acres each, and each was covered by a family like your own father's family, with laboring sons and daughters, in your opinion would it be better for the country or injurious to the country that you should be "busted" or not?—A. I suppose it would be a great deal better for the country if all men were industrious and all had opportunities for work. I cannot understand how it is possible that you can draw any such conclusion or inference.

Q. As that you should be "busted?"—A. No, sir; but that the ad-

vent of a certain number of men at my farm should necessarily do more than I have done myself.

Q. That is certainly what I mean, whether you do not think that 750 families would be more profitable to the State and a better guarantee for a healthful future than for you to own 75,000 acres?—A. If they had come here and hired California labor, every one of them would have been "busted," and they would not have done any good.

Q. Are not four sons and two daughters and the father and mother capable of working 100 acres?—A. They are capable of doing something.

Q. Are they not capable of doing one hundred and seventy-fifth part as much as you do?—A. I think you cannot bring 750 families on my farm to do as much work as I have done in the last few years without capital. I do not think they could accomplish all I have accomplished myself.

Q. You spoke of the effect of railroad building as developing this country. Was Ohio also developed by railroad construction?—A. Yes, sir; railroads and canals.

Q. Was that work done by whites, or by Chinese; do you remember?—A. The contracts for building the Ohio Canal, and mainly, I think, on the railroads, too, in that State, were taken by Irishmen; and I would relate an incident now that would come in just about pat, if you will allow me.

Q. No, I will not allow you, if I can prevent it.—A. All right. I wanted to tell you that I have seen my countrymen arm themselves with clubs and revolvers and drive the contract Irishmen off the Ohio Canal.

Q. Do you not know the circumstances under which the Central Pacific Railroad was built?—A. No, sir; I know very little about it.

Q. Do you know it obtained from the city of San Francisco, and Sacramento, and Placer, and other counties of the State, and from the State itself, some millions of dollars in subsidy?—A. I dare say I heard it all.

Q. Do you know it obtained a subsidy from the General Government of some eighty millions of dollars?—A. I know it got something.

Q. Do you know it obtained a subsidy of many thousand acres of valuable land?—A. Yes, sir; and many lands not worth a cent.

Q. Do you not think they might have afforded, from the gratuities given them, to have employed white labor?—A. I think they could not have built the road at all with white labor, or it would have been made up in high freights to-day if they had employed white labor.

Q. Do you not think those gentlemen could have afforded to have built it with white labor, from what you know of them and the result of the enterprise?—A. I do not know enough about the business. I know that railroad building is a very serious thing, and I do not propose to go into it myself. I suppose the gentlemen who built that road knew what they were about and did their best.

Q. If, instead of ten thousand Chinese on that road, they had employed ten thousand men from New England or Ohio, what to-day would have been the relative difference? Would the State have been in a better condition?—A. I think the railroad would not have been built.

Q. You are in favor still further, I understand you, of reducing even the price of Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir; about one-half.

Q. It is now about one dollar a day?—A. It is now about $25 a month on a farm, and board. Twelve dollars, I think, we could stand.

Q. By "we" you mean the proprietors?—A. I mean generally the farmers. The farmers could stand about $12 a month.

Q. Do you mean the small farmers, or any farmers at all?—A. The proprietors who hire labor would make more money if they paid $12 a month. I think they would make the farm a success.

Q. You mean profitable working of the land?—A. I mean success of all kinds.

Q. You stated that, in your opinion, nothing but cheaper labor would save the agriculture of this State?—A. That is what I say.

Q. Then, unless we continue to reduce labor, agriculture will cease to be an employment in this country?—A. I think so. I think there is no doubt of that, unless some great change takes place in our life that we cannot see.

Q. You are the friend of the laboring man?—A. I claim that I am a laboring man myself.

Q. You are also the friend of the sheep. They make money?—A. I like all domestic animals very well; they are all useful.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you think that the interests of society are advanced or the race improved by a system which keeps the wife and children exempt from physical labor?—A. I think that all men ought to work, and all women to the extent of their power. I think we are all better off with a certain amount of labor. There are times when women cannot work, and they should then be spared the necessity.

Q. As you were brought up in your father's family, and as was the custom of your neighbors, was it the habit there for the women and children to do a certain amount of work?—A. We all worked.

Q. Is that the habit with the white families in this State in the same position?—A. Some of them work, but a great many of them do not. A great many of them are very idle, when they ought to do something. One of the causes why our agriculture suffers is that the proprietor himself is not always an efficient, good, earnest, workingman. There is a little too much idleness.

Q. How is it about the children?—A. Very generally they are not working as they ought. The poor families in the country, I think, are raising their children the best. Necessity compels them to labor, and that saves them.

Q. Which makes the best man or woman, those who are born and brought up in idleness, having no occasion to use their muscles, or those who are put to labor?—A. The question admits of only one answer. Every one, I think, would be better off for work; everybody ought to work.

Q. It seems to be a great desideratum to have a man earn so much money that his wife and children may do nothing. Do you consider that to be an advantage?—A. I think not. I think everybody ought to work; it makes a man a better citizen; the child more level-headed, with less vagaries in the brain. They grow squarer; straighter. I think there is no doubt about that. A fair and equal distribution of mental and physical labor is always best.

Q. You think that exercises and healthy development are to the advantage of the people?—A. I think there is no doubt about it.

Q. To what cause do you attribute the existence of so many hoodlums here?—A. There are a great many causes operating to bring about this condition of affairs. Apparently the parents have been getting along pretty well, speculating, making money, and are careless about the

education of the children, and it may be ascribed in part to the common disinclination which has swept over our people to work. I do not know how it all comes, but I simply state it as a fact, that the American to-day is disinclined to work. He wants to live by his wits.

Q. Do the white men exact the same labor from their children in this State that your father exacted from you?—A. No, sir; as a rule, they do not.

Q. When I say "your father," I mean the people where you lived and where you grew up.—A. I understand yon.

Q. As boys, we did a good deal more labor than these people do now?—A. O, there is no comparison.

Q. What became of the old gold-miners who used to go around prospecting in the placer-mines? When the placers gave out, what became of that class of people?—A. I find very few of them doing any good to-day. Not many of that old class are doing any good. Their lives were sort of upset; they did not seem to have any object or aim in life, and they have generally gone down.

Q. Is not the bummer class usually made up of that class of people who made $16 a day, and as work went down they were not willing to work for less? Are there not a great many of them in that class? Is not that the source of a good deal of it?—A. I should think a good many of them belong to that class. It looks to me as though the disinclination of the American to work to-day is a sort of national disease. It seems to have swept over the whole continent. I cannot tell you the cause. I do not know enough to know what makes it; I only know the fact.

Q. May not the causes be different in different parts of the country?—A. Possibly.

Q. May not the cause here be the exhaustion of the placer-mines, and this old class of prospectors and gold-diggers, disinclined to work, recruiting the army here; and in the East may it not be in a great measure the discharged soldiers who make up that class?—A. Very likely.

Q. How many would you compute that class at in this city from your observation?—A. I am so rarely here I do not know what the proportion is. I should think, from what I see in our towns in the country, where I am very well acquainted, that if the proportion is the same here as there, perhaps two-thirds of the entire population are doing little or nothing.

Q. It would certainly number a thousand, would it not?—A. A very great many thousands.

Q. Do the eastern immigrants who have come here complain of the high price of land? Is that made a cause of complaint?—A. They want to settle always in the very finest places. There is the attraction, of course, to certain localities where men have lived and made their homes. They become attached to their places, and they say, "I do not want to sell this land; it is my home; you can have it for $200, but I do not care to sell it at all." All these immigrants who come to buy land want those very places. They do not want to go out and take the new lands of the country and go through the long process of building a home. There are cheap lands, and plenty of them, in the county where I live; lands cheaper than I bought eight years ago. I paid ten dollars an acre for that land, and there is plenty of land in that county to-day that would sell for four, five, or six dollars an acre.

Q. Are the classes of white people who come to this State the class who go out into new lands to break them up and settle them?—A. I think not, as a general thing. Those who come to California are not

really frontiersmen. They are mainly from the towns and cities of the East. They come here attracted by the climate and fame of California as a place to live.

Q. How is it with the European immigrant who comes here? Is he one of those pioneers who go out into new lands and make settlements?—A. I do not know. I suppose generally the drift is to the towns and cities everywhere among our own population. Take farmers' sons. The first thing a farmer's son does is to go off to town. He gets disgusted with farm-life. I do not wonder at it.

Q. When Chinamen get money, do they confine themselves to rice and tea?—A. My Chinamen live just as well as anybody. They live just as I do.

Q. How is it generally upon the farms?—A. I think about the same. If they are put to it, they will live very cheaply; but I do not think a Chinaman can live a bit cheaper than I did myself twelve years ago here. Then it did not cost me eight dollars a month to live.

Q. If a Chinaman has an opportunity to live well, will he do so?—A. I have known a Chinaman to pay $2.50 for a chicken.

Q. What is their habit in that respect?—A. I think they will have just what they want, cost what it will.

Q. Where they live upon the farms, do they eat the same as the farmers do?—A. Precisely.

Q. The farmer provides the same for himself?—A. The same. I feed my wife and the Chinaman alike. They do not sit at the same table, but they have the same food, prepared by the same hands.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you ever lived in the mines?—A. No, sir.

Q. How do you know enough about what has become of the early miners to state that they have become bummers?—A. I have disclaimed any particular knowledge of that class of men.

Q. Did I misunderstand you in thinking you said that those who worked in the placer-mines, which were exhausted, grew tired of labor and became bummers?—A. I simply assented to the proposition of Mr. Brooks, that a good many of them might have become bummers, and that they might have contributed to the number of those who are bummers now.

Q. Do you not know that mining, digging quartz-mines, &c., are largely carried on now, and that the population formerly working in the placer-mines are now working there?—A. I suppose so.

Q. Are you not aware that a great many of the old placer-miners have gone into the valleys and are proprietors of farms?—A. I suppose these changes are taking place all the time.

Q. Who is your district judge? What is his name?—A. Fossett.

Q. Do you know Judge Belden, the judge of the neighboring district?—A. I know Judge Belden.

Q. He is a very capable gentleman and good judge?—A. I think so.

Q. Are you not aware that he was one of the men who worked in the mines when gold was near the grass-roots?—A. I did not know that.

Q. Do you know the large colony in San José known as the Nevada men, quite a distinct class there?—A. Very likely.

Q. Are you aware that those are the men who worked in the mines when the gold was plenty on the surface?—A. I do not know anything at all about those men.

Q. Then I would ask you, if these things may be so, whether you would not be slow to assent to a proposition that would stigmatize a

class of men engaged in early mining?—A. I think I know enough of a great many of the early miners to know that their history has been eventually very bad. Those men generally turned out badly. A great many are good men; I do not pretend to say that they are not.

Q. Do you speak of it as a type of the class?—A. I do not speak of it as a type.

Q. Do I understand you to assent to the proposition that the Boys in Blue of this city, the discharged soldiers, are bummers?

Mr. BROOKS. I did not say anything about the Boys in Blue.

Senator SARGENT. You spoke about the discharged soldiers, and here is a distinct association of them, a society. [To the witness.] I want to know if you assented to the proposition that these discharged soldiers are bummers?—A. My mind was fixed more on the Eastern States than anywhere else.

Q. How long since you have been there?—A. I have not been there at all. I was going to say that is what I read. I have not been there for twenty years.

Q. Then you do not know that these discharged soldiers became bummers?—A. I only know from what I get outside. I have not seen them myself, and do not know in any other way than by intelligence.

Q. Has it not been said in the papers, and generally remarked as a wonderful thing, that our armies were disbanded and the soldiers went back to peaceful and industrious occupations? Was not that stated as a remarkable circumstance, and very much to the credit of our soldiers?—A. Very likely; but very likely very many of them have turned out bummers, too; and that would not be to their credit.

Q. I ask you if the fact is not stated to the contrary of the great mass of them, as a rule?—A. I do not know.

Q. Have you never seen that stated?—A. I have not.

Q. You have not seen it stated that they have returned to the industrious avocations of life?—A. I may have seen it stated, but it is not on my mind.

Q. You would be incredulous of that?—A. I should say that my convictions are that a great many of the returned soldiers turned out badly.

Q. We are speaking of them as a rule. Your judgment upon that matter you put beside your judgment upon some other matters you have testified to here to day?—A. What other matters?

Q. There must be a standard by which eastern people reading your testimony can judge it. Do you state that it is your belief that as a rule a very considerable class of men who fought in the war are now bummers and engaged in no peaceful employment, and did not return to peaceful avocations?—A. I did not say that.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You spoke of the Chinese living in the same way that your family live?—A. I said that they live in the same way that my white laborers do. I have a table for my white laborers, and a table for my Chinamen, but they have the same kind of food, prepared by the same hands.

Q. Many of the proprietors allow the Chinese to maintain themselves; you do not?—A. I do sometimes; but not as a rule on the farm. When I have excessive employment, or a great deal to do, I sometimes contract with my men to do the work and board themselves.

Q. Do you know how the common Chinese laborer lives; what his principal articles of diet are?—A. I know that the Chinaman will eat a great many things that an American will not eat.

Q. What is his principal article of diet?—A. I suppose everybody knows that Chinamen are very fond of rice.

Q. Rice and tea?—A. Yes, sir; and they live upon all kinds of vegetables, just as my family does.

Q. When they dine at the table you supply, they eat what you supply to others as well as to the Chinamen? I am speaking of where they contract in gangs and feed themselves.—A. I was going to say that I sell them vegetables and meats when they board themselves in about the same way and proportion as those articles go on my own table.

Q. What is your politics?—A. It is pretty hard for me to tell what I am. I think I vote the republican ticket generally; but on the broad way I am a democrat; I am a national man, as near as I can be one.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You are a democrat and vote the republican ticket?—A. I am a democrat who votes the republican ticket.

ALFRED WHEELER recalled.

The WITNESS. Governor Morton asked me to bring down the statistics of Chinese emigration and immigration to date, and I have endeavored to do so, making such estimates for deaths and departures inland as I thought correct and reasonable.

Senator SARGENT. Read them.

The WITNESS. They are tables showing the annual arrivals and departures, as shown by the San Francisco custom-house records, of Chinese to and from California by sea from 1848 to October 1, 1876, with estimated deaths and departures inland to other States and Territories, and the total present Chinese population in the State of California. These figures are the same as those I gave the other day, from 1853 to 1873, inclusive, (See Appendix Q.) I did not go over my old figures, but took the same that I presented the other day. Prior to that there were no custom-house records on the subject; but in examining the report of the State senate committee, which made an investigation on the same subject, I took their estimate, presuming that to be as correct as any that could be made. That report gave 10,000 as the probable gain of Chinese prior to 1852, in California. Accepting those figures, I made the sum-total of arrivals to the 1st of October, 1876, 233,136; departures by sea, 93,273; making a gain by sea of 139,863. I also put down an estimate (which is only my own opinion somewhat corroborated by others who are probably better able to judge than I am) of the departures inland to Oregon, Washington Territory, Utah Territory, Idaho Territory, Nevada, and States east of the Rocky Mountains, as 20,000 during the whole of this period. The mortality of the Chinese I estimated at 2 per cent., the same as that which occurs among the whites.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The same as the mortality among the whites, including children, or adults only?—A. I took 2 per cent., which is the estimate in this city, I think, of the proportion of deaths to the general population.

Q. Of all ages of whites?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you not aware that the mortality of children all over the world is greater than among adults?—A. I think it is.

Q. Ought not your calculation to be modified by the probable percentage of deaths among white adults, as compared with Chinese adults?

There are very few Chinese children here.—A. I do not know how to estimate deaths among the laboring adult population. The mortality among the Chinese male adults might not be perhaps of the same grade as that which would occur among the whites generally. Therefore, I put the mortality at 2 per cent. However, it will be subject to such criticism as may be brought to bear upon it. My table makes the total of deaths 25,900, and the total of departures inland and the total of deaths deducted from the gain by sea, which is 129,863, leaves the net gain as the present Chinese population of California at 93,963.

Q. Does that embrace arrivals to Oregon or other Pacific ports?—A. No, sir; only the port of San Francisco.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Your figures are 93,000 Chinese now in California?—A. Yes, sir; 93,963 now in the State of California.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. On the coast rather, including Nevada and the Territories?—A. No, sir. I took 20,000 as the departures inland to all quarters, to the Territories and to the States on the coast, and also to the States east of the Rocky Mountains, as the aggregate during the twenty-seven years.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The aggregate would, then, in your estimate, be about 110,000 in the whole United States who arrived at this port?—A. It would be 20,000 added to 93,000.

Q. One hundred and thirteen thousand.—A. Yes, sir.

JOHN H. HILL sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident of California?—Answer. I came to California in July, 1850.

Q. Where have you resided?—A. Principally in Sonoma County. I have been east occasionally to visit my children, but Sonoma County has been my place of residence.

Q. What has been your business there? Have you been a farmer in Sonoma County?—A. Yes, sir; cultivator of fruit principally.

Q. Do you employ Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please state what kind of laborers they have made as to their honesty, integrity, and habits.—A. I find them from experience to be temperate, industrious, honest, and good laborers, creating no trouble whatever.

Q. Is it a common practice in Sonoma County to employ Chinese in that business, fruit-raising?—A. I think in my neighborhood there must be perhaps some 500 Chinamen employed. It is principally a vine-growing district.

Q. They are engaged, then, largely in cultivating the grape for the farmers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Could you get white labor to do that work?—A. I do not think we could. I think it is one of the industrial resources of the country that would have to be abandoned if it depended upon white labor. There are certain seasons of the year when a large accession to the ordinary number of hands is required, when the crop is ripening, and I do not think white men could be got on the spur of the moment to do the work.

Q. What is the sentiment of your people generally, your neighbors, and the people of Sonoma County, with whom you come in contact,

in reference to Chinese labor?—A. I think it is favorable, if I may judge from circumstances and what I know.

Q. That is a democratic county?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Largely so?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. One of the richest counties in the State, I believe?—A. I think it is one of the best counties in the State; perhaps as well improved as any other.

Q. Is it your son who is a member of the State senate?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He was elected as a democrat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was he employing Chinese at the time of the election?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And before that?—A. Before the election.

Q. Has he employed them since?—A. Yes, sir; entirely.

Q. I have a vague impression that your son polled a very large vote at the time he was elected to the senate. Please state it in the aggregate.—A. I think there were some 3,300 votes polled in the county, and I think he received 2,700 or 2,800 out of the 3,300. I do not think that there was a laboring-man in the district who voted against him on account of his employing Chinese labor.

Q. You consider that a pretty fair test that that is the public opinion upon that question?—A. I should think so.

Q. Sonoma County is noted as a vine-growing county, is it not?—A. The immediate district where I reside is exclusively vine-growing.

Q. Is that Sonoma Valley?—A. Sonoma Valley. I believe if it was not for the Chinese labor that business would have to be abandoned, and hundreds of people would be entirely ruined.

Q. Vine-growing is then a vital interest to those people, a permanent interest?—A. Exclusively, almost, in that locality.

Q. Then, in view of that being a permanent interest, the people of your county do not make a party question of Chinese labor at all. They do not ignore a candidate for office on the ground that he is favorable to Chinese labor?—A. No, sir.

THOMAS BROWN sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been a resident of California?—Answer. I have been here upward of nine years.

Q. What is your occupation or business?—A. I am at present cashier of the Anglo-California Bank.

Q. You do business with China and the Chinese people in the way of exchange?—A. Yes, sir; we do a considerable business with Chinese merchants and with China and Japan.

Q. What is the extent of the business which your bank does, as near as you can approximate it?—A. I suppose that our exchange business will average in the neighborhood of a million or a million and a half a year; probably over that.

Q. Does that consist in coin?—A. It consists in valuations of China, the purchase of bills, and shipment of bullion.

Q. That is done by Chinese merchants here principally?—A. We sell a large amount of exchange to Chinese merchants.

Q. In your business relations with them, how have you found them for honesty?—A. So far as our business transactions with Chinese merchants are concerned, they have always been very straightforward and very correct.

Q. Did you ever have business you know of in which Chinese here

remitted to China to comply with contracts made for laborers coming here?—A. Not in recent years.

Q. Your business with them is principally in exchange?—A. Principally in exchange.

Q. Has that business increased any in the last five years?—A. Yes, sir; it has increased very materially in the last five years.

Q. Do you think restricting those people from coming here, or abrogating the treaty with them, would have a good or a bad effect upon our relations with that country, financially or commercially?—A. That is a very difficult question to answer. Of course it depends very much upon the wants of China for bullion. If the Chinese market wants bullion, of course they will seek it where they can buy it the cheapest.

Q. The balance of exchange is generally against every country that deals with China, is it not?—A. I have not investigated that matter.

Q. Where is the bullion-market now located?—A. The bullion-market in former years has been mostly in London, on the other side. Within the last year we have been able to handle our bullion here to a much better advantage than to ship it to London.

Q. That advantage lies in the transportation of the bullion in freight?—A. In the transportation of the bullion to London.

Q. Could we not become the bullion center here as well as London, as far as India, China, and the Orient are concerned?—A. We ought to be able to compete with them, of course.

Q. The balances ought to be in our favor in addition to all the round-about way of shipment to London?—A. I should think not.

Q. Do you think it would be advisable for our people to cultivate friendly and social relations, by treaty and otherwise, with those people in that view?—A. I think it is the principle of our Government to cultivate friendly relations with all nations.

Q. Do you think it would be policy to restrict the immigration or trade with China, in view of what you know of that people?—A. That is a question which I do not feel prepared to answer so far as immigration is concerned. There are good points and bad points about it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What are the bad points to which you refer in connection with Chinese immigration?—A. I think a large influx of Chinamen would have a bad effect upon our people here. As a general thing, among certain classes there is a prejudice, and to bring in a large influx at once would have a bad effect.

Q. Do you think the morals of the average Chinaman are as good as the morals of the American or European?—A. I am not prepared to say about that. So far as my knowledge and intercourse with them is concerned, I have always found them very straightforward and correct.

Q. You have only had intercourse with the merchant class?—A. With the merchant class and servants. I have employed them for several years as servants.

Q. Would it be as safe to leave a Chinese servant where he would get access to your money as a white servant?—A. As far as my experience goes, I have always found them very honest. I have never had a great many of them. I have employed them for the last six years.

Q. Do you think it desirable that the Chinese quarter should extend over the city?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. Is it possible for the Chinese to come here in numbers without ex-

tending that quarter?—A. Unless they put them in some other locality, I do not see any other way.

Q. We have no power to do that?—A. No; we have no power to do that.

Q. What objection is there to the extension of the Chinese quarter?—A. I think it has a depressing effect upon the value of real estate, and drives out pretty much all other commercial business in that neighborhood.

Q. Does it drive out families?—A. Yes, sir; there do not any families live in that section of the city.

Q. Have you noticed whether it has closed churches or not, and devoted them to Chinese houses?—A. There were churches in that neighborhood. I believe a good many of them have been closed. Whether it was done on account of the Chinamen or a disposition to move off to some other more desirable locality, I do not know.

Q. Where the Chinese quarter now is used to be the seat of a large and prosperous retail trade?—A. Yes, sir.

JOHN M. HORNER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you lived on this coast?—Answer. I have been here over thirty years.

Q. Where are you residing?—A. I am residing in Alameda County, near the mission of San José.

Q. Near the old mission of San José?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your business?—A. Farming, ever since I have been in the State.

Q. What do you raise?—A. Almost everything that is raised on farms around the bay here—grain, vegetables, horses, cattle.

Q. Have you employed Chinese labor, or do you employ it now?—A. Yes, sir; I have employed almost all nationalities, and a great portion of them are Chinese.

Q. You employ any labor that you can get?—A. Yes, sir; any labor that I get hold of.

Q. Could you successfully carry on your farming operations without Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir, I could do so; but I find them a very convenient class of laborers. Yet the whole success of farming does not depend upon them.

Q. To what extent does it depend on the Chinese?—A. When we have abundant crops there has not been really help enough aside from the Chinese in California available to harvest the crops, and without them much of the crop would go to waste.

Q. Has there been an overplus of labor this fall?—A. There has not in our neighborhood, even with the Chinamen there.

Q. Do your neighbors employ Chinamen?—A. They do. The Portuguese, Frenchmen, and Americans employ them. All who own property there employ them.

Q. Without distinction of nationality or politics?—A. Yes, sir; it makes no difference.

Q. Then they look upon them as a necessity as laborers in your neighborhood?—A. That is the general impression.

Q. You must be pretty well acquainted in your neighborhood, having been here thirty years. What is the common opinion of people in your neighborhood on this question of Chinese labor; are they for or against it?—A. They are for it, as a general thing. That arises, however, more on account of it reliability than on account of its cheapness.

Q. Do you call the Chinese labor here cheap labor, in fact, in comparison with labor in the Eastern States?—A. No.

Q. You have been east within a few years?—A. No, sir; I have not.

Q. You do not know the wages paid in the Eastern States?—A. I hear that they average about $14 for laborers on the farm.

Q. What do you pay Chinamen here by the month?—A. We pay them $1 a day.

Q. Counting twenty-six days in a month?—A. Yes, sir; and the Chinaman boards himself. Some of them command better wages; but that is the average.

Q. Do you make butter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For the market?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Iowa, you know, ships a great deal of butter here. Can you compete successfully with Iowa in this market in butter?—A. We have never been able to supply the market; but we are able to sell all our products at a very good figure.

Q. Then to what cause do you attribute the fact that you pay double for labor here nearly, within two dollars a month, of what they pay in Iowa, and yet you can compete with Iowa in this market, and sell your butter here?—A. We have distance in our favor, which works as a kind of tariff, and our product is fresher and sells at a higher figure.

Q. Is there much fruit-raising and berry-raising in your neighborhood?—A. There is fruit raised, but not many berries, in my neighborhood. There are some berries raised down this way toward Oakland.

Q. You are about twenty miles from Oakland?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that a few years ago a large proportion of the fruit rotted on the trees and under the trees?—A. Yes, sir; and does yet every year.

Q. Does that occur to the extent at present that it did a few years ago?—A. I think so. They are getting some patent driers now by which they use up a considerable amount, but they have not been able to consume or use up all the fruit.

Q. Do they employ mostly Chinese labor on the fruit-ranches in your neighborhood at certain seasons of the year?—A. I think they do.

Q. Picking and assorting fruits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Quite an income is derived, I suppose, from that trade in this city, is there not? I suppose this is the market?—A. Yes, sir; quite large. This is the market.

Q. Do you think that the indorsement of either political party against Chinese cheap labor here, as it is called, really affects any of your neighbors or influences them in which way they vote when both parties stand upon the same footing?—A. No, sir; not at all.

Q. You do not think that cuts any figure among your farmers?—A. No, sir; but it rather operates against both sides.

Q. What is your politics?—A. Republican. I have always voted that ticket.

Q. You do not think, then, that the man who can make a stump-speech, and assure the people that he is the most bitter enemy of the Chinese, is the strongest man?—A. No, sir; he does not get any more votes down there on that account.

Q. Suppose the question were submitted to that part of Alameda County, divested of all political significance or any other issue, simply to go to the polls and vote Chinese labor "yes," or Chinese labor "no," what would be the result?—A. If you take out a certain class of people who have no home or nothing, but who are wandering about, three-

quarters of all those who own property would vote for Chinese labor. That is my impression.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are they in favor of an umlimited number coming here?—A. That is an open question with them.

Q. You think they have not made up their minds whether they want an unlimited number or not?—A. I have discussed the question somewhat with them, and some are of the impression that it would do no more harm than it would to leave the immigration open as with other nations. Others, again, think that there should be a kind of restriction placed upon it if it is possible to do so without disgracing the Government.

Q. Some of those who employ Chinese labor think if it could be properly done it would be well to have restrictive legislation?—A. Yes, sir; but they would not wish to disgrace the Government in order to do that.

Q. None of us wish to do that.—A. No, sir.

MAX MORGENTHAU sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in this State?—Answer. Twenty-seven years.

Q. What is your business?—A. For the last fifteen years, manufacturer.

Q. What manufacturing interests are you connected with?—A. I am interested in three manufactories, the woolen-mills, the jute-factory, and the candle and soap factory.

Q. How long have you been connected with those manufacturing interests?—A. With the woolen-mills about sixteen years.

Q. How long with the jute-mill?—A. Since it was in existence, six years.

Q. How many bags do you make in that mill?—A. This year we run a little more than usual. We make about 12,000 a day.

Q. In previous years where did we get our bags?—A. They came from Scotland.

Q. They are grain-bags, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the capital stock of the company in the jute-business?—A. Between $400,000 and $500,000.

Q. Do you know the amount that we paid Scotland for bags before you commenced manufacturing?—A. We must have imported last year from eighteen to twenty million bags. My estimate may be a million short; I cannot tell.

Q. What did those bags cost here?—A. I am not posted; but I should think they must have cost ten cents or eleven cents apiece.

Q. How many bags are you manufacturing now to supply the place of those?—A. Within the last four months we have run over-time, and we must have manufactured, on an average, not less than 12,000 a day.

Q. When we imported bags at ten cents, or eleven cents, the aggregate amounted to $2,000,000 annually?—A. At least.

Q. Do you work Chinese labor in the jute-factory?—A. When we ordered the machinery, we ordered a whole cargo of white people to come right along with the machinery from Scotland; but they left us.

Q. They did not stay with you?—A. No.

Q. For what reason?—A. First, when we engaged them they thought they had a good thing, and when they came out here it seemed they could do better.

Q. What did you do then?—A. We were compelled either to shut up or employ Chinese labor.

Q. You employed Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did the Scotch come out at their own cost, or did your company bring them here?—A. We brought them out, but I do not know the price. I know when the machinery came they had on board people from Scotland. But I am not a director of the company; I am only a stockholder.

Q. Do you know whether they worked with you long enough to reimburse you for the expense of bringing them out?—A. That I cannot tell.

Q. Are you hopeful of enlarging your business sufficient to make bags enough to supply this coast?—A. We could enlarge our business, but we cannot compete with them. I will give you a little illustration which might be known to the gentlemen of the commission: I saw an article last summer that bags really went down to 9 cents. I saw that the Grangers had a meeting and sent petitions to Congress that they should take off the duty on bags on account of the fact that they could not afford to pay those prices; so that those bags were really sold at a loss, and of course ours also.

Q. Those bags were from Scotland?—A. Yes. We have only enlarged within the last two or three years. We worked first smaller, but it did not pay at all, and we thought we had to increase so as to do something.

Q. Can you make it a successful enterprise by furnishing bags at 12½ cents apiece to farmers?—A. At those prices we would make money. I have invested there probably $12,000, and it has not paid me to this day 6 per cent. per annum.

Q. It has not paid that to any of the stockholders?—A. No. It might be better this year.

Q. What could you get for that capital if you had it out on the street here and loaned it?—A. According to our money affairs it would be no trouble for me easily to get 10 per cent.

Q. With the best of security?—A. O, yes.

Q. Can you not loan money at 10 per cent. and compound it, a great deal of it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then manufacturing, even with Chinese labor, is a very hazardous business?—A. I should not put in it another cent if I had fifty million dollars; not in this State.

Q. You have considerable interest in these enterprises. I should like for you to state your experience in bringing these enterprises to their present condition.—A. I have watched these enterprises closer, perhaps, than any other man on this coast, because I have taken a deep interest in the welfare of this coast. I may say I have put nearly every dollar I have got in this world in manufacturing, to the amount, probably, of from one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand dollars. I have found out that factory-business is here a very bad business. I am speaking openly, frankly, and plainly. Any person who is willing to come and take all my stocks and dividends may have them to-day for cost. The great complaint which I have noticed for years is that our people on this coast have got little love for home-manufacturing enterprises. The great difficulty is that the man who puts in his money puts it in without knowing what he does. Those who do not know the business think a factory is a good thing. The people have put in their money, and I do not believe that hardly any are successful. The reason is very plain. I should like to make the statement as short as possible

in regard to what my observation has been. For the last fifteen years, this coast has sent away, I may say, twenty-four dollars out of every twenty-five dollars that have been earned. This coast has produced more bullion than perhaps would have supplied the whole world. You have seen what our mines have turned out. In fact there is very little left here. The great difficulty is that we ought to have, at least, fifty more factories here. I may say that a hundred would not be sufficient. If only our people would study that subject a little, and take care of home-interests, they would see the importance of it. For instance, the export of our wool this year has been in the neighborhood of fifty-four million pounds. I must speak of such things as I know. I am sorry to come here, because people may say it is all my talk; but my only object is to see the whole State prosperous. We import not less than eight and ten and twelve millions of dollars of clothing a year. We send our wool from here to the East. Our factories use up, probably, from two million to two million and a half pounds. We pay the expense of shipping the rest of that wool East by railroad. The goods are made up there and come back here.

Q. Paying two freights?—A. Paying two freights. It is not more than half an hour ago, after I was called here, that I had a conversation on this subject with a gentleman. We have taken all the trouble to make people understand that we can make as good an article here as there is anywhere in the world. The best proof of that is that we supply the Government of the United States with our goods here. That is the only resource we have got. There are two woolen-mills that turn out not less than three millions of dollars, or could do so very easily, but the goods are all imported here. I understand that there were three boys' clothing manufactories started here and they had to abandon them; they could not get hands, it was an utter impossibility. There was a tailor living next to me about a year ago; I consulted him; said I, "How is your business?" He said, "Business is dull." I had this suit of clothes on, which is now eighteen months old. The tailor said, "I will furnish you that clothing, fourteen dollars for the whole suit." He referred to this very suit that I wear now. Said I, "What would you charge for making the suit?" Said he, "I will make it for twenty dollars." Said I, "If I furnish you with the cloth and everything why do you ask me twenty dollars? How long does it take to make a pair of pants?" He said, "It takes a day." Said I, "What do you pay?" He said, "I have got to pay the man from four dollars to four dollars and a half." Said I, "How long would it take to make the vest?" He said, "A day." Said I, "What does that cost?" He said, "Four dollars." Said I, "How long will it take to make the coat?" Said he, "Two days." Said I, "Why do you ask such a tremendous price?" "Now," he says, "you do great injustice." Said I, "We manufacture with large capital. People are willing to do anything to seek investment. Why do you ask that price?" He said, "I will tell you how it is; good tailors are very scarce here. I take a tailor; he works one or two days, and two days he goes on a spree." Said I, "I will try you." I got my suit made and went around and showed it to people. They said, "You are nicely dressed up; how much did you pay for that suit?" I said, "That suit cost about sixty-five dollars." Then one of them said, "I will furnish it to you for thirty-five dollars." Said I, "I will do it." I took a bundle of cards from him and put them in my pocket. I told my friends, "I will satisfy you what we can do here." I brought them there, probably, thirty-four customers. Afterwards some went away. The tailor said, "I will put you up a suit for twenty dollars." He made four, five,

and six suits, and then he commenced advancing—twenty-two dollars, and then twenty-five dollars. I got sick of it. I went further. I furnished him my cloth and gave him my credit, and I give you my word the money to-day is out eight months. Said I, "You will not do it, you do not want to get any such custom. How much did you get in the old country?" He came from the same place that I came from. Said I, "Did not you have to work from morning until evening; here you start at eight o'clock and at eleven you go off. Then you come back, and at four o'clock you go home; that will not do; this country wants more work; we have got to work." This is the everlasting trouble here, that the men do not want to work.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. This was an employer you were dealing with, a man who hires, a boss?—A. Yes, I spoke to the boss.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. And the great difficulty was in the cost of getting clothing made up, $4 for pants, $4 for a vest, &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I understand he raised his demands. Do you understand that the workmen raised their prices on him?—A. I cannot tell. He raised his demands on his customers.

Q. Then it was not a question of difficulty to get men, but your difficulty was that he raised the demand on you?—A. He told me he could not get any good men.

Q. But he did furnish you these clothes, but afterwards raised the demand on you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the difficulty was with him?—A. He asked me more, and of course I had to pay it or quit.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is it not a fact in almost all the departments of goods which we manufacture, that we cannot to-day get white labor to enter into the manufacture of those goods to any considerable extent to compete with the East?—A. I am sorry to say that I must confess there is too much truth in it. We cannot get them, and I could mention to you ten or twelve of our leading importers.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Could you mention as another difficulty an indisposition to buy California manufactures on the part of the people here?—A. No; there was a few years ago an argument brought up that they did not want to buy those articles because they were made by Chinamen, but I have tried them. I have put them up goods and said, "Here is a shirt made by a Chinaman; here is one made by a white man." The shirt made by the Chinaman would cost five or six cents less than the others—and they always take the goods made by the Chinaman.

Q. They take what they can buy the cheapest?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then so far that is a discrimination against the white man in favor of the Chinaman. Does that have a tendency to crowd out white labor?—A. No, sir.

Q. Does it not give the white labor less shirts to make if you cannot sell what they make so well? If the community will buy shirts that are five or ten cents cheaper, made by Chinamen, rather than buy shirts made by white men, does not that diminish the number of shirts that the white man can make?—A. I should think so.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you ever meet with a white man, in buying a shirt, who discriminated and would rather have one made by a white man?—A. We do not deal with them in that way. I only hear this from parties who deal in the article.

Q. Is it not the experience generally with all classes that no matter who they are they buy where they get the cheapest?—A. I think so.

Q. How is it about boots and shoes? Is there a great importation still of them here? There has been a great deal said about the Chinese monopolizing that business.—A. This business is quite different from ours. In former times—when I came here, in 1854—I used to import shoes myself from Germany, and I got a good price for them. We imported all our shoes before any shoes were made here, and I believe more than half the boots and shoes are imported to-day. The manufacturer can do nothing here, because in the whole United States there is a kind of combination among the boot-makers. What do you call them, Crispins?

Q. Yes; Crispins.

A. We ship any amount of hides. There are car-loads going away to-day. I have been among those men because where hides can be got I can get the tallow, and I buy tallow. I have seen more shipping of hides than I had any idea of. The difficulty with boot-manufacturers comes in that way. They took the Chinamen, but their machinery is so little that it hardly amounted to anything, and it is a very easy thing to learn. After the Chinamen learn that business they will go away and start business for themselves. In a woolen-mill or jute-factory it requires from $200,000 to $300,000 to get machinery to put up; but, you see, the boot-men find out that after the Chinamen have learned the business, they work to a great extent on their own hook. Of course, that goes against those men, and that is the reason it seems they are to a great extent opposed to the Chinamen, because they really find out that the Chinese work against their interest. I do not come here to advocate the Chinese. I come here as a free man, and I am ready to answer any question to the best of my ability.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. So you think it is against the interest of the employer as well as the employed in the boot business to use Chinese?—A. I have no doubt if the thing is carried on the Chinese will get the control over that business; but in our business it requires too much capital to get machinery. What it might be in the course of time we cannot tell.

Q. In any business that does not require capital and machinery, the Chinese make progress much faster and get control quicker?—A. Yes, sir; so in the cigar business, I remember the time when they used to import every cigar from the East. Of course Havana cigars come here to-day, but they used to get our cigars from the East. There was not a white man here making cigars, and the result was that cigars were shipped from the East; and then cigars were shipped from here East, and we have done a great business, because by the Chinamen making the cigars here we get them really in proportion cheaper than in the East. But it seems that the eastern people would not stand that and they have taken hold of the business, and that business has stopped here and they cannot ship East because the eastern people can work equal with the Chinese here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. So that the manufacture of cigars here does not interfere with the eastern cigars?—A. No.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Because you reduced the price of labor in the East by competition?—A. I only know that the cigars first came from the East, and then the Chinamen made them here and shipped them East; but it seems the people of the East have taken hold of it and will not allow them to go East from here.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose we made them cheaper, the people of the East could not prevent their coming, could they?—A. It seems so.

Q. The price of tobacco is about the same in both places that it used to be?—A. It seems that tobacco coming here is principally sent from the South; so they save in the freight.

Q. Then the coming down of prices must be in the cost of the making of cigars, that is the labor?—A. It is all in the labor.

Q. So that, if they have brought down the industry in the East, it must be at the expense of labor?—A. I remember years ago when I would see those Chinamen coming along with a bundle of overalls and jumpers, common cloth. I walked over the plaza and very often I thought how bad it is for this country that these common goods that used to be all imported here should be made by Chinese, and they should get the control, and our people do not make those goods. I thought of it very often. The thing has troubled me for the last six or eight years, although I never expressed my mind. I looked at it as a very bad thing for the future. Still I could not change it. The Chinamen make no fine clothing here. They make their own clothing, and they make some very common goods that we used to import here. But, as I said before, there are at least ten or twelve very large importers here dealing only in underwear clothing. Every dollar's worth of that goods is imported, and not a dollar of it made here.

Q. Have you lived in any State of the Union except California?—A. I have lived here twenty-seven years, and I have been out of the State in that time forty-eight hours. I was in the States eight or ten months after I came from Europe. I used to be in Cincinnati, and then went to Saint Louis. When I heard the news about California I came here, because I did not like the climate there, and I did not like a great many things. I thought if I did not like California I would go back to Europe.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What amount of boots and shoes do we import now?—A. I have no idea.

Q. Does it amount to $7,000,000 in your opinion?—A. I cannot speak of that. I will speak about another fact, that is the candle-factory. I have my books here. I will show you my pay-roll, and the way I started that factory, [exhibiting books.] I started to work that factory with white labor.

Q. Up to a very few years ago did we not buy all the candles from the East that we used on this coast?—A. To my great sorrow, we buy them to-day from the East.

Q. Do we not send our tallow to Boston and the East, and it is made into candles and sent back here?—A. Last year we shipped away from here several million pounds of tallow. When I started this factory I found the great difficulty was that there was not enough of tallow here. I was compelled to send to Australia for it. I found that there was a duty of one cent on a pound of tallow. I had an application made to Congress to try to take off that duty, as there is no duty paid and no

tallow imported in the United States except in California. I sent on petitions to Congress, signed by the leading merchants. Some of them did not like to sign because they thought it would go against us. They thought if the tariff was taken off it would stop our commission in tallow. The moment the thing leaked out that we were petitioning Congress, the eastern manufacturers worked against us; and all that Congress could do, or has done, they went and put in soap as a compromise, so that we could not get the tallow free. It was really done because the eastern manufacturers did not like to lose such a nice little thing as they had here. They used to get twenty-seven or twenty-eight cents for candles, which was a big profit to the factories here. Dealing in mining stocks, I knew what candles were required. Two people came from the East with large families. They had no means. They were recommended to me by an old friend from Germany. They were candle-makers. I said to them, "You have a large family?" They told me they had. Said I, "Can you make good candles?" They said, "We can; but we have bought machinery and cannot pay for it." I said, "How much are you short?" They said, "$5,000." I said, "Well, here is a check. I will give you $5,000; and if that is not enough, you can have another $5,000. We will try your goods, and see what you can do." I gave them $5,000. I started them, and they did pretty fair. The amount our factory turns out is about 60,000 boxes of candles. Another factory here makes 75,000 boxes; but I do not believe that we want less than 600,000 or 700,000 boxes a year.

Q. Do you think we imported that number?—A. We import them to-day.

Q. What is the value of the candles we imported before you went into the business? This is a business that has been open to white labor for twenty-five years here, and you must have inquired into it.—A. I will take the average of one hundred boxes at $3 a box, or $300 for a hundred boxes. Some of them sold for $2.25 and some of them went for $3.50.

Q. How many boxes do we import now?—A. I should think we import to-day not less than five or six hundred thousand boxes. I may be mistaken, but I cannot tell. I think that is a close approximate.

Q. That would be $1,800,000 that we import now?—A. Not less than that.

Q. Has not the business of making candles been open to capitalists here for twenty years?—A. Yes, sir; it is open to everybody. It is not a paying business to-day. We cannot compete.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Because you cannot get the tallow?—A. We can get plenty of it cheaper than in the East.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is the difficulty, then?—A. The difficulty is, as I have stated before, our people have a particular love for goods made outside of San Francisco.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Goods bought outside of San Francisco?—A. Yes; they have great love for them. They have no idea that it is our interest to keep money here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. From force of habit for a long time buying eastern candles?—A.

Of course. The ladies do the same thing. They would rather have a dress that came from Paris than one made in the East or here.

Q. To what extent can you make candles now in your factory?—A. There are two factories here, and, if necessary, in fact I could start another and supply the whole coast. There would be no trouble for me to get the money.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Could you make them at the price that eastern candles sell for here?—A. I think we can make just as good.

Q. Can you make them cheaper than they can sell eastern candles for here?—A. In fact, lately I cannot see how they can send them out here; but they are coming right straight along. It looks to me hardly possible, even at the price that they are sold here, that they could be manufactured. Those people have made a great deal of money from this coast, and perhaps they may try to freeze us out. They can stand it. Some of them have made millions of dollars.

Q. Can you sell at a profit at the present low price?—A. No; I cannot make a cent.

Q. And you do not believe they can?—A. It is very doubtful to me whether they can; but they keep them coming. There are probably five thousand grocery stores here. In six years, I believe I have never sold fifty boxes among our own people here. I sell them out on Front street, and have a few mines to sustain me.

Q. Do you offer them at the price of eastern candles to these corner grocers?—A. At the corner groceries I do not offer any. If I offer to the retail business the wholesale will not buy of me. I am either a manufacturer or not a manufacturer. I have to offer inducements.

Q. Do you employ Chinese only in your manufactories?—A. Lately; but not all. There is no factory run on this coast but that you may say 66 per cent. goes to white labor. I see Mr. Heyneman made a statement here. For instance, here is my pay-roll. When I started I had nothing but white labor, and I will show the difficulty. I started in with girls principally. [Exhibiting books.]

Q. State how the pay-rolls run.—A. When I took them on the business—July 29, 1871—I had not a single Chinaman employed. All that I had employed was one man here, $2 a day—a white man; another, $1.50; another, $1.50; another man, $1. Here comes, again, $1.50. Now come the girls—83½ cents a day right along. So this pay-roll goes on. Now, down here again are some men, $2, $2, $2, $1.75, $2, $2, &c.; $2.50; $2. This goes on up to December 2, 1871. From then I started to put in a few Chinamen. The reason was this: As I stated before, my man had no capital. I went out every day to see what was going on in the factory. I came out one morning and found no steam up. I asked our people what was the matter. "Well, the girls did not come to-day." "What is the trouble?" "They got a holiday." Said I, "What holiday? There is no holiday in the city." They said, "O, well, we did not want to tell you. We stop very often. We have days here when we cannot work." Said I, "Mr. Winter"—that is the superintendent—"I will tell you what holidays I recognize in this place. I recognize Christmas, New Year's, Fourth of July, and you may give them St. Patrick's day and every Sunday, but any other holidays I have got to stop, because, you see, when these girls do not come all the rest of the work is stopped. We start up in the morning at five o'clock with the steam, and they do not give us notice, and they do not come here. The coals are gone, and the other men have to be sent away.

That thing must be stopped. If it is not stopped I will shut the factory up." Said I, "There are too many holidays for me. I like to see people, no matter who they are, keep any religion, but to make so many holidays we cannot stand here. I am willing to come up to proper holidays." Finally they abandoned the business. They would not work. I had a soap-man there. The soap-man I paid $2.50 a day. One day my man came in and said, "Mr. Morgenthau, we have got to quit. There is no soap-man. The man is dead-drunk. It is a dangerous business. He may blow up our whole factory. Can you get another one?" It is the same thing when I start to do something. I have tried fifteen soap-men, but I have not got one for the last eighteen months. It is a great risk to sacrifice the other men who are there taking care of the machinery under these conditions; so that in fact I have not had one, I believe, for the last eighteen months. There are none here.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Look at your pay-roll to-day and state how it is.—A. I started in with Chinese. The first Chinese was December 6. I paid them $27. The whole pay-roll was $287.30, of which the Chinese received $27. The next week the Chinese labor was $30, and the whole pay-roll was $290. That does not include the superintendent. The following week the Chinese labor was $26.25, and the pay-roll was $260.40.

Q. State how it is now.—A. To-day the pay-roll is, one white man, $5; one white man, $3.50; one white man, engineer, 4\frac{1}{2}$; one white man, $2; one white man, $2.25; one boy, $1.50; Chinese boss, $1.25; Chinaman, $1; Chinaman, $1; Chinaman, $1; and so on. The pay-roll to-day is $298. With $60 for the superintendent, the whole pay-roll is $358, and out of that the Chinese received $162.

Q. Have you Chinese in those places you have mentioned, soap-men, &c., or white men?—A. This is the whole factory.

Q. You spoke of the soap-men you tried?—A. I have got a Chinaman working there, but the head-man has got one of his own, because I cannot find one I can trust.

Q. Do you find any trouble with drunkenness of white hands now?—A. No, because they are mostly relations of my head-man. For instance, there are two sons, and they never drink. We had to discharge watchmen several times on account of drunkenness.

Q. Do you find that drunkenness among them is exceptional and not prevalent?—A. No; they do not drink, except the watchman, who was drunk, and we had to discharge him. The men I have got here do not drink.

Q. The reason you give for the employment of these Chinese is not on account of your getting them cheaper, but on account of the unreliability of the white men you had before?—A. Exactly. I should prefer white labor any time. I have always given them instructions not only in the candle-factory but in the woolen-mills, whenever you can place white labor, as near as possible, always give them the preference.

Q. Even at the higher rates?—A. If not too much.

Q. Even at the price you are paying?—A. I always prefer to give them the preference.

Q. Then the wages which you pay the white men does not enter into the question of competition at all; but it is the question of reliability, whether they get drunk or not?—A. No; that is not the thing. My opinion is that if we had all white people, for instance, we could do away with those Chinamen. All these white men who receive that salary would have to quit, they would be idle, if we did not employ Chinese.

Q. But you ran it altogether with white labor at first?—A. When we started six years ago we had a better price for our goods and could afford it; but the price has been so terribly reduced by importation that we were compelled either to change off and compete or quit; and the moment we would have quit the white help would have quit also.

Q. You say that your friends in the East are trying by means of large capital to freeze you out?—A. Yes; and by cheap labor.

Q. But you say you thought they sent goods here cheaper than they could afford?—A. I said I did not know whether they could make anything.

Q. You said you thought they did not make anything?—A. It looks to me that they cannot make anything.

Q. Then they must do it to freeze you out?—A. Something must be the matter. I cannot make anything. I have not been out of the city, and I do not know how they manage it there.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Some Germans came here some years ago from Saint Louis to establish a candle-factory?—A. These are the parties I speak of.

Q. Do you recollect that they put 3,000 or 4,000 or 6,000 boxes of candles on this market at one time, and that the importers from the East put on the same number of boxes three or four cents a pound less than our manufacture?—A. Not much less.

Q. That was done to drive you away?—A. They do it to-day all the time.

Q. They put their candles on the market at a less price to drive our manufacturers out?—A. Yes; they do it all the time. As I stated before, it is remarkable. I do not know how it happens, but the people here do not help us. For instance I go down to Front street and I say, "Gentlemen, why don't you help us along? It is for your interest as well as ours." They say "We want a candle you cannot supply for us," and I tell them it is their interest, and as long as it is our interest and the candles are just as cheap, why not give the preference to our manufacturers here?

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If the people here would give the preference to our home-manufactories we could afford to carry them on and pay decent prices for labor?—A. I think we could. It would show some appreciation, and I think the manufacturer would really be liberal enough. I do not believe there is a single manufacturer on this coast who would not prefer to give our people the preference in giving them work.

Q. Why should you give our white people the preference if they are, as you describe them, so utterly unreliable, drunken, &c.?—A. I did not want to describe them that way. I do not want to be misconstrued.

Q. You do not mean to say the whites are as a rule addicted to intemperance and are unreliable as workmen?—A. I do not mean to say they do not drink.

Q. Do you wish to testify that as a rule the white working classes in your experience of them are so intemperate that they are unreliable as workmen?—A. I do not believe that you could trust them.

Q. Then what is that you do not want to go into the newspapers?—A. You want to ask me whether I think those people are reliable on account of drunkenness?

Q. Did you mean those people you have under your thumb?—A. O, no; my people are all sober men except one or two.

Q. Then your testimony is as to others except those who work in your factory; your experience of the working classes of this city is, that they are so drunken as to be unreliable?—A. I do not say that.

Q. What do you say?—A. I say the great difficulty is that the demand for labor is more than the manufacturer can afford to pay.

Q. That is another subject. I am asking about their drunkenness. I do not believe that the working-classes of this city or State are drunken, as a rule. If you do, I want you to state it clearly and say one thing or the other.—A. I have stated that as far as I know in my factories I could not find a soap-maker to-day unless he was a drunkard.

Q. So you think as a general thing soap-makers are drunkards?—A. I could not say that.

Q. Does your experience lead you to that conclusion?—A. The soap-men in my manufactory were all discharged as drunkards.

Q. What inference do you draw from that fact as to the character of the working-classes?—A. As far as drunkenness is concerned?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. I do not believe they are all drunkards, because we could not get along with them if they were.

Q. You believe most of them are?—A. No.

Q. You believe a large proportion of them are?—A. No; I believe a good many are; but I do not think it would be great injustice to the white race to say that.

Q. I think the tendency of such testimony is to do great injustice to them.—A. I beg your pardon, I do not want to do them injustice.

Q. Have you as much respect for the white laboring classes as other classes of the community?—A. I have more respect for the white laboring classes than I have for the Chinese.

Q. Why?—A. I think as far as we have gone we could not do without the Chinese, but my own conviction is that in the course of time I do not believe they would make very good citizens.

Q. Why not?—A. For the last 25 years I have lived right close to them, and I have seen their children in the same kind of clothes to-day that I saw them in 20 years ago, with their pig-tails on. I have not seen that they have tried to cultivate and come up to children of our white population. I did not come here to advocate the Chinese or the whites. I came here as an independent man to give you all you wish to know of my business affairs.

Q. Is there any other reason excepting that they keep their costume and wear pig-tails that they would not be desirable as a large population of the State?—A. I do not believe that they intend to stay here. They want to make a little money and go home, and then, perhaps, come back again. Whether it is from the treatment that they receive here or their views that they want to go back I cannot tell. Of course their treatment is such that if I should have to come into this country and be treated as they have been treated, I certainly would not have much love for the country.

Q. Do you think there is much sentiment in this State aside from some people against the Chinese?—A. A great many are not opposed to them. What I call our better class of people are in favor of them. I can give you the reasons why. I think we must have from four to five thousand Chinese employed in our private families. I have not any in the house, never had one, and would not have one myself as a servant. If you should take them away from their employment in families, I believe all our ladies would try and beg of them not to leave this country, and they would say they could not get along without them. When you come to the point I will give you my own experience. Since the fourth of July last, I have had about twenty girls in my house. I pay $35 a month to the cook, and $25 to the girl up-stairs. I have had not less than twety-four if not more since that time. Out of those

twenty-four about four or five had to be carried away. I had even to send for police to get them out. Our cook would be so dead drunk we could not get enough to eat. One will come to my house dressed up like our biggest ladies in San Francisco, and ask for the wages. We tell them that we always pay high wages, $35 a month. The question is, "How many children have you got?" Well, it is rather too much; five pair; we have got ten children. "What, ten children?" "Yes; we have got ten children." They think it is a thing that is remarkable. My wife tells them, "If you think we have too many for you, I can drown half a dozen to please you." Then the wages are settled. Then they want to see their room where they are going to sleep. Sometimes I tell them when I am around home, "I think you will get as nice a room as you had when you lived at home;" and I know where they came from they did not have as nice a room. Then they would like to see the kitchen, to see that the kitchen is clean and nice. Then they ask, "What privileges do you give to the girls?" I say, "What do you mean by privilege?" "Well, have I got to open the door when the bell rings; must I bring in the plates; can I bring my cousin and all those to the house in the evening?" I tell them, "I do not keep any public house;" and then I tell them, "You can go." One time I was not at home, and my daughter came down and said, "Papa, come home, the girl is dead drunk." I went up and there was the girl lying there, and two bottles of whisky, and the cooking scattered all around the kitchen. This has happened to me since the fourth of July.

Q. Are we to understand that you have had at least twenty-four different servants employed since the fourth of July?—A. Not less. I have had two for five years, which shows that it is not a hard place to stay.

Q. Then there are some good ones?—A. At the time when they were scarce they have staid for five years, but lately when people think all these places are so much more crowded I had twenty-four, and they would not stay or could not stay.

Q. Then in the former times when Chinamen were not so plenty the servants were better?—A. I want to prove that our labor has not decreased; that we are scarce in girls to-day, and good girls. You can send for two thousand ladies, the best ladies here, and they would make the same statement to you. It shows that we are not overcrowded with good girls.

Q. Do I understand that these good servant-girls were here years ago or lately?—A. That is about four years ago. We had one of them five years, and another five years.

Q. Why do you not take Chinese in your house?—A. I do not want them.

Q. Why not, if they are better than the whites?—A. I have three or four grown daughters; and I do not want any Chinamen in my house, because I am not in love with them at all.

Q. Do you think there is any danger in that respect?—A. Well, I would not like to have them in my house.

Q. Do you think that that sentiment is also shared by other people who have grown daughters?—A. In the first place, as a general thing, I believe most of the Chinese do not sleep in the house where they live; they go away and go in Chinatown, in their institution there, which I do not consider clean enough for me to let them come back the next day.

Q. Do others who employ Chinese overlook that disadvantage?—A. I do not know what they do. I have been living close to them now for

the last twenty years. I am hunting now to get away from that neighborhood, because I cannot stay there any more.

Q. Why not?—A. It is a bad neighborhood.

Q. Is it bad because the Chinese are there?—A. In former times I had one street to go down, and now that is taken up.

Q. Taken up by the Chinese?—A. Taken up by the Chinese.

Q. How is that an objection?—A. It is an objection because I do not believe it would suit my taste for my children to go through Chinatown, and if I could help myself I would move them off to-morrow from that place. Property has been decreased for six or eight blocks there, and it would not be any inducement for me to go somewhere else. Personally I do not care to go. Whether Chinese, negroes, or Indians, one is as good for me as the other; but when you have got grown daughters and a wife, they have different feelings; and I shall be compelled to move my home, and only for no other reason than that the Chinese drive me away.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Coming back to the original subject, do you know that other manufacturing enterprises all go through about the same drawbacks that you are going through in the candle-factory, in competition with the East?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is that overcome, and how do you finally succeed by Chinese labor?—A. I have consulted several of our superintendents as to what the price of labor is in the East, and they tell me that labor in the East is not higher, as a general rule, among this class, than our Chinese labor is.

Q. You do not catch my question exactly. Do you know that every manufacturing institution has had the same thing to contend with in introducing goods here that you have had?—A. All alike.

Q. Do you not think it is more through the force of habit of our people, that they have been so long ordering goods from the East, and they do not desire to use California-manufactured goods?—A. I have stated to you before, that it is the most remarkable thing that our people have never paid any attention to our home manufactures. If they would, there would be room here for fifty thousand more people. As it is, every manufacturer you have puts in his money, and they say, "That man is a fool." I think they ought to furnish him a little inducement and encouragement, for the more factories there are carried on, the more white labor will be employed. For instance, take this candle-factory, and similar concerns. I use up five or six hundred boxes a day. They are made mostly by white men. The lumber has to be imported. I employ a drayman; he keeps four horses. I have had to have porters attending to that business. I never had a Chinaman to do my work in my office. I take a man and pay him four dollars a day, and if I do not need him, he will be home every hour whenever I want to employ him in the office.

Q. To how many white men have you given labor in your candle-factory that you would not have employed if you had not started? How many white men do you employ now?—A. I have showed here by pay-rolls. The pay-roll is $358. Out of that, $162 goes to Chinamen. Here is their receipt. [Exhibiting.]

Q. The balance, then, is paid to white men?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By the establishment of this candle-factory you have given that amount of employment to white men?—A. Yes, sir. About a month ago I found that two or three Chinamen wanted to get two bits more a

day. The moment I got that notice I sent to the intelligence office, and I said, "Send me four or six white men and I will give them a dollar and a half; I want to stop that thing." They sent the men out. The man who got them from the office told me, "I know your feelings, and there is something wrong in your factory; it seems they do not want to keep those men." I was sick. I sent out word, "What is the matter?" They said there is a man said they did not understand that work. It is common work, nothing but shoveling. They said they would spoil their pants and spoil their shoes. I said they must put on overalls. Before I give a Chinaman a dollar and a quarter, I would rather give a white man a quarter of a dollar more, but they would not stand it.

Q. You cannot get them at that?—A. They would not stand it.

Q. Do you think we have a surplus of labor here?—A. O, lots that we could employ. I think 30,000 or 40,000 men could easily be employed. I had a little trouble last night in my house. We spoke about why there was so much talk about hoodlums and boys. That came up.

Q. I want to hear you on that subject.—A. I will explain to you a little about it. I had bought a bonnet for my wife, and they were speaking about the fact that some ladies cannot get bonnets here, they must get them from France. I asked, "Why should we get those things from France?" They said, "Why, because they make them nicer there." Said I, last evening, "What a pity that our noble ladies in San Francisco, our big ones, do not come to the conclusion to let us see what we can do. If there is not a good bonnet-maker and good dress-maker here, let them come from France. I would be willing to give out of my own pocket, every month, $5 to help them on, and have our little girls who walk around from morning to night on the street put in the employ, and let them learn something. I have no doubt we ought to be able to get some good people here and keep the money here." "O, no; it will not do; it is not nice unless it comes from Paris." I do not complain of rich people spending money, but I do not like to see people of the poorer class want to come up to the rich. Our luxury is too great here, and it is remarkable that, with all this luxury, the money is not spent here. It goes away. As fast as we make money it goes off. I look on that in regard to the whole United States, and I look at it in regard to my own family. If I earn $2 a day, I do not think I have a right to spend $3 a day.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Does that money go to China?—A. No, it does not. Whether it goes to Germany, France, England, Italy, Switzerland, or China, to me it makes no difference. I did not come to this country to support the whole world. Charity begins at home, and when we have got to spare we ought to let it go somewhere else.

Q. You have seen the growth of the manufacturing interests here to their present condition?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What would be the effect if we manufactured all the goods that we consume here?—A. We would be the richest people on the face of the earth.

Q. Do you know of any other people in the United States who can spend about $40,000,000 a year, for 10 years, to buy their goods? Do you know of any State in the East that could stand it?—A. I do not know how rich they are in the East. I am not sufficiently acquainted there. If our mines hold out we can stand it; if they do not hold out we are gone in.

Q. If we produced that amount and kept the $40,000,000 a year here, we would become rich in proportion?—A. The best proof of it is that the manufacturer can get money in the East for 5 and 6 per cent. That is another great drawback here. I do not believe unless a man is very rich and has good security that he can get money here for less than 10 and 12 per cent. Money is too high, and it is a great drawback on us. It is remarkable that in all the hundreds of millions we have thrown out of our mines, still money is very high here. I do not call our manufacturing manufacturing at all. What we are doing here is a drop in the ocean compared with what we import. We have not a single cotton-factory here. If a man comes to me and wants me to help start another factory, do not ask me any more. If I was worth $50,000,000 I would never put in another cent in my life-time.

Q. What is money worth East?—A. If I understand, 5, 6, or 7 per cent. I do not know.

Q. You have to contend against that cheap money?—A. Certainly, and it is a great drawback.

Q. What has built Massachusetts up to the highest standard of wealth?—A. Manufacturing.

Q. What has made England so wealthy?—A. Manufacturing, of course.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Has that been done by Chinese labor?—A. No; of course not.

Q. Could we not do it here with white labor?—A. We ought to do it.

SIMON L. JONES sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you been in this country?—Answer. About twenty-four years.

Q. Where did you come from here?—A. I came from Texas.

Q. What has been your business?—A. Auctioneer.

Q. You are of the firm of Jones, Benedict & Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have had considerable dealings with Chinese on this coast?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How have you found them for honesty and integrity?—A. Very reliable.

Q. And honest in their dealings?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What has been the extent, if you can approximate it, in round numbers, of your dealings with them?—A. Of late years it has been limited.

Q. Give an approximate for a series of years.—A. I suppose our transactions must have amounted to a million of dollars.

Q. Bought at auction principally?—A. We sold a great deal for them, and they bought occasionally.

Q. They buy great quantities of tobacco from you?—A. No, sir; not extraordinary quantities. They buy tobacco.

Q. What kinds of goods?—A. All kinds of goods.

Q. In your dealings with that class of people how do they compare with the white race?—A. I do not know about making comparisons. It is said comparisons are odious. I know one thing, however; I never want to deal with better men than Chinese. I have had less trouble, or as little trouble at any rate, with them as I have had with anybody. They are very reliable, and keep their word, as much so as anymen possibly could be in the world.

Q. Did you ever lose anything by them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Any large amount?—A. No, sir; not a very large amount; much larger by others I have lost by them, of course. My dealings are very extensive, and it could not be otherwise, but I never doubt the integrity of but very few of them.

Q. It is the mercantile class that you come in contact with principally?—A. I do not want any better men to deal with than they are.

Q. From what class is that class of merchants rising; have they built themselves up in this country or did they come here as merchants?—A. They differ. Many have come here as merchants sent out from China with capital. Probably others have built themselves up here.

Q. From laborers to merchants?—A. Some of them; but my dealings with them have not been so extensive.

Q. How do they compare with those who came here as merchants?—A. I am not aware that I can draw a distinction between them.

WILLIAM H. JESSUP sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. How long have you been residing in the city of San Francisco?—Answer. About twenty-six years.

Q. Have you been engaged in the manufacturing business here?—A. I have.

Q. In what branch of manufacturing?—A. In the manufacturing of matches.

Q. Have you had experience in the employment of boys, girls, and Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What have been the results of your experience?—A. The result of my experience with boys and girls is very unsatisfactory.

Q. What was the difficulty in the employment of boys?—A. They were unreliable, both in constancy to labor and in their conduct about the factory. I never could rely upon them performing their work satisfactorily. If I would leave the factery and go up street, when I came back I would find them throwing matches all over the factory, the floor covered with them, and they would be burnt up; and sometimes I would find them on the top of the two-story building chasing each other all over the roof. By such things as that they destroyed a great deal of property, and I found I could not control them at all.

Q. How long did you try to carry on your factory with boys?—A. Something near a year. Before I went to hiring Chinese labor, I hired white men. I set them to work and gave them good wages from the first. They were dissatisfied. They were not satisfied to take the rate we could pay to compete with the imported matches. We were compelled to hire labor as cheaply as possible in order to produce the article in any way. They would commence to work and they would expect to get good wages from the first. If they could not they would be dissatisfied. For instance, in learning they would not probably make over ten or fifteen cents a day at the same rate that we were paying them then, and the Chinamen now—practiced hands—would make probably $3 a day at the same rate that we were then paying for putting up matches.

Q. You paid them by the piece?—A. We paid them by the piece.

Q. Not by the day?—A. I tried them somewhat by the day, but that would not work at all.

Q. Why?—A. They would not seem to learn, did not seem to take an interest in learning. When they got their wages they were satisfied to go right on without any advancement at all. They took no interest in it. When it came down to piece-work they would be dissatisfied unless they could make full wages from the beginning.

Q. From what class of people did your white men come?—A. The laboring class, as a general thing.

Q. They were of no particular nationality?—A. No; none at all.

Q. You had to take green hands altogether?—A. I had to take green hands altogether. There were no instructed hands here, no artisans who understood the business at all. Occasionally a man would come along who understood manufacturing, but then he would want $3 or $4 or $5 a day to begin with. I had two or three sets in the wooden department. I then made wooden boxes to put the matches in. There I employed some half dozen white men.

Q. What was the next change you made?—A. The next change I made was to try girls in the packing of matches and putting them up, and I found more difficulty with them than I did with the boys, and could not do anything with them.

Q. From what class of people did your girls come?—A. The poorer classes, laboring women.

Q. Of all nationalities?—A. Yes, sir. There is no question as to that.

Q. What do you say was the difficulty with them?—A. They were unreliable, and they were dissatisfied because they could not make good wages from the first.

Q. In what respect were they unreliable?—A. I could not depend upon them. When I would show them how to do a thing and go away and leave them, I could not rely on their doing it. They would not be instructed. That was the difficulty that I found with the boys. It was utterly impossible to set them to work and give them instructions that they would abide by. They would make little changes to-day, little changes to-morrow, and in a week you would find them doing entirely different from the instructions you gave them.

Q. The boys you say were unreliable because they would not stick to work?—A. They would not stick to work and would destroy the property, and it was the same characteristic in reference to learning with them as with the girls.

Q. How is it in reference to the girls? Were they unreliable in that respect or some other?—A. They were always fooling and talking, and could not get their minds down to business. Probably it was because I did not have patience enough with them.

Q. Do I understand you that the girls could not get their minds down to match-making?—A. That is true as to that peculiar kind of match-making.

Q. What was the next change that you made?—A. The next change I made was to hire Chinamen.

Q. What was the result of that experiment?—A. The result of that was in building up a factory to the exclusion of the imported matches.

Q. Did you carry on that business to a profit?—A. I did.

Q. Did you carry on the business with either boys, girls, or white men to a profit?—A. I never could have succeeded. I am satisfied of that fact.

Q. In what respect did the Chinese prove more advantageous?—A. They were more attentive to their business; there was no fooling or leaving of their work. They would stay and work, and they were satisfied with the wages that they made, depending all the while on the facility in getting along faster, turning out more work after a while, and they would learn. They would follow instructions. You take a Chinaman, a green China boy, into your factory and show him just how to do a thing, and if you leave him and come back, if it is a year afterward,

you find him doing the work precisely as you instructed him. I have never found any difficulty at all in that way with them. Whenever you have given him proper instructions he will abide by those instructions.

Q. Do you find any difference between the Chinese and the boys and girls as to their attendance?—A. O, yes.

Q. What is the difference?—A. The Chinese are more attentive to their business always; never get into fights, and there is no fooling or talking. There is very little talking going on among them.

Q. No sky-larking?—A. No, sky-larking, or throwing anything around. I presume the year I was carrying on the business with boys I lost 500 gross of matches by bunches of matches being thrown across the room like playing ball, and burning them up. Probably I lost a thousand gross in that way. I would come into the factory many a time and see the floor covered with bunches of matches.

Q. Was that a safe amusement?—A. No; it was not; it was very dangerous, because there is a good deal of combustible material in the building, paper, dry wood, &c.

Q. Were the Chinese that you employed, boys or men?—A. Both boys and men; young fellows, principally young men.

Q. To what cause do you attribute these characteristics of the boys and girls that you have alluded to? Do they differ here from the boys and girls in other parts of the Union?—A. I think they do. I think it is more the force of habit, their custom of living, the parents not having to depend on the labor of the children to contribute to the family support. I think, probably, it would be a proper construction to place upon it to say that the laboring-classes here, as a general thing, depend upon the labor of the head of the family for the family support, and that they do not depend upon the labor of their children. I think that is the cause.

Q. The children do not grow up in habits of industry?—A. They do not. That is the way I attribute the difficulty we have among our laboring-classes.

Q. Is our society different in that respect from the society in which you were born and educated?—A. Very much. In all countries I have ever lived the children of the poorer classes were taught to contribute a portion to the support of the family, and here it is in a very slight measure the practice.

Q. I do not know what you mean by "the poorer classes." All of them are poorer than somebody else?—A. Classes of mechanics and laboring men who cannot get along without support for their families by manual labor.

Q. When you were a boy, with those well-to-do mechanics, farmers, &c., what was the custom in regard to the children's services in the family?—A. The custom was where I was raised, and in my father's family, that every member of it had to contribute something to the support of the family.

Q. Every one had to do some work about the establishment, about the place?—A. Every one had to do his *pro rata* of work. It was always understood we had it to do, and even in the families in good circumstances, as far as my knowledge went.

Q. What is the case here in this State in that respect?—A. The case here is entirely different, from my observation.

Q. Do children do anything about the house?—A. Very little, from what I have seen.

Q. How do they employ their time?—A. Generally on the streets,

from my observation, when they are out of school, and a great many of them do not appear to go to school at all.

Q. From out of what class of boys, when you want employés in your factory, do you have to get them?—A. I do not know in fact where I would go to get them, unless I would find them in the street.

Q. Can you get those children who are properly brought up at home, and made to assist their parents, as employés in your factory?—A. That is what I would have to get if I got any to do anything.

Q. Could you get those?—A. No, I do not suppose I could; because most of those who are kept at home generally look for an easier class of work; to be office-boys and to attend to duties of that kind. They do not like to go into a factory to learn a trade, especially such as a manufacturing business where they could not learn all that is to be learned in the trade.

Q. What do you say in regard to the moral character of these Chinese operatives as compared with other operatives?—A. As far as I have seen them it is good. I have never seen a steadier, more cleanly set of men in my life than I have had to do with in my manufactory.

Q. What are their habits in regard to cleanliness?—A. The habits of all that I have employed are exceedingly cleanly. If there are dirty ones, I have never had them in my factory, and I have never made any effort to find cleanly ones.

Q. What are their habits in regard to washing themselves?—A. I can scarcely ever go into my factory in the afternoon after they have done their work but what I find them all washing with their clothes stripped down, the shoulders bare, washing their necks, rubbing their heads. I have always found that every Chinaman in the factory keeps his towel, and they are hung up in a row on nails in that part of the factory where they wash, and each one has his individual towel. That I have always observed since 1864, when I first commenced hiring them.

Q. How do they compare in that respect with white men in the same situation of life?—A. I am sorry to say that I think, as far as I know, speaking of my own factory, they surpass the white laboring-class in cleanliness. I cannot speak as to the general habits of the people; but that is my experience.

Q. Did the white men put you to much expense for water for washing their bodies?—A. I never saw one who would more than wash his hands and face in the factory.

Q. That was the extent of his ablutions?—A. Yes, and sometimes they were not very particular about that.

Q. In regard to their clothes, which were the most cleanly?—A. My Chinamen always look clean and tidy as far as their kind of clothing will permit. Of course it is very plain-looking clothing; but I have never seen a dirty Chinaman about my factory. Of course he is poor and his clothes are cheap, but they appear to be clean.

Q. Are they woolen or cotton?—A. Cotton goods, principally.

Q. Are they in the habit of washing them?—A. Yes; they always wash them.

Q. Of what material are the clothes of the white man?—A. They are principally woolen. Chinamen wear woolen pants, I believe, as a general thing.

Q. Speaking of the entire Chinese population, what is their moral character as compared with the people of any other nationality?—A. That I am not prepared to answer, because I have not been much in the thickly populated portions of the city. I very rarely go there. It is not a very attractive place, I am willing to admit; but I do not know anything about their habits as to immorality.

Q. What do you say in regard to the industry of the Chinese as a class?—A. I think the Chinese as a class are the most industrious men I ever knew in my life.

Q. Do you see Chinamen at any time loitering on the street, standing around, loafing?—A. Very rarely.

Q. As a general rule do they appear, when you see them, to be going to or coming from their business?—A. Nearly always when they are in other portions of the city than their own haunts. I do not know what they do there; but in other portions of the city you nearly always see them going about the same gait as though they were going to attend to business or had attended to it.

Q. You have seen a good many of them doing that?—A. Some of them.

Q. Then you can form some opinion as to their general character as to industry?—A. Their general character, I say, is as good as any people I ever knew.

Q. What do you say in regard to their temperance?—A. I do not know. I have been here twenty-six years, and have seen a great deal of Chinamen, and I have yet to see the first drunken Chinaman. I have never seen a Chinaman who I thought was under the slightest influence of liquor.

Q. Are we troubled with beggars at all?—A. I believe I never saw more than three or four in twenty-six years.

Q. Of other kinds?—A. O, of other nationalities?

Q. I ask you whether we are troubled with beggars here?—A. Not a great many.

Q. And how is it with the Chinese? Do you find many of those to be beggars?—A. I say I have never seen more than three or four in twenty-six years, and they were rather a modest class in regard to persistence in their demands.

Q. When you have been on Montgomery street have you ever been approached by people who wanted a quarter or a half?—A. Yes; a good many.

Q. That is not a very uncommon circumstance, is it?—A. No; not very.

Q. Generally on the plea of necessity, to get a breakfast?—A. Yes; I had an application of that kind yesterday.

Q. There is a strong odor of whisky about them?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that a numerous class here?—A. There are a great many of that class.

Q. What color are they?—A. Generally white men.

Q. What has been the treatment that the Chinese population has received from the whites here?—A. I think it has been anything but flattering to the conduct of the whites.

Q. What have you seen in that respect?—A. I have seen a great deal of it, abuses of every kind.

Q. What shape did it take?—A. Almost every conceivable shape, from mere violence down to insult that is uncalled for even to a dog.

Q. To what extent does this violence extend?—A. To a very great extent, I think.

Q. From what class does it proceed, from the whole community or from any particular class?—A. No; it generally emanates from the laboring classes, from what I have seen. In fact, other men have got too much to attend to to turn to abusing a class of people for nothing.

Q. Have you ever seen any Chinamen abused by American-born citizens?—A. Very seldom; occasionally you will see it done.

Q. To what do you attribute this abuse?—A. I do not know what it is, unless because they imagine that their labor comes in conflict with the labor performed by the Chinese. I do not know what else to attribute it to. The origin is prejudice; but the prejudice probably emanates from that cause.

Q. Have you ever seen Chinese wounded by these boys?—A. Very frequently.

Q. Have you seen any arrest made of the assailants in consequence?—A. I do not think I ever saw a man arrested for abusing a Chinaman.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you ever make complaint yourself?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Have you met with any Chinamen who dress in the American fashion?—A. O, yes.

Q. According to American notions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How were they treated?—A. They were generally treated better.

Q. They do not provoke the same animosity?—A. No. I do not think I have ever seen one abused who was dressed in American costume. It may be because their nationality is apparently removed by it; that they do not observe them as much, because there are a good many other nationalities which it is pretty difficult for a man to distinguish a Chinaman from, if he were to dress in the same costume.

Q. Many of our people here are darker, are they not?—A. Some.

Q. Californians of Spanish descent, Italians, &c.?—A. Certainly.

Q. Some of them are darker than the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir. I think myself, if they were to dress in a different habit, there would be less of that abuse, because there would be an uncertainty as to whether they were Chinamen, or belonged to some other nation.

Q. The peculiarity of the costume forms an excuse to provoke something of the animosity?—A. I think so. In fact, I have told a good many Chinamen that I believed it would be much better for them to adopt the habits of American clothing, that they would meet with less abuse.

Q. Have you employed Chinese as domestics in your family?—A. I have of late years.

Q. How do they serve you as domestics?—A. As a general thing, they are very good.

Q. Do you put the same trust and confidence in them that you would in other servants?—A. Just the same. I never make any difference.

Q. You have no reason to distrust them?—A. Never. I do not believe I ever had a Chinaman in my employ who ever took a dollar's worth of property from me. In the match-factory our habit has been to take revenue-stamps all the way from $1 up to $1,500 at a time, and leave them in charge of the Chinamen, and I do not believe we have ever lost a dollar's worth of stamps since we have used them. Repeatedly I have given my Chinamen $1,500 worth of unstamped stamps at a time. We generally get from $5 to $15 worth in a batch.

Q. How do they compare as to truthfulness with other people?—A. I do not believe I have ever had one lie to me. I certainly have never found it out, if he has. As far as my experience goes, I find them very truthful.

Q. What effect upon the prosperity of the State has the introduction of the Chinese had?—A. I think it has had a very good effect. I do not believe that any light manufactures would have ever succeeded in the world in competition with Europe and the Atlantic States at the high

rate of interest here without the aid of Chinese labor. The habits of our people in sticking to their importing and transporting of goods here are almost impossible to break up, they have such a preference in that direction, and the only way it can be done is by forcing upon the market cheaper goods and equally as good. To do that there is no profit in any small manufactory that would justify any man in putting in capital enough to make it a success, and without the hiring of Chinese labor it could not be done and never was done.

Q. Unless you can give them as good an article for less price, they import?—A. That is it exactly—as good an article or a better article for less price. I have tried every way in my power to establish the home manufacture of matches here, but I could not find a man to aid me. The importers would not stop their importation even by my offering them 25 per cent. I offered to furnish as good an article 25 per cent. less, and they would not break up their importation until I told them I was bound to introduce them; that I would drive every foreign match out of this market if it cost me $20,000 to do it. I found the only way I could do it was to hire Chinese labor to do it, and I succeeded in doing it.

Q. Do you think there are any circumstances in our condition here to make it advisable to limit the immigration of Chinese?—A. I would say yes; I should like to see it limited. I think the time is now passed for the absolute necessity of the cheaper class of labor. I think now the condition of manufacturing, &c., is so divided up that it would be easier now to establish manufactories than it was at that time. At that time it could not have been done because no man would be fool enough to put sufficient capital in to break down this competition at that time where it would be necessary to hire white labor to do it. It could not be done; but now there is a different state of affairs. I should like to see the Chinese population limited or the increase of it.

Q. Do you think there is any danger of an influx greater than we can possibly dispose of?—A. I do not think there is. I think those things will regulate themselves. Those men are pretty smart men; in fact I know they are, and they are not going to be fools enough to send a great quantity of men here, greater than can find employment here. The men who send the Chinamen here know what they are doing, and I do not think they would send too many. I think that that would limit it enough. They would only go where there is great inducement for making money.

JOHN M. HORNER recalled.

The WITNESS. I have here a statement which was not written for this purpose at all, but we have had this Chinese matter under consideration for a number of years. I have put together some arguments which I wish to present. The excitement now existing in California about Chinese immigration to this State is remarkable on account of its taking possession of and controlling the actions and, apparently, the judgments of men of admitted intelligence, as well as the ignorant and depraved; and that, too, so far as we can discover, without one argument to justify them in their assumed position. We cannot excuse them on the plea of ignorance, and don't wish to charge them with floating on the tide of public opinion because the idea is popular; yet it does seem unfortunate for our country, and its idle, suffering laborers, that statesmen have not the whole control of the ship of state at the present time, that more liberal views and plans of progress should obtain so that every available source of labor could be made available for creating either individual, State, or national wealth.

It is admitted that human labor is the source of all wealth, and if the

thousands of Chinamen and the millions of laborers now idle in these United States could be set to work improving the country and otherwise producing wealth, the industries would be at once restored and our prosperity be assured. Those effects would all be brought about by judicious laws, and it is clearly the work of the statesman. If our own laborers were all employed, a few thousand Chinamen in our midst would not create one wave of trouble upon the body-politic.

The Chinamen being industrious, would then be considered a blessing, as there would then be employment for all, and all would be producers of wealth.

A nation that forces idleness upon its people by unwise legislation, or does not foster the industries by judicious laws, is committing physical, moral, and financial suicide.

To object to Chinamen because they "labor too well" or because they are "cheap, reliable, and industrious laborers" is void of reason or humanity. As well should a tradesman object to superior and cheaper goods being sold in the market while his more expensive and inferior ones remain unsold; or hand-workers object to the employment of machinery in the production of the necessaries of life because the machine works more accurate, more reliable, and more economical.

The Chinamen are the first people treated as criminal or objected to because they were "reliable, industrious, or economical." With all other people those qualities are considered virtues.

The Chinamen are no more to blame for the unemployed laborers of California than they are for the unemployed of the balance of the nation; no more to blame than the Irishmen were for the unemployed Americans during the short and bloody reign of "Native Americanism."

It cannot be supposed that should the one hundred thousand Chinamen be summarily ejected from California, the present idle laborers would immediately find employment at advanced rates of wages, because, first, many improvements now being prosecuted would surely stop if a heavy per cent. should be forced upon the labor portion of the enterprise.

Second. Many factories and industries that can now with cheap labor barely keep in motion would have to stop if they had to pay either higher wages or have the demand for their wares curtailed. If by ejecting the Chinamen these results should follow, the white labor now employed as foremen and bosses in such establishments would also be thrown out of employment; thus it would be seen in this case less white labor would be required by ejecting the Chinamen than by retaining them.

Third. As a large number of the Chinamen are idle, it may reasonably be supposed that those that do labor barely create sufficient of the necessaries of life to sustain the whole number; hence if they should be sent away the labor now required to sustain the Chinamen would not then be wanted, consequently no extra white labor would then be required.

The steam-engine, performing the physical labor of thousands of men, the thrashing-machine, performing the labor that was formerly done by men, and the horse, in fact, that plows our land when they could be equally well dug up by white labor, are responsible with the Chinamen for the unemployed white labor of California.

Why not destroy or stop their use so that the white labor could be employed?

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are you giving that as testimony, or as argument before the committee?—A. You can take it for an argument. I only have that much more (indicating) to read.

Senator SARGENT. If there is only that much more, I suppose you can go through with it.

The WITNESS. Why not tear up the railroads, blow up the steamboats, stop the stages, kill off the horses, and destroy the telegraphs, &c., so that white labor could take their places? All could then find employment. Thousands would be required to row the boats and carry the burdens, and thousands more to act as runners to carry messages, mails, &c., and thousands more to take the place of the horse upon the farm, to dig up the ground, &c. The above arguments are all on a par with the idea that if the Chinamen were driven out the white labor could all be employed. And it savors of "Native Americanism" of a generation age, when a like war was waged against the Irishmen even to bloodshed; or the factory laborers of Britton combining against the spinning-jenny, or the laborer of the South against the cotton-gin, the stage-coach and freighter against the railroad, &c.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean by the statement that large numbers of Chinamen are unemployed?—A. There are many in the State who are not employed at this time.

Q. Your observation is that a large number of them are idle?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. About what proportion of the whole number?—A. I cannot state the proportion, but there are idle Chinamen all the while, and sometimes they are here by thousands.

Q. It has been testified here that they are all industrious with slight exceptions?—A. So they are; but when labor is scarce they cannot all be employed.

Q. Your argument here is based upon the idea of driving out the Chinamen now here. Do you understand that that is the proposition now before Congress?—A. No, sir.

Q. Suppose the proposition were that we should prevent an unlimited influx, in case they should attempt to come here in any number that might result from domestic wars or famine or any other exigency which would make life difficult or impossible in China, how would your argument apply?—A. An argument on that score foots up with me about this way: If they do not bring their families here, they do not increase in a natural way, and they have a kind of religious superstition or something else that they must go back when they get to be old or their bones must be sent back. Consequently, if we have a half million over here in about thirty years, they would all be sent back or their bones would go back. Therefore a large amount of them here could only stay a few months at most under their present arrangement.

Q. Do you think it is a desirable population to have half a million when this is not their home and they care nothing for the country except to make money and go back? Do you think that can be compared in desirableness of population with a million who would come here to make homes, build up communities, erect school-houses and churches and conform to our customs?—A. Your question is so long that it is hard to answer.

Q. Not at all; I am only comparing one class with the other. It is simple in idea, though it may be long in statement.—A. They do not

come until they are needed. It is a kind of a labor-machine, and when it is used they go away.

Q. I was trying to get at the idea of the creation of wealth and its influence upon our political and moral condition.—A. I do not see that the creation of wealth could work much hardship against the American nation, the building of railroads, or the reclaiming of swamp-lands.

Q. Take a non-voting population of several millions in this State, not considering it their home, not even allowing their bones to remain here when they die—for we know they have a superstition which requires them to return, dead or alive—would you think that a desirable population because they produce wealth?—A. I would not say this State; but apply it all over the whole United States and I would not see any objection.

Q. You think it would be a benefit to the whole United States to have the Chinese, by millions, scattered all over the country?—A. Yes, sir; if the proper laws were enforced.

Q. Proper laws for what?—A. For the improvement of the country.

Q. Such as what laws?—A. National laws.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Laws requiring them to work cheap?—A. No, sir; my idea is, that our Government should be the commanders of certain improvements in the nation, and they should always, at all times, have plenty of work on hand.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. And employ the idle people?—A. And employ the idle people, instead of having them grumble as they did last year,

Q. You believe in the Louis Napoleon system of making public improvements in order to employ people?—A. Yes, sir; not for that purpose only, but we should be so much better accommodated. That would retain the wealth. All the wealth that they created we would retain.

WILLIAM N. OLMSTED sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In San Francisco.

Q. What is your business?—A. Merchant.

Q. Have you resided in China?—A. I have.

Q. When did you reside there?—A. I resided in China from August, 1862, until January, 1870.

Q. Were you connected with the China trade before that time?—A. Before that time I was in a New York house for three years, a tea-house largely engaged in importation from China.

Q. What house was that?—A. Oliphant, Son & Co.

Q. In what business were you engaged in China?—A. I was in the mercantile house of Oliphant & Co., one of the largest American houses doing business in China.

Q. At what place?—A. They were doing a general business throughout China.

Q. Where was their place of business?—A. Their places of business were in Canton, Hong-Kong, Fuhchau, Shanghai, Takiang, and Hangchau.

Q. What opportunities had you of visiting the interior and seeing the Chinese people?—A. Very little of seeing the interior of China. I staid various times at the ports of Takiang, Fuhchau, Canton, the English colony of Hong-Kong; and, in addition to that, Hangchau,

Chingkiang, Swatow, Amoy, and the Portugese colony of Macao. I was never any great distance from either of those ports.

Q. Did you know or hear out there of Thomas H. King?—A. Yes, sir; during the latter years of my residence in Hong-Kong I knew of Mr. King.

Q. What was he doing there?—A. In 1869, at one time, he left Hong-Kong in command of a vessel bound for San Francisco. At a later period I knew him as connected with the United States consulate.

Q. Did you have an opportunity as good as that enjoyed by persons resident there to learn the ways and customs of the Chinese and their character?—A. Yes, sir; the house I was with was largely engaged in the purchase and sale of merchandise, the shipping of merchandise, and the chartering of vessels. We were brought closely in contact with various Chinese merchants.

Q. In what sense is the word "cooly" used in China?—A. In the sense of laborer.

Q. Is it a Chinese word?—A. No, sir.

Q. By whom is the word used?—A. The word is supposed to have been originally brought from Hindoo by the Portuguese, from their settlements abroad. I believe the origin of the word is Sanscrit.

Q. By whom is it used in China?—A. It is used, generally, by all foreigners.

Q. Does it apply to any particular kind of labor?—A. No, sir; it applies to laborers in general. The word "cooly" was used as a term of reproach during the period of emigration to Peru and Cuba, and at a later period the coolies who were shipped to Peru and Cuba were known among the Chinese themselves, and generally by foreigners, in referring to them, as pigs, those men who were bought and sold like so many cattle.

Q. How does that class of people compare with the Chinese immigrants to this country?—A. The Chinese immigrants to this country are not all of one class. I would divide the people of China into three classes. The mandarins, who are the governing class, with whom foreigners are brought into but little contact, the mercantile class, and the laboring class.

Q. Which class immigrates to this country?—A. The mercantile and the laboring classes.

Q. Are either of them of the same class as that of the coolies who were sent to Australia?—A. They were sent very largely to Australia.

Q. I ask if either of these classes is the same as those sent to Australia?—A. Not the same as the classes sent to Peru and Cuba.

Q. Which was the class which you said was called pigs?—A. The lowest of the laboring classes, the men who were sent to Peru and Cuba.

Q. Have you a knowledge of the United States legislation in regard to the subject of cooly importation?—A. I cannot say that I have. I am aware that there are passenger acts providing for the number of coolies that can be brought in vessels; and I am aware also that the Hong-Kong government has emigrant-laws.

Q. It has been stated here that the cooly act enables the consul to exact large fees from every cooly whom he ships, whereby they charge more charter-money. Is that correct?—A. As to the opportunities of the consuls for making such charges I am unable to speak. I can only say, however, that I have concluded myself a number of charters with the Chinese for the conveyance of passengers, and in those charter-parties there was always a stipulation that the charterer of the vessel

paid all the expenses attending the shipment of coolies. I have such charter-parties with me.

Q. I want to know whether the charge of the consul is such as to increase the burden of the ship or the charter-money so as to be onerous.—A. Certainly not to the ship. There is an express provision in the charters that all these expenses are borne by the charterers.

Q. You say you have made a good many charters there of ships?—A. I have.

Q. You have not hired ships yourself for these purposes?—A. No, sir.

Q. In what way do these passengers that come from China leave China and get here—under any contract? And, if so, under what sort of a contract?—A. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the majority of the men who come here come by inducements and representations which have been made to them as to the field which they would find for their labor, and the greater remuneration which they would obtain here as compared with the labor in their own country. A great many of those men are poor and have not the means to pay for their passage and provide for the necessary outfit, and there are always to be found men in China who are willing to provide funds to cover those expenses.

Q. Why are they willing to provide the funds for these purposes?—A. It is the employment of their money, obtaining a high rate of interest in so doing.

Q. Is not that a somewhat unusual contract?—A. It may be; but I have heard such things.

Q. It is not a business that you would be likely to go into here?—A. Certainly not.

Q. I want to know why it is that these poor laborers can obtain the money upon a loan to pay their passage-money out here when, probably, white people could not do the same thing?—A. There are profits to be derived from the business. In the first instance there is a profit for the charterers of the vessel. The charterers of the vessel take up the entire capacity of the ship for a lump sum. They then sublet portions of it for freight, and other portions again for passengers. They anticipate making a profit upon that. The men who ship the coolies generally buy passage-tickets in large quantites. They obtain upon those purchases in large quantities a discount, which is their first source of profit. The advances which they make are afterward repaid to them, or agreed to be repaid to them, at a high rate of interest. The Chinese there, in possession of funds, whether as agents of parties here or as principals themselves, are willing to make those advances for their repayment.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What security do they give?—A. The security in those contracts is very often the personal security given by relatives and friends in China.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. And if there is default, how is it?—A. If there is default, under the Chinese laws those relatives can be proceeded against in China.

Q. To what extent and under what process?—A. To the extent of fine and imprisonment, and the Chinese are generally very much averse to subjecting their friends to fine and imprisonment on their own account. In that way they are more loyal than almost any other people I have ever met.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What rate of interest do they generally pay?—A. That I cannot tell.

Q. A large rate or a small rate?—A. Very often a high rate of interest.

Q. Five per cent. a month?—A. I do not think as high as that. Still the amount of the advance which is made is comparatively a trifling sum. If you were to estimate the probable cost of passage and the outfit, it would not amount to fifty dollars.

Q. They pay a higher rate of interest in commercial transactions?—A. Yes, sir; money in China generally brings from one per cent. to one and one-quarter per cent. per month.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What would be the return on one of those contracts until it was carried out? If the advance was fifty dollars, how much would the broker get?—A. It is almost impossible for me to say unless I knew what the rate of interest would be.

Q. It would probably be doubled?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. More than that?—A. In some instances undoubtedly.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In that sense, as a rule they come here under contracts for labor, those contracts secured by the obligation of their friends and relatives in China, which may be enforced under the Chinese laws by the exaction of fine and imprisonment?—A. They do not come under contracts for labor.

Q. Is it not substantially that?—A. I do not think it is. I think it is more in the nature of a note that they give.

Q. A note which has to be worked out by their labor here?—A. A note which is to be worked out by their labor here, but there is no stipulation as to their labor or its duration.

Q. They are to obtain employment here until they can remunerate and retire that obligation, whatever it is?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are these men inveigled into coming here?—A. I would consider that almost an impossibility.

Q. Those who come here come by their free will and consent?—A. The immigration laws in Hong-Kong, our own consular laws, and our own laws ought certainly to put a stop to any immigration of the kind. I never heard of any instance in Hong-Kong of force being used to put emigrants on board ship, while I have heard of force being used in the Portuguese colony of Macao in shipping coolies to Peru and Cuba. I should like to remark in connection with this subject of voluntary and involuntary immigration that there have been numerous instances of passengers on board vessels for Peru and Cuba rising and capturing the ship, but I never yet heard of an instance of the kind on board passenger-vessels coming to San Francisco. I think that points out a vast difference in the character of the two classes of immigration.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Has there been any attempt of the kind upon vessels coming to this country from China?—A. None that I ever heard of during my residence in China or since my residence here.

Q. Is it common to loan them money to gamble in order to get them into debt so that they may be brought over here?—A. That I cannot

tell you. If their indebtedness were very heavy, I do not think that the advance necessary to cover that indebtedness would be made by the men in Hong-Kong who make such advances as I have named.

Q. Does imprisonment for debt generally prevail in China?—A. That is a point upon which I cannot answer definitely.

Q. Did you hear of many instances of imprisonment for debt there during your residence in that place?—A. No, sir; there are imprisonments there of Chinese; but a foreigner engaged in mercantile pursuits would know very little upon such subjects; they are not brought to his immediate notice.

Q. Do they acquire in China the use of alcoholic drinks at all?—A. To a very small extent; but there are fewer among the Chinese than among any other people I know of.

Q. Is gambling common there?—A. As common as it is elsewhere.

Q. Is it any more prevalent?—A. I do not think so.

Q. How is it regarded by the laws there?—A. I have known attempts to be made in some of the open Chinese ports to suppress it by the Chinese authorities. I know that in Canton, at all events, the authorities endeavored to put down gambling.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do they succeed as well as we do here?—A. I fancy about as well. Do you mean Chinese gambling or foreign gambling?

Q. Chinese gambling.—A. That I cannot tell you. I do not know how well they succeed here.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you refer to foreign gambling or Chinese gambling in China?—A. I was referring to Chinese gambling. There are no foreign gambling-houses in Canton that I am aware of.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are there in any of the cities where you resided foreign gambling-houses?—A. None. In Macao the gambling-houses are open to foreigners. That is a Portuguese colony, under Portuguese law.

Q. What kind of gambling do the Chinese have?—A. The game which is most commonly played there, I believe, is the same game which is known here as tan.

Q. Is the gambling very heavy?—A. No; it is not generally for very large sums. In China the Mexican dollar is equivalent to about a thousand copper cashes. The Chinaman is disposed as a rule to venture very few cash upon a bet.

Q. Does he venture as much upon his game as we venture upon an ordinary game that is played for pleasure?—A. A great many of them; but, of course, that would depend a great deal upon a man's means as well as his inclination.

Q. It is a very common thing among Americans to play for drinks or to play for the cards, or something of that kind?—A. It is very common.

Q. Would not that stake amount to as much as a good many stakes at tan?—A. Very frequently.

Q. How is prostitution regarded in China?—A. I think very much as it is here.

Q. Is it a legalized pursuit there?—A. That I cannot tell you.

Q. It stands in about the same consideration as it does here?—A. One moment; as to the Chinese cities and their regulations in reference to prostitution I cannot give you any information. I know that in Hong-Kong all the brothels there require license.

Q. That is under the English government?—A. That is under the English government; but as to how it is under the Chinese government I cannot give you any information.

Q. From your intercourse with the Chinese, do you know how prostitution is regarded by them?—A. I think our own views of the matter are very similar to those entertained by the Chinese, or rather the Chinese views of the matter are very similar to those entertained by ourselves.

Q. Do you know whether in China any persons of illegitimate birth can obtain an office?—A. I do not.

Q. You do not know what the regulations on that subject are?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. In the Chinese treaty-ports, ports that are open to the entry of foreigners, do the Chinese and Americans live together?—A. The Americans and English, the foreign residents, in almost all the ports live in a space which has been set apart by the Chinese government, and which has generally been denominated the foreign concession. In Canton, during the time I was there, fully one-half of the American residents were living right in among the Chinese, and in Fuhchau a majority of our emigrants merely skirted the Chinese portion of one of the suburbs of the town.

Q. What is the cause of their being put in a place by themselves, or having been put there?—A. For the greater convenience of building and for their titles. They get their government titles and generally obtain more room. Foreigners like to associate together.

Q. Does the Chinese government require them to keep separate from the Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. Or separate from other parts of the city?—A. No, sir; it is not obligatory upon the foreigner to reside in the concession.

Q. But he does it as a matter of taste?—A. He does it as a matter of taste.

Q. Who are the Chinamen who live there in the concession?—A. Most of the Chinamen in the concession are servants in foreign employ.

Q. Do any of the Chinese merchants live there?—A. Not upon any concession.

Q. By what means do the foreign merchants make their purchases?—A. Direct from the Chinese merchants, from the inspection of samples.

Q. Do they keep their stocks there in stores?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the business of the comprador?—A. If you will excuse me one moment. The teas almost invariably come down from the hongs, who have large warehouses, and who have also accommodations for the tea-men who are interested in the different chops of tea. A chop of tea, say of three or four hundred packages, may have half a dozen men interested in it. These men will all go and reside at the house of this hong merchant. They will name to him the price at which they will sell their tea, and he receives a commission from them, or sells it upon such an advance to the foreigner as pays him the cost of warehousing and the entertainment of these men during their residence at the shipping port.

Q. He either buys it himself, or undertakes to sell it upon commission for them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Very much as a commission-merchant would do here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the business of a comprador?—A. A comprador is a Chinese seller, through whom almost all the business transactions pass in one way or another. He generally receives a commission from the seller upon all purchases and a commission from the buyer upon all sales.

Q. In the course of trade is it usual to send agents into the country to purchase teas, silks, and other goods?—A. That is at times done.

Q. By whom is it done?—A. Foreign merchants themselves will occasionally send an agent into the country. Occasionally some few foreigners have gone some distance into the country themselves, but the merchants residing at the tea-ports will very frequently make advances to the Chinamen four or five months in advance of any teas being received. They will intrust those men with the money to go up in the country and make purchases for them.

Q. What security have they for the payment of that money?—A. Nothing whatever but the note given.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What amount, in round numbers, do they trust them with?—A. I have known of advances of fifty and sixty thousand dollars to be made to one Chinaman. The rate of interest charged is high, but the purchaser eventually pays for that, and gets it in return from the consumer.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are they faithful in keeping these contracts?—A. I have always found them so. I have bought large quantities of teas from Chinese merely from the sample. After the terms of our bargain were concluded, the Chinaman would merely say, "Puttee book," in other words, to make note of the transaction in my purchase-book. He would then send the teas into the warehouses, where they would be weighed and examined, and after shipment they would be paid for. If the market had fallen during that time, I never knew of a case where a Chinaman refused to send teas into the warehouse on account of a difference in the market.

Q. What is the meaning of the word "hong?"—A. A hong house is a place of business. Hong may mean the firm. If you speak of a Chinese hong, you may mean the premises where they do business.

Q. It may mean either the firm or the place of business?—A. Either.

Q. Is the name usually applied to any individual where they carry on business?—A. Very frequently it is the name of an association—the firm-name.

Q. Do the foreign houses have any such name?—A. They are all designated among the Chinese by those names.

Q. Does this name usually have some meaning?—A. It has some meaning.

Q. What was the name of your firm?—A. Tung Foo.

Q. What was the meaning of that name?—A. The Chinese gave it a very flattering interpretation; they called it "Associated Integrity."

Q. From what part of China do these immigrants come who are here?—A. Mainly from the Kwang Tung province.

Q. In what business are they engaged before they leave there?—A. Some of them as merchants, some of them laborers, some of them undoubtedly as artisans.

Q. Are many of them agricultural laborers?—A. Yes, sir; a number of them; the larger proportion of them, I should say.

Q. How does agriculture in China rank with other pursuits? How is it regarded?—A. It is a very honorable pursuit. There is nothing that is degrading in labor in China or elsewhere that I am aware of.

Q. Are not special honors paid to agriculture there? Does not the emperor himself annually make certain religious ceremonies connected with the pursuit of agriculture to give it dignity and rank?—A. I am not able to inform you on that point.

Q. You did not participate in their religious observances?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think that the emigration from that country is likely to increase greatly?—A. I think that the immigration will keep pace with the demand.

Q. Do you think the demand will control it?—A. I do; entirely. I look upon the Chinese as a very keen, shrewd people, and I think that the moment they see that Chinese labor cannot be profitably employed here, or anywhere else, the emigration from there will be checked.

Q. Do you see any necessity, in the condition of affairs connected with this business, to call upon Congress for legislation to control it?—A. No, sir; I do not fear any great influx of Chinese beyond the demand for them. When the demand ceases, the influx will cease.

Q. Do you think the immigration of Chinese, up to the present time, has been beneficial, or otherwise, to the State?—A. My impression is that it has been beneficial.

Q. What is the state of our trade with China? Is it increasing, stationary, or decreasing?—A. I think that our trade with China is increasing. I think they are now consuming more flour than they did. They are certainly taking larger amounts of quicksilver from us than formerly.

Q. What are the possibilities or probabilities of improvement in that trade?—A. My impression in regard to our trade with China is that ere many years pass there will be a great increase in our cotton goods. Hitherto they have been confined almost entirely to American drills and sheetings, and the English have had a monopoly of other descriptions of cotton goods; but if we can export from our Eastern States to England and compete with English manufacturers in their home-markets, there is no reason why we should not, ere long, obtain a large proportion of this Chinese trade in American cotton manufactures.

Q. If we could raise cotton here and manufacture it into that class of goods, what amount of demand is there in that market which we could hope to supply?—A. Without the figures of consumption there, it would be impossible for me to tell you; but still it would be a large trade. There has been a large trade for years past, and a very profitable trade.

Q. They use more of cotton in their attire than they use of woolen?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do they manufacture any cotton there themselves?—A. Yes, sir; there are some native manufactures.

Q. What are they?—A. They manufacture largely what is commonly known here as nankeen cloth.

Q. Is there not such a thing as Canton flannel?—A. That is not made there. That is a manufacture of cotton, but still it is not made in China.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What is the price of common agricultural hired labor in China? Do you know?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you not know that it is about $4 a month, and that that is a high price for it?—A. I do not know it; but my idea is that that is quite a good price for agricultural labor in China. Their cost of living is less there.

Q. You think about $4 is a high price?—A. It is about a fair price, from the information I have.

Q. They get about $25 a month here?—A. I think about $30, and find themselves.

Q. Suppose they get $4 there, would they not be willing to come here if they could get $8 a month?—A. No, sir.

Q. How much does it cost to bring a Chinaman here?—A. There is not only the cost of coming here, but there is a difference in the expense of living.

Q. How much does it cost to live in China?—A. You can buy rice in China at about three and a half dollars a pecul of 133 pounds, and here it will cost them about six cents a pound.

Q. Suppose they live on flour at two cents a pound?—A. Flour will not give them the same nourishment as rice, although they are larger consumers of flour than they were a few years ago.

Q. What can a Chinaman live on here a day?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. He can live on 10 cents, can he not?—A. For the actual cost of living, I suppose he could.

Q. That would be about $3 a month?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he would make $5 profit if he got $8 wages?—A. He has got to clothe himself and house himself.

Q. His housing does not cost anything. A Chinaman does not occupy much room. Do you not believe that Chinamen would come here if they got $10 a month?—A. No, sir, I do not.

Q. They only get $4 there, and would not come here for $10 when they can get here for $22?—A. I do not think they can get here for $22.

Q. What does it cost them to reach here in sailing-ships?—A. The passage, generally, is about $25 to $30; but then, again, a man requires some outfit besides that.

Q. Have they not come here for as low as $12?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you not know of their having shipped from here to Hong-Kong for $12?—A. I think not.

Q. You think a man who can only earn $4 a month in China, and can get here for $25, would not come here and work for $12 a month?—A. No, sir, I think not. I think myself I would require a larger sum than that to go among foreigners and leave my country, and work.

Q. Suppose you only got $50 a month here and could get $100 in England, and could get there for $50.—A. I think I would rather work in America for $50 than in England for $100.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. For a Chinaman to come here it would involve leaving his family?—A. I think there is a great difference in that respect. I think the Chinese family ties are strong.

Q. He is very much attached to his country and his family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it more easy for a Chinaman to raise the sum necessary to bring him over here than for an American to raise the sum necessary to bring him here from the States?—A. Yes, I think it is; because there are people in China who have made a business of importing Chinese for the sake of the large interest they get. I do not think you would find any one in this country to carry on such a business. If I would go to a perfect stranger and say that I wanted to go out to the West, I do not think he would advance me the money to go for the sake of the interest on it.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Is it not the fact that coolies were hired to go to Chili and Peru for $5 a month, on contracts for five years?—A. I do not know.

Q. Would they not be as likely to come here for the same wages that would induce them to go to Chili and Peru?—A. I think they would. I do not say they have not gone at that price, but I am not aware of it.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. I understood you to say that they were a different class of people who went there.—A. They all come from the same laboring class. There is a class of people who are called pigs, but it is after they have accepted labor-contracts and in the course of shipment that they are generally known in that way.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Are those who come here generally known as hogs?—A. I have never heard it. I have heard them called a variety of names after they get here.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not think that Chinese labor could prosper here at a rate of payment that white labor could not support itself on, considering the cost of maintaining the family of a white laborer, and the larger amount of comforts that are necessary to an American laborer's family?—A. I think undoubtedly the Chinese can labor here cheaper than the white laborer. At the same time I think a great many whites can labor here vastly cheaper than they are doing. I think that the amount of deposits in our savings-banks, mainly from the laboring classes, is the best evidence of that fact.

Q. I have heard quite an account about the savings-banks and the amount of laborers' savings, and there seemed to be a tone of envy in it. You have no such feeling?—A. Not at all. I am glad that our laborers are saving.

Q. Would you not take it as an evidence that they cannot be a drinking set in this State if the laboring class has laid up sixty millions of money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think that would answer a great many aspersions on their character to the effect that they are idle, worthless, and drunken?—A. I would not characterize the whole of them that way.

Q. You think that would be evidence that they are as a class saving and frugal?—A. As a class, yes, sir. I have evidence before me every day in my walks to and from my business where I pass liquor-saloons and see the number of men hanging about them both by day and by night that makes me think they are spending a great deal of money which could be saved. There is scarcely a day passes that not one and sometimes more applicants come to my house for meals.

Q. In other words, there are men who patronize liquor-saloons here?—A. A large number of them.

Q. Do you think they are the laboring class? Do you not see well-dressed men, brokers and lawyers, patronizing these liquor-saloons?—A. Yes, sir; but the class of liquor-saloons I was referring to are not such as lawyers, brokers, and merchants patronize.

Q. Do you not see another class, perhaps as large, at all our hotels, and at the gilded gin-palaces along Montgomery and Kearny streets, places patronized exclusively by the higher class of men?—A. I see a great many going in and out.

Q. Men who speak with contempt or pity of the laboring class?—A. I do not know that they speak of them with contempt; they may speak with pity. I feel a great deal of pity for numbers of these men.

Q. Why do you pick out the laboring class, then, as patronizing liquor-saloons, when you admit that other classes patronize them so largely?—A. Did I pick them out?

Q. You spoke about the men you saw hanging around liquor-saloons. I wanted to direct your attention to the fact that it is not confined to the laboring classes of this city.—A. You asked me about our laboring classes, whether they were a thriftless set as a class.

Q. I did; and I asked you whether the fact that they have been able to lay aside sixty millions of dollars (I believe that is the amount given as their earnings in savings-banks) was not in your mind evidence that they were a saving class as a rule. You replied "yes, sir," I believe, to that?—A. Yes, I did.

Q. And then you went on to qualify that and to say that you saw liquor-saloons that they patronized?—A. You asked me if they were an idle, thriftless, dissolute, and drunken set.

Q. I asked you if their savings were not proof that they are quite frugal as a class.—A. You asked me if there were any exceptions.

Q. Why do you dwell on that exception, when it is not peculiar to them; but you admit that lawyers, doctors, brokers, and merchants also very largely patronize drinking-saloons?—A. I did not dwell on it as an exception.

Q. You mentioned it as a reproach against this class?—A. I did not mean it as a reproach; I said that they would save more money if it were not spent in that way.

Q. Would not those who consider themselves better also save a great deal more money if they did not patronize these drinking-saloons?—A. Undoubtedly; but I think, as the endeavor was to show that our laboring classes were so badly treated by the Chinese that they could not compete, I had a right to say that there was a disposition to spend their money in that way.

Q. Unquestionably it was the purpose to show that the laboring people spent their money?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know whether any or all of the laboring men have deposits in savings-banks?—A. I know a great many who have.

Q. Then the argument would not apply to that portion of them?—A. Not at all; but I know much more money would be saved but for the fact that I have stated.

Q. Do you know of men in higher ranks, who are considered so, who would have had a great deal more money if they had not spent it in that same way?—A. I am not speaking of it as a peculiarity.

Q. Then I come back to my question, whether you do not think that the Chinamen, with their cheap living, would not be able to work for wages here at a less rate than the American laborer can maintain his family upon and live in the comfort which we should like to see laborers have?—A. Certainly; I can answer yes to that question unhesitatingly.

Q. Then, that being so, is not the demand for Chinese labor equal to the amount of labor there is which may be obtained by any one?—A. No, sir; I do not think that our labor-market here is overstocked.

Q. I do not ask you whether it is, but I ask whether the demand is not of course always for the cheapest article in the labor-market?—A. If it is of equal skill.

Q. It has been testified here that the Chinese have the utmost skill, the greatest adaptability, reliability, and everything of that kind. I ask you, if they can furnish their labor so much cheaper than the white laborer, whether the demand for their labor will not be equivalent to

the amount of labor done on the coast in the process of time?—A. I do not think it will.

Q. Why not?—A. I think there are a great many people who are not willing to employ Chinese labor at all, and I think there are a great many others who will give the preference to white labor, if they can see a fair profit by doing it.

Q. Are not those men compelled by competition with those who do use Chinese labor to use Chinese labor also?—A. I do not think so; I think that a great many employ white labor when they could employ Chinese, and pay more for white labor, in order to obtain a better remuneration for the product of that labor.

Q. Take two men starting a shoe-factory in this town, one of whom employs Chinese labor at half the price that he can get white labor for; which gets the market?—A. I do not know that he could get it at half the price; but I should think that the man with the cheaper labor would make the larger profit.

Q. He could command the market?—A. He could undersell the other.

Q. Then, if he undersells, he drives the other out?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does that not compel the other to use Chinese in self-defense, to keep a footing in the market?—A. It may be, but at the same time the man who was driven out of labor pays less for his boots.

Q. But consequently he has no money to buy the boots?—A. The question is, whether there are not other trades and employments open to him.

Q. If it applies to one trade it must apply to all. I merely use the case of boots as an illustration of the whole. If the American workman is driven from one business to the other by Chinese competition until all these branches are absorbed, what is there left for him?—A. It would take so long to teach the Chinese these various branches, in order to drive out all American labor, and the loss in that way would prevent its being done.

Q One of the points made here is that they learn very readily, that they do just what they are told; but suppose it takes ten years to do it, would we be any better off ten years from now if that should happen?—A. I think in that time we will be pretty well satisfied with the labor we have.

Q. With what labor?—A. With the white labor, or the Chinese labor that may be here.

Q. You think these causes will not produce discontent at the end of that time?—A. I think as our State fills up we shall have cheaper white labor.

Q. As it fills up with what; Chinamen?—A. No, sir.

Q. What inducements has white labor for boot-making, candle-making, match-making, clothing-making, and all other branches, if the work is done by Chinese?—A. I do not think it is all done by Chinese

Q. If it gets to be done by them?—A. I do not think it will get to be. I am merely giving my individual opinion now.

Q. Set aside your individual opinion and take the case which I suppose, which a great many very respectable men believe, what will be the effect then? If the farm-labor, the candle-manufacturing, and all those other departments are taken up by Chinese, what inducement is there for white labor to come?—A. I think as our country increases here, and as industries are opened, there will be further demand for labor.

Q. Suppose those industries are occupied by Chinamen, as boot and

cigar making now are?—A. I think they will find other branches very remunerative.

Q. Suppose those other branches are still occupied by Chinamen?—A. You can suppose *ad infinitum.*

Q. Name what other branches the Chinese will not fill.—A. I think it is the same way with European immigrants. They have taken the lower classes of labor, and it has elevated American labor. You find comparatively few American house-servants.

Q. What do you mean by servants?—A. As domestics in the household.

Q. I am referring to work of artisans, farm-hands, &c.—A. But the Chinese are not all artisans. A great many of them are mere field-laborers, and there they find employment.

Q. I want you to name the business of an artisan that ten years from now you can say the Chinamen will not be in.—A. I cannot name it; that is an impossibility. I cannot tell you anything about what will happen ten years from now.

Q. But you tried to tell me that there would be no fear ten years from now; that everybody would be satisfied. Is it not the fact that there is no trade of the artisan that the Chinaman will not learn, and is not beginning to fill, and will not fill?—A. I am not sufficiently conversant to tell you.

Q. If you cannot name one that he will not fill, what is white labor to do if all the farm-labor, and all the business of artisans, and all the servants are thus opened to the occupation of the Chinese, and will be so filled by them?—A. As I say again, there is a large class in our community who will not employ the Chinese.

Q. You lead me back over the same course. Suppose competition compels them to do it?—A. There are people here who, despite that competition, will not do it.

Q. Must they not fail in business if they cannot command the market?—A. Not entirely.

Q. What are the reasons?—A. I know of instances—when I say I know of them, they have been reported to me by those who are in possession of information—where people say that they frequently employ white labor, and that they employ all white men who will come to them, even when in some cases they have found the Chinese are better laborers; that they prefer the white men, and will employ all who will come to them for employment.

Q. Then the chance of the white men depends upon the simple preference that some persons in the community may have to employ them rather than Chinamen. Is that it?—A. It would to some extent depend on that.

Q. What house were you connected with in China?—A. Oliphant & Co.

Q. Is that house still doing business there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. On as large a scale as formerly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you connected with it now?—A. We are their correspondents.

Q. What is your firm here?—A. Richard B. Irwin & Co.

Q. Are you acquainted with the Cantonese boat-people, or river-men?—A. I have resided in Hong-Kong, which is the chief port of Canton, 96 miles from Canton. I have staid in Canton.

Q. Were you familiar with the inhabitants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know anything about the river-population there, who live and die in their boats?—A. Yes, sir; there is a very large floating population in Canton.

Q. Is that population drawn upon to supply the immigrants w[h] come to this State?—A. I do not think so. I think there are very f[ew] of these Canton boatmen who come here. I think they come from t[he] district adjacent to Canton, but I think these boat-people remain the[re] and attend to their avocation.

Q. Have you mingled enough with the lower orders of Chinese there to observe them?—A. I have observed them in my ordinary every-day walks.

Q. I mean enough to observe their morals and habits?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are their habits and morals?—A. I do not think they are any more immoral than the whites. That is my observation.

Q. Do you know whether or not they are addicted to sodomy?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know whether or not they are addicted to communication with animals, geese, &c.?—A. I do not.

Q. Have you ever heard so?—A. I have heard such things.

Q. Have you heard it stated there?—A. Yes, sir; but I never heard cases stated by any one who was in possession of facts, I believe.

Q. Who stated it there?—A. It is almost impossible to say.

Q. I do not mean the individuals; what class of persons?—A. Merchants, and people with whom I was in the habit of communicating. I have heard such remarks passed among foreigners themselves. I never heard anything of the kind from the Chinese. I never questioned them on the subject.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You state that a large class of the laboring people spend their money in drinking whisky and getting drunk?—A. I did not say a large class.

Q. A class?—A. I said there were exceptions.

Q. You spoke about frequenting saloons, &c., by the laboring people in this city?—A. I said some of them. I did not speak of the laboring class as a whole.

Q. You said that was a habit among the laboring classes?—A. I said there were exceptions. Mr. Sargent spoke of them as being a thrifty, industrious class, and about their having money in the savings-banks, and I said, yes, but that in my daily walks, and in passing from my place of business to my house, I saw numbers of them frequenting the saloons.

Q. Did you go into the saloons?—A. No, sir; I did not. I am not in the habit of going into saloons.

Q. Did you see them drinking?—A. Yes, sir; I did.

Q. What were they drinking?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Have you gone into saloons?—A. I have gone into saloons.

Q. Do not the mass of our brokers, bankers, and merchants go into saloons? Does not the mass of our business men on California street and the merchants and brokers and lawyers go into saloons and drink whisky or some kind of liquor during the day?—A. I see a great number going in and out.

Q. You go in yourself?—A. Very seldom.

Q. You go sometimes?—A. O, yes.

Q. Is that considered a disgrace?—A. I do not know that it is a disgrace; but I think we would all be very much better if we kept out of such places.

Q. I am not asking that question. Is it considered among merchants and business-men a disgrace? Does it lower a man's credit to see him going in and taking a drink of whisky?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Do you think that the lower laboring class, the mechanical class, go into saloons and drink more than the mercantile and banking and broker class of people?—A. I do not know, as a class, but I know that a great many of them do. I very seldom see a merchant, or banker, or broker intoxicated upon the public streets, and I see large numbers of men intoxicated upon the public streets.

Q. People of your class get drunk at home generally?—A. I do not know a great many of them who do.

Q. You think this drinking of liquor is not confined to the lower laboring class?—A. No, sir; I think that the drinking of liquor is not confined to any class in the community.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did you know the Wanderer, a vessel in China, and do you know what her business was there?—A. I knew a vessel called the Wanderer, trading on the Yang-tse-Kiang.

Q. In what business was she engaged?—A. She was trading between the ports. I think she was in some Peruvian trade. She was then commanded by Captain West. There may have been more than one vessel by the name of the Wanderer.

Q. Was that a legitimate business under the laws of China?—A. No, sir; the visiting of non-open ports was prohibited to foreigners.

Q. Do you consider cheap labor and low-priced labor synonymous?—A. I do not know. Labor may be cheap, and yet it may not be low-priced; it may be low-priced, and yet it may be very dear.

Q. Do you think the Chinaman will ever be able to command the same wages that an American will?—A. No, sir; I do not think so.

Q. Do you think he is the equal of the Americans?—A. I do not think so.

Q. Do Chinamen acquire our language readily?—A. It takes them some time. Still a great many of them do pick it up very readily.

Q. Until they acquire a pretty good knowledge of our language, are they able to compete to any great degree with Americans, and to what degree?—A. That would be done under the management of foremen.

Q. It can only be done in gangs with foremen?—A. Just the same as a foreign vessel trading in China will employ Chinese crews with an interpreter.

Q. They could not engage as individuals to work separately?—A. No, sir.

Q. As a general rule, do the Chinamen who come here remain long enough to acquire that knowledge of our language?—A. It is impossible to say how long they would remain. That, I think, would be a matter of inclination and ability—inclination to remain and ability to return.

Q. What is their inclination about returning?—A. I think the most of them return in a few years. They may come back to America again, but they go home and visit their families.

Q. Most of them will return in a few years?—A. Yes, sir; we know that they are constantly coming and going.

Q. Do they as a general rule leave their parents behind them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know to what extent Chinamen are here with their wives?—A. No, sir; I do not. I know that some of our Chinese merchants are married, but the Chinese keep their wives very much at home. I frequently visited the houses of Chinese merchants in China, and sometimes went with American ladies, and while the ladies would be admitted to the apartments of the women, the foreign men never

are; and so it has been here. I have been to the places of business of our Chinese merchants here, and the children have come out, but, as a matter of course, I never made any inquiry in relation to their wives.

Q. Do their wives appear upon the streets?—A. It is not the custom in China, and I do not think it is with the Chinese here. I know the Chinese on that point are very particular.

Q. Would a person navigating a small craft in the waters of China have much opportunity to know the habits, customs, and morals of the empire of China?—A. The general knowledge of the empire of China from people visiting China is confined to the open ports upon the coast which they visit.

Q. What opportunity would a sea-captain have to see anything of the society of the Chinese by visiting these open ports, as the commander of a vessel?—A. I may say that there is no society among the Chinese, as we know society. I should say that the opportunity of seeing the mandarin class would be limited mainly to those with whom he had dealings, or with whom he had an introduction from his consignees; and his opportunities of seeing the females of the family would be about equal to my own; and I may say I had no opportunities whatever.

Q. When you were in China were you acquainted with the hong that Captain King spoke of; I think How Qua?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you know such a hong?—A. I know one How Qua in Canton; a very large merchant, and a very old merchant. There is another How Qua in Hong-Kong, who is a portrait-painter.

Q. Was How Qua the name of individuals?—A. I believe that was the name of the individuals.

Q. What was the business of the one in Canton?—A. The one in Canton was a hong merchant, who was generally known as Old How Qua. The old merchant was dead, and his successor, his son, was doing business, but very little business, living himself as a private merchant with very large means. I have been at his house quite frequently. The one in Hong-Kong I knew nothing about, except that I have seen his sign in the street, How Qua, portrait-painter.

Q. Had he anything to do with chartering vessels?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Was there a How Qua there chartering vessels?—A. Not that I am aware of. There were other houses largely interested in chartering vessels, Wo Hang, Wing Mow Chong, and Cum Chong Tai.

Q. What was the credit of the house of Wo Hang?—A. Very good.

Q. Were they able to make charters also?—A. There was never any difficulty about that if you could agree on the price and terms of the charter.

Q. Did you have anything to do with charters made with Wo Hang?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what capacity?—A. One moment. I am not sure that I ever closed any charter with Wo Hang myself or not; but I know that my house, the house of Oliphant & Co., have done so, and if I was in there when the charters were closed, I may have done so as the consignee of the vessel.

Q. Have you any of those charters here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you produce them?—A. Yes, sir. [Producing papers.]

Q. Mr. King said in his testimony that the credit of these houses was so poor that they could not make a charter without security. You have a number of charters here made with these houses, and among the list charters made with Wo Hang?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many have you there?—A. I have twelve charter-parties

here in all, in eleven of which I had some concern, either in Hong-Kong or here.

Q. With how many of these is Wo Hang a party?—A. Three of them.

Q. They are all with Chinese hongs?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is the firm of Wo Hang composed of a single individual, or how is it composed?—A. It is composed of several individuals, but there was one man who always attended to their chartering business. He was the one who was as often known by the name of Wo Hang as by his Chinese name. His Chinese name I do not know.

Q. Was it very common to address the managing member of a firm by the name of the firm?—A. O, yes.

Q. Is it the same in this city?—A. It is done by those who do not know them personally.

Q. Is it common to call the manager of the Hop Ke Company "Hop Ke"?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you any charter made by Mr. King with a Chinese hong?—A. There is one here.

Q. Is there any security upon any of these charters?—A. Yes, sir; there is a security upon one of these charter-parties:

The said amount to be secured by bills of lading indorsed to Captain Barrett's order, representing cargo of equal value to the amount of this charter.

Q. That is an agreement with the charterer?—A. Yes, sir; I was in Hong-Kong when that was concluded, and that vessel was expected to carry a large amount of passengers.

Q. The statement, then, is not true that the Chinese houses have such bad credit that they cannot charter a vessel without security?—A. I offer documentary evidence on that point.

Q. You say you have a charter here made by Mr. King?—A. Yes, sir. [Producing a paper.]

Q. Is there any surety, or guarantee of security, upon that?—A. No, sir; a portion of that charter-money was paid in Hong-Kong; the balance was to be paid here in San Francisco.

Q. Is this house in any way an agent of the six companies, or any of them?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Have they any agent there known as such?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know what the business of the six companies is here?—A. My knowledge of the six companies is derived mainly from information from others, and general conversation, and observation.

Q. You have been continuously all this time in the China trade?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If they had been engaged in any China trade, would you not have known it?—A. I think I should have known it.

Q. You knew all those who were engaged in the China trade?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever hear of any of these six companies being engaged in any mercantile operations?—A. No, sir.

Q. You never knew of their being engaged in anything of that kind?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. (Indicating a charter.) I see this charter provides, "the captain to have a lien on the cargo for freight, dead freight, and demurrage." Is not that in the nature of a security?—A. That is customary here.

Q. This is Wo Hang & Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Might not Captain King mean that security where the captain is to have a lien on the cargo for it. May not that have been what he meant by security?—A. I do not question that for a moment.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. There is always a lien of that kind?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. A lien for freight and all on the cargo?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. May not Captain King have meant that?—A. He may have meant that; but if he did, he conveyed a wrong impression, because the best merchants in San Francisco, in chartering a vessel to Liverpool, give a lien on the cargo.

Q. Some of these charters do not contain that provision?—A. Most of them do; some of them do not.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. It has been stated that the Chinese have no conception of the dignity of the individual man. Is that a characteristic of the Chinese, or what is their characteristic in that respect?—A. I think a great many of them are apt to resent indignities.

Q. How does it apply to the Chinese generally?—A. I think they are very prone to resent any offense offered to them.

Q. Do you think that statement would not be true as applied to Chinese generally?—A. That is my view of the matter.

Q. Have you tried the Chinese here?—A. Yes, sir; as domestics. I have one in my employ now.

Q. How do you find him in regard to honesty, faithfulness, &c.?—A. He is as honest and faithful a servant as a man could wish for.

Q. Do you make any difference in Chinese servants in regard to trusting your house to them when you are away?—A. No, sir; none whatever.

Q. Do you have any hesitation in leaving your house with this Chinese domestic in charge?—A. No, sir; not the slightest. I would leave it unhesitatingly. I do frequently leave it in his charge, my silver and all quite under his control.

Q. What do you say in regard to their neatness?—A. I would not ask for anything better.

Q. And truthfulness?—A. It is unquestioned. I am speaking of the individual.

Q. Have you had any other experience with the Chinese here than that one?—A. Yes, sir; I have had several of them as servants in my house.

Q. What do you say of them generally in these respects in regard to faithfulness, truthfulness, and honesty?—A. I have found them more or less truthful. I generally have found them very faithful and attentive to their duties; and as to their honesty, it is unquestioned. I felt very badly when one fellow on going away brought his trunk with his clothes and wanted me to look at it to see if he had taken anything away. I looked at it; but it was on the outside.

Q. You had no cause to suspect any of them?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the character of the whole Chinese emigration here, as you have noticed it, as to industry and habits of economy?—A. As far as my personal knowledge goes, I have nothing to say to their disadvantage. As to my hearsay knowledge, that has been very diverse.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 17, 1876.

WILLIAM W. HOLLISTER recalled.

Mr. BEE. Colonel Hollister wishes to file this letter in the appendix. [Producing a paper.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is it a letter of his own?

Mr. BEE. Yes, sir. (See Appendix R, Exhibit 1.) Also a communication with reference to the criminal transaction of Santa Barbara. [Producing a paper.] (See Appendix R, Exhibit 2.)

The WITNESS. I would like, if the commission will permit me, to recall one remark of mine which I made yesterday. Although it does not amount to very much, it was not really what I intended to say, but it was impulsively uttered. The remark was simply that I smoked ten cigars a day, and sometimes got drunk myself. As to the cigars I plead guilty, but I was never drunk in my life. I should like to recall that part of my testimony.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. While you are on the stand I should like to ask you as to the general size of farms in California; in other words, the general average of the farms?—A. They vary very greatly in size here as elsewhere. There are many small farms, and there are a great many large farms. Large farms have grown as a sort of necessity out of the conditions of California, which are abnormal from the beginning to the end. Our grants were made by the Mexican government, and they were slow to disintegrate, owing to very many causes. The chief cause of this, as I hinted yesterday, was the application of the fence-laws to California—a statute iniquitous *per se*, a bad, vicious statute. It governed and controlled very greatly in the land affairs in California. It would be a long story to go through the whole of it, but in the main I state it as a fact.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did the statute provide that the man who owned the land should fence it, or that the man who owned the cattle should fence them in?—A. The fence-law was to the effect that for the purpose of enjoying and using property, the owner was obliged to fence the land, literally to fortify it against the invasion of outsiders and outside stock. It is a law common to many of the older States, but inoperative from disuse. The people have grown wiser than the law.

Q. The law really was that a man could not recover damages for injuries done to his land by the trespassing of cattle, unless he had a good fence?—A. Exactly, except he had a legal fence. That was one of the most important considerations in the world which entered into the aggregation of land in California. It literally forced farmers into small localities accessible to timber, where fortifications could be built.

Q. On the other hand, would not the absence of the fence-law have enabled a man to hold a vast quantity of lands without fencing them, and consequently without expense?—A. I think not. I think, if you protect the citizen by law, you open up the country alike to all men, rich and poor. The citizen should not be obliged to protect himself. The law should be his defense.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What do you call small farmers? What proportion of the farmers here are living on 80 or 160 acres, corresponding with the farms that we have in Indiana or Ohio?—A. They are very large in numbers in proportion to the large tracts. Our lands are disintegrating rapidly, as fast as there is anybody to occupy them. There is no want of lands or

lands cheap enough, but the farmers are not here. We have lands that we have been offering in the market for ten years at a maximum of from four to ten dollars an acre. We sold one very remarkably fine farm for ten dollars, and the lands are to day held at fifty dollars by the purchasers.

Q. What were the average prices that you got for Lompoc?—A. Ten dollars and sixty cents. It was one of the finest farms in California; that was a price unusually high. It shows the value put upon it by those who made the purchase.

Q. You say these large tracts are becoming broken up into small farms?—A. Every day, as fast as the purchasers come here. The lands will go to the plow as fast as there is anybody to buy them. As I stated, one of the difficulties of buying land in small quantities has been the operation of the fence-law. The small proprietor could not buy land of the large proprietor because the small proprietor insisted upon his right, under the fence-law, to turn his animals out, and let them run at will. The large farmer was afraid of being grazed to death, and dared not sell at any price.

Q. That law has been repealed?—A. That law has been repealed. The trespass laws, generally, I think, apply now to most of the agricultural counties of the State. You see how utterly impossible almost it was to subdivide the lands of this State while those fence-laws were in operation. I, for instance as a proprietor, could not sell 160 acres——

Senator SARGENT. We do not need an argument upon the question.

The WITNESS. I want to state just one proposition. I could not sell my land because the purchaser insisted on the right to turn his animals out. If I let him have 160 acres for farming purposes he might graze a thousand acres of my land, so that I was not only forced to hold on to what I had, but rather tempted to buy more to prevent aggression. The trespass-law now admits of disintegration.

FRANCES AVERY sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. Eight years next December.

Q. What business have you been connected with in the State?—A. Several.

Q. Were you the secretary of the California Pacific Railroad at one time?—A. I was connected with that railroad. I was not the secretary.

Q. Are you familiar with Chinese labor?—A. Somewhat.

Q. Have you employed them in your family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How have you found them as house-servants?—A. All that could be desired.

Q. Trustworthy and competent?—A. Entirely trustworthy and competent.

Q. And honest?—A. And honest. I had one servant temporarily in employ when I had some friends visiting me who was a little dishonest, but he was the only exception.

Q. Have you trusted them, in the absence of your family, with the care of your house and valuables?—A. Yes, sir; I have left everything in the house in their charge, open.

Q. Do you think the Chinese, employed as domestic servants, displace white girls?—A. They may to some extent.

Q. As a general proposition?—A. I do not think they do.

Q. Have you observed the immigration of Chinese, as to numbers?—A. No, sir; only in a general way.

Q. Only as you get it from the newspapers?—Yes, sir.

Q. You are somewhat familiar with various enterprises. Were you not connected with the Saucelito Land and Ferry Company at one time?—A. I am now.

Q. Do you think it policy to restrict the number of Chinese emigration at the present time, as against the departures, say?—A. No, sir.

Q. If we had a population in 1862 or 1863 of 300,000 people, in round numbers, and 60,000 or 75,000 Chinese at that time, in round numbers, and we now have a population of 600,000 or 700,000 of all classes, including Chinese, and Chinese exclusively to the amount of 120,000, do you think that we have had, since 1860, any influx or increase not proportionate with the increase of white population?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then, do you think, if we had an increase of 500,000 more whites in the next ten years, and an increase of 200,000 more Chinese here than what we have now, that we would have too many?—A. That is a question which I do not think anybody can answer. It will depend entirely on the improvements going on in the State and the demand for labor.

Q. Taking the past fifteen years from 1860 as your basis, with the same proportionate increase since 1860, with a population of 500,000 more whites, and double the amount of Chinese that we have now, do you think it would be detrimental to the interests of the coast?—No, sir, I do not think it could be.

Q. In other words, your opinion is that our necessities require this gradual increase in the same proportion with the increase of whites?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why do you think so?—A. Because I think that as the population of the State increases we will have a larger demand for laborers, and must get them.

Q. Do you think this proportionate increase of the whites and of Chinese adds to the labor and usefulness of the Chinese and gives them more employment?—A. Yes, sir; that is my observation.

Q. How have you found those Chinese that you have met and done business with?—A. Straight, square.

Q. As to their habits, how do you find them?—A. So far as I am able to judge, their habits are as good as the habits of any other class of people.

Q. Are your house-servants cleanly in their person?—A. Remarkably so.

Q. Do they ever talk impudently to your family?—A. I never knew but one to do that, and he was a cook. My experience with cooks is that if they are good they are usually impudent.

Q. Do they claim privileges at night and at day through the week?—A. Not greater than those claimed by other servants.

Q. Have you had any experience with the other class of servants?—A. Not in this country, except with nurses.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do you mean when you say that they do not displace white girls? Suppose there is employment for 7,000 domestic servants in this city and 6,500 of them are Chinese, do you think that so far they occupy the field or do not occupy the field?—A. I do not think they displace them any more than you can say Irish servants displace Americans.

Q. May not that be true also?—A. That may be true in one sense.

Q. May not the Irish servants be citizens of the United States?—A. That may be.

Q. It is simply a citizen taking the place of another citizen, but I am speaking of Chinese. When they occupy the field, do they not displace other labor?—A. If you look at it in that way you might say they do; but in regard to the employment of servants in my own experience, and I presume it is the same with everybody else, the people want good servants, and you might as well complain of good servants displacing poor ones because the poor ones are out of employment.

Q. So that as a rule you say that white servants are poor and that Chinese servants are good?—A. I have said nothing of the kind.

Q. I asked you when the Chinese occupy the field if they do not displace others. You replied by saying that the best may displace the poorest. That does not prevent the displacement, does it?—A. No, sir; that would not prevent the displacement.

Q. Then they do to a certain extent displace white girls if they occupy the field?—A. If you put it in that way.

Q. Is not that the way to put it?—A. I do not think it is.

Q. The question was asked how do they displace white girls. Can they both occupy the field at the same moment? If you employ Chinese servants you do not employ white servants?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then the Chinese take the place the whites otherwise would have?—A. If I could not get good servants I would take the best I could get.

Q. I am simply asking whether they can both occupy the same places at the same time.—A. No, sir; they cannot.

Q. Then if the Chinese occupy the place they displace the others?—A. In that sense they do, but quality comes in as an element in that question.

Q. Then I ask you if you mean to say, as a rule, that white servants are bad and Chinese are good?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then I do not see what quality has to do with it. Do you think any number of Chinese in this State would be too many?—A. Yes; I think there might be too many here.

Q. Why?—A. If there were more here than could find employment there would be too many.

Q. Do you think that there could be too many white population here up to the extent of five or ten million?—A. If they did not find profitable occupation for themselves or others there would be too many.

Q. Do you know what the capacity of this State is for population, not crowding it more than Massachusetts is crowded?—A. I know that it is very large.

Q. Some fifteen million?—A. It might be as many as that.

Q. Do you think it would be a misfortune to this State to have as large a population as Massachusetts has?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think it would be a misfortune to this State to have as large a population of Chinamen as Massachusetts has of white people?—A. We could not tell until we had them here.

Q. I ask your opinion. I come back to my first question. Do you think we could have too many Chinese here?—A. In order to answer that question I would have to give you my own views about it.

Q. That is what I want?—A. As an American, I do not believe in having too many foreigners here.

Q. Do you make no distinction between foreigners?—A. Very little.

Q. You would just as lief have the Chinaman as the German?—A. If they behave themselves.

Q. You would just as lief have the Chinaman as a permanent element of our population?—A. If they behaved themselves and proved them-

selves worthy of privileges, I do not see any reason why they should not live here as well as any other foreigners.

Q. Laying aside the if, which would you prefer, Chinamen or Germans, to build up our State as a permanent population, having in view our civilization and our institutions?—A. If they did not speak the language, I should think they might be possibly a detriment, but until I get further information on that subject I do not wish to express an opinion.

Q. With that exception, considering our institutions and moral welfare, are they as good as the Germans?—A. I do not think we have had an opportunity of judging yet.

Q. Have you any opinion on the matter at all?—A. I should have some hesitation in saying that they were as good as the Germans.

Q. Why?—A. Probably because they are aliens and they seem stranger to me than any other foreigners.

Q. Are there any other reasons?—A. That would be the only reason.

Q. Do you know anything about their habits of life in what is called the Chinese quarter?—A. Only from passing through there.

Q. Do you see that in any other element of our population?—A. No, sir; not to the same extent.

Q. Do you think that is a pleasant feature?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know whether they have a habit of first and second wives—what we call polygamy?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know anything about their buying and selling women?—A. I have heard of such a thing among them.

Q. That being true, is that an objection or a recommendation?—A. If it were true I should consider it an objection. But I have also heard of something very similar going on with white women.

Q. Buying and selling them?—A. It is not called buying and selling them, but it is really a kind of trade in them.

Q. That is done to a very limited extent?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is not that which you refer to simply that some persons make a nefarious business of enticing girls, under promise of fine clothes, &c., into houses of prostitution?—A. Yes, sir; it begins in that way, as I have understood. It is a matter that I know nothing about personally, only from what I have seen in the newspapers, and heard.

Q. That is not an American custom?—A. No, sir.

Q. You do not know of four thousand women held in that way in this city?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY;

Q. Are you an American citizen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was your father an American citizen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was your grandfather an American citizen?—A. I believe so.

Q. Was your great-grandfather an American citizen?—A. I believe my great-grandfather was an Englishman.

Q. How far do you have to go back to become a foreigner?—A. About as far as any other American.

Q. Then might not these men whom you now style foreigners, new immigrants from Europe, become, in the course of a generation, as respectable a citizen as you are?—A. I should hope so.

Q. Do you think the Chinese in two or three generations come up to your standard of morals, civilization, and intelligence?—A. Some of them.

Q. What proportion of those who come here?—A. That I am unable to say.

Q. Can you guess?—A. No, sir.

Q. In what State were you born?—A. Ohio.

Q. Do you employ Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it not because you employ Chinese, and because you find it convenient, comfortable, and profitable to do so, that you entertain these views regarding them?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know much about them?—A. In one sense I do.

Q. Do you know anything of their habits in China?—A. No, sir; I have never been there.

Q. Do you know anything of their institutions?—A. Not much.

Q. Do you know anything of their literature?—A. No, sir; I have never read any of it.

Q. Do you know anything of their language?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know anything of their manners, habits, or customs?—A. Only what I have read and heard from friends who have lived in China.

Q. You have never heard of their polygamous system, their dual wives?—A. I have heard of that.

Q. Have you ever heard of the purchase and sale of Chinese women for prostitution?—A. I have heard of that.

Q. The sale of female children?—A. I have heard of the sale of women for prostitution, but I have never seen anything of it.

Q. Do you know anything about it? Had you these things in your mind when you testified as to the relative value of the Chinese race and European immigration?—A. When I speak about the value of the Chinese population, it is generally with a view to their value as a laboring element.

Q. With a view to their present value as laborers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As to their advancement of the material welfare of the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q You have not considered the moral or political question?—A. I have, so far as I am able to judge of the Chinese.

Q. I ask you if you have considered the moral and political questions involved in the future of this State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you think about it? Do you think the morals of the Chinese are equal to ours?—A. In some respects, I do.

Q. In what respect?—A. As far as integrity is concerned.

Q. Do you believe in the Christian religion?—A. I do.

Q. Do they?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you believe in the Bible?—A. I believe I do.

Q. Do they?—A. They do not; they do not know anything about it.

Q. Is their civilization like ours?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is not their civilization diametrically opposed to ours in nearly all respects?—A. In many respects.

Q. Which is the best?—A. Ours, in my opinion.

Q. Then having conceded these facts, which do you think in the ultimate future of California would make the better State?—A. I do not think if California were to turn into another China it would be any advantage to it.

Q. Why not?—A. Because it would be retrogression from our present standard.

Q. In what respect would it be retrogressive?—A. Because I think it would be bad for us to be under their form of religion or under their control.

Q. Then you are not in favor of restricting immigration?—A. That would depend on circumstances.

Q. Under what circumstances would you be in favor of unrestricted immigration? You understand the meaning of the word "unrestricted?"

—A. I do. I do not think there is any necessity for any legislation on the subject.

Q. That I have not asked you. I asked you simply whether you are in favor of unrestricted immigration. You said you were, under certain circumstances. I ask you now, what are the circumstances?—A. If the Chinese do not get control of this country and make another China of it.

Q. Up to what point in numbers would that danger commence?—A. When they should become citizens with power to vote and control matters.

Q. And exceed ourselves in number?—A. Possibly.

Q. Then up to the point that their numbers would not exceed ours, you think it is desirable that they should be permitted to come here. Do you know enough of the law to know whether they can become citizens or not?—A. No, sir; but I have always understood that they could not. My impression is that they are prohibited from becoming citizens.

Q. For what reason?—A. Because they are Mongolians.

Q. Europeans are admitted to citizenship?—A. O, yes.

Q. Is that because they are Europeans?—A. No, sir.

Q. You do not know, then, the reason why the naturalization laws discriminate against the Chinese?—A. I am satisfied that it is because people are afraid that if the Chinese are allowed to become citizens they may try to introduce their manners and customs here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What interest do the Chinese take in politics at the present day?—A. None, so far as I can find out.

Mr. BEE, (producing a paper.) Read that article from the San Francisco Chronicle of November 16, so far as it is marked.

The witness read as follows:

ANTI-COOLY MASS-MEETING—THE PROCESSION—THE ATTENDANCE AT THE PAVILION, ETC.

The anti-coolyites held a mass-meeting at the Mechanics' Pavilion last evening. The various clubs formed in line on Third street and marched to the pavilion via Market, Sixth, and Mission streets. Some very peculiar transparencies were borne aloft in the procession, one of them representing a hideous Mongolian countenance rampant on a field argent surmounting the strange device, "Hence, horrible shadow!" A big club couchant completed the banner. Another transparency demanded the immediate abrogation of the Burlingame treaty and denounced the witnesses before the Chinese commission. Another exhibited a skull. The ninth-ward club carried a gallows from which an effigy of Rev. Otis Gibson gracefully dangled, and when the main body of the procession had filed into the hall the Rev. Gibson was ruthlessly burned at the stake by the demonstrative crowd.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did you see that procession?—A. No.

Q. Does the paper there state how many there were in it, and how large the meeting was?—A. I do not know.

Senator SARGENT. I wish you would look and see.

Mr. BEE, (indicating.) Please read those four lines.

The witness read as follows:

HORACE DAVIS.—Horace Davis, the recently elected member of Congress from the San Francisco district, spoke for about fifteen minutes.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What class of people generally burn people in effigy, in your opinion? What class compose the society of San Francisco, in your opinion, who would lower themselves to this low, dastardly mode of satisfaction?—A. I should think they were people incapable of any lowering.

Q. You think that that is about as low as they could get?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your opinion, then, if they should burn any one in effigy you would take the class who did it as the lowest strata of any community?—A. No; I could not always say that.

Q. There might be exceptions?—A. There might be exceptions.

Q. If you saw that act condemned by the better class of people and by the press of this city in unmeasured terms, when they had burned in effigy a respectable citizen, a man representing a high office in the keeping of this people, what would you think of it? Would you think they belonged to the same class under the same circumstances?—A. I should think probably they did.

Mr. BEE. I want you to read from the Post of yesterday a communication begining there, (indicating.)

The witness read as follows:

If the respectable Christian (?) nobility on this coast want communism established and civil war inaugurated throughout this magnificent country, where there is plenty for all if properly distributed; if Christian ministers can be hired for such base purposes, let them beware lest the shadow which went through the streets on Wednesday evening may not become a dreadful reality. You may pen up Chinamen like swine, but you cannot make slaves of white men.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know how large that pavilion is?—A. I know that it is very large. I have been out there.

Q. That is the pavilion where the great republican demonstration was held the night Senator Booth spoke?—A. Yes, sir; I believe so.

Q. The number stated at that time as present was 7,000. Do you think that hall would hold 7,000?—A. Hardly.

Q. About that?—A. The one or two times that I have been in the building I never estimated its capacity; but, judging from my memory of it, I should judge from four to five thousand would fill it comparatively full.

Q. Union Hall would hold that number, would it not?—A. I say I never estimated the number the pavilion might hold.

Q. It runs from street to street, does it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many acres does it cover?—A. That I could not tell you.

Q. It is an enormously great building, in which the Mechanics' Institute was held?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. This account says:

By 7 o'clock in the evening the crowd began to assemble at the pavilion, and the hall was soon after full.

Then it must have been an assemblage of six or seven thousand people?—A. If the hall was full, and if it will hold that number.

Q. I read further from the Chronicle, from which you have just read:

The management had made no preparation for reserving seats for the men marching in the procession, and in consequence, when they arrived, they were obliged to get in as best they could. Several hundred organized a meeting in the southern portion of the pavilion, improvised a platform, and listened to several speakers. About 150 ladies, members of the Workingwomen's Club, had been invited, but upon arriving were obliged to return home, no place having been provided for them. The Industrial School band opened the meeting with a national air.

That must have been a very large meeting?—A. From that account it would seem to be so; I did not go to it.

Q. This is the authority from which you read. Do you know by whom the meeting was called to order?—A. I have seen that it was called to order by Mr. Bryant.

Q. The mayor of the city?—A. The mayor of the city.

Q. I find this in the continuation of Mr. Davis's speech:

He said the assembling of so many people was incontrovertible evidence that the people took an interest in the matter of Chinese immigration, and that they were sincere in desiring a restriction of the influx.

Do you find in that sentiment anything to condemn, as an expression of his opinion?—A. No, sir; not in that.

Q. Again:

He made a brief reference to the rebellion, which was owing to the introduction of an element foreign to the desires of the people, and believed that if the Chinese were allowed to come here in the future it would lead to another fratricidal war.

Do you find anything in that which reflects upon his character as a patriotic citizen of this State?—A. No, sir. I do not agree with him.

Q. There is a difference of opinion upon it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There seemed to be, however, six or seven thousand people there who did agree with him, and others who went away because they could not get in?—A. According to that account.

Q. This item in the Post, to which your attention was called, seems to have been a communication signed by "T. H." Did you notice that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is not the expression of an editorial opinion?—A. I noticed that.

Q. I find several communications here, and over the heads of them it says: "The editor is not responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents." Did you notice that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you mean to imply by your testimony that that was the opinion of the respectable Post?—A. I did not wish to be so understood. I should hope that neither the Post nor any other paper would support such views as those.

Q. Is it not true that the people of this city, as a rule, are opposed to violence against any classes?—A. Yes, sir; I think so.

Q. Is it not also true that this Chinese question is a source of great irritation among large numbers of our people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is it strange, where large numbers of our people are irritated, that here and there a man should write a communication wherein he would express opinions that are violent?—A. No, sir,

By Mr. BEE:

Q. About what is the population of this city? Do you recollect at what Mr. Langley estimates it?—A. No, sir.

Q. 250,000? 300,000?—A. I have been given to understand that they claim 250,000.

Q. Have you seen anything in any of the papers condemning the burning of a witness here in effigy?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is it an unusual thing for American citizens, where they very much disapprove of the course of a man, to burn him in effigy? Have you not heard of those things happening in all parts of the country?—A. Yes, sir; but they are rare.

Q. They are rare in this city, are they not?—A. Yes, sir. I speak of the whole country, including California. I am glad to say that they are rare.

Q. Still those things occur?—A. Yes, sir; they have occurred in other places.

Q. Did you ever see an instance of it yourself?—A. I do not think I

ever witnessed an instance of that kind. I have heard of several in the course of my life.

Q. If you never witnessed an instance of it, how do you know but that respectable people may take that mode of expressing their protest against that which they very much disapproved?—A. I intended to convey in my answer to Colonel Bee's direct question the fact that under some circumstances some respectable people might take part in such a thing; but as a rule I should think that persons who would do such a thing as that belonged to the very lowest class.

Q. Did you ever hear of the instance of Martin Luther and those who believed with him burning certain books publicly that they disapproved of?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you remember, in revolutionary times, about the time of the declaration of our independence from England, George III and his ministers were burned in effigy in many of the principal cities of the United States?—A. My impression is that I have heard of that; I think something of that kind took place.

Q. So that on occasions of great public feeling it is not unusual for that form of expression of dissent to take place?—I will not go so far as that; I will say that in cases of great public excitement and indignation such things have taken place, but it is the exception, not the rule.

Q. Is that not because the people rarely get terribly excited over matters of that kind? It is very rare that occasions arise for circumstances like the declaration of independence against England on account of outrages which we supposed we received from them, taxation without representation, &c., sending the Hessians to our shores, and the breaking out of a great rebellion in our land, where I believe there were a number of those instances, were there not?—A. There may have been.

Q. And this influx of Chinese, now one-sixth of our whole population, greatly moving certain classes of society—those occasions are somewhat rare in history?—A. I believe they are.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. They burned witches in Massachusetts?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Did they burn the effigies of witches?—A. They generally burned the witches themselves.

Q. That is another affair, then. Sir Mathew Hale, I believe, sentenced a witch to be burned?—A. I believe so.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Civilization has advanced some since that day?—A. I think it has.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. They do not burn witches now?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You live in this city?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How extensively are Chinese employed in the capacity of domestic servants in this city?—A. That I cannot answer, only to say to a very large extent.

Q. Why are they employed?—A. Because they make better servants.

Q. Do you think it is on account of their quality as servants that they are given employment?—A. Yes, sir; I am sure of that, because, as far as I am able to find out, the wages paid them are the same as the wages paid by persons employing white servants.

Q. Is there any difficulty in getting white female servants in this city?—A. There is difficulty, I understand, in getting good ones; but there is that same difficulty in the East. There is an abundance of white servants, and plenty of them get employment.

Q. I understand, then, that the Chinese are employed because of their character as servants?—A. Yes, sir. In fact, in many cases I may say, I have heard of people who employed them for no other reason, people who did not like the Chinese, and were prejudiced against them.

Q. What is your impression as to the trust reposed in them by people? Do they leave their houses, with Chinese in charge of their houses in their absence, with as much freedom as they leave their homes with other servants in charge?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there or is there not as much trust reposed in their integrity as in white servants?—A. I think there is.

Q. Do you think they are as free from the charge of petty stealing as white servants?—A. Yes, sir. My experience in that respect shows them to be fully as trustworthy as the generality of white servants.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. I understand that you are the agent of Mr. Rulofson for contracting for labor?—A. My connection with the California Pacific Railroad was as Mr. Rulofson's agent. He was one of three contractors for building the road. He attended to the financial part of the business. Mr. Haskins was the working contractor who employed Chinamen in building the road.

Q. It was in that connection that you made your observations about Chinese outside of domestic employment?—A. Yes, sir.

FREDERICK W. MACONDRAY sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you lived in this city?—Answer. I have been here twenty-four years, or more.

Q. You are of the house of Macondray & Co.?—A. I am.

Q. It is an old mercantile house here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your house has been extensively engaged, I believe, in the trade with China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What have been your relations with the Chinese with whom you have dealt as to their integrity, honesty, and ability, and as business men?—A. From all our dealings with them here and in China I do not know any class of merchants, I think, who are more honest and upright or who have a better reputation for integrity than the Chinese.

Q. To what extent in round numbers do you deal with the Chinese in a monetary point, annually?—A. Perhaps $500,000 or $600,000 a year. We have never lost a dollar by them to my knowledge in twenty-six years.

Q. You have business relations with the white people?—A. Of course.

Q. How do they compare with Chinese in their honesty and integrity as merchants, favorably or otherwise?—A. They do not compare, of course, as favorably as the Chinese.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In what line of business is your house engaged?—A. In shipping to China and importing teas and sugar and rice. We have ships and steamers consigned to us from China, and we send ships and steamers from here to China.

Q. What proportion of your entire business is with the Chinese?—A. I could scarcely answer that question.

Q. You spoke about $500,000 or $600,000 annually being your trade with the Chinese, and I simply wanted to get at the aggregate of your business.—A. Possibly half of it is done with the Chinamen.

Q. You say you have never lost a dollar in your traffic with them?—A. Not to my knowledge, never a dollar.

Q. Have you had losses?—A. Of course. I only speak of my own knowledge. I have been in the house some sixteen years, and in that time I am quite sure that we have never lost a dollar by the Chinese.

Q. Have you had losses? Have you lost by white people?—A. Certainly, we have. Of course, we must have done that.

Q. Are your contracts with Chinese generally made in writing?—A. No, sir; I do not know that I have ever made a contract with a Chinaman in writing.

Q. They are verbal contracts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they comply with them?—A. They do.

Q. In dealing with white people are your contracts verbal or in writing?—A. That is according to the custom. With the white people, of course we make contracts in writing very often, but at other times we do not.

Q. What is the ability of Chinamen as merchants?—A. I think it is good. I have been to China in nearly all the different ports there, and have seen the different kinds of Chinamen, the northern and the southern Chinese.

Q. What is their capacity to manage a large business?—A. I think it is good. They have good ability to do that. There are more of the mercantile class in the southern part of China as a general thing than in the northern part.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Suppose you sell a cargo that arrives, or a portion of it, to an American, English, German, or any mercantile firm, do you make that contract binding in writing?—A. We do sometimes, and sometimes we do not.

Q. Do you ever make it binding or otherwise with Chinese houses?—A. We do not do such business with Chinese generally as to sell a cargo that arrives.

Q. Or a portion of it?—A. No, sir:

Q. You say you have lived in China. How long were you there?—A. I was there twice; a year, perhaps, in all.

Q. What class of Chinese emigrate to this country from China?—A. People from the southern part of China only, from one province. I think there are very few other Chinamen here.

Q. As a class how are they looked upon in China as to their standing; in other words, what class emigrate to this country from China?—A. There is the mercantile class who come here, and then there are simply these laborers, artisans, &c.

Q. There is a lower order below those people in China?—A. I should fancy there would be.

Q. Then they occupy a position there relatively to our laboring population here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the physical condition of the Chinese who come here?—A. I think their physical condition is good. I think they are healthy and strong.

Q. From your observation of the class who have been coming here for 25 years, is it liable to breed disease by coming in contact with our race?—A. I do not know that I am able to pronounce on that subject. I think, as a rule, they are strong and healthy, able-bodied men.

Q. Do you know from your experience in China whether they come here voluntarily or under compulsion?—A. My impression is that they all come here voluntarily. I think some have come here under contracts between particular men.

Q. How far does the contract go? Is it the advance of money for their passage?—A. I presume that is it. I really know nothing about that matter at all.

Q. You know of no contracts ever having been made for servile labor here, like the cooly system?—A. No; I never knew a case of that kind. We have never had anything to do with bringing Chinese here or importing them in any way. We have had offers of that character from the Southern States to take them to Louisiana, but never have done anything of the kind at all. I really know nothing about their importation.

Q. You have a line of ships from here to China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you bring any passengers by those ships?—A. When they wish to come, of course.

Q. What is the passage-money?—A. It is about $30 by a sailing-ship. They always come at one season of the year, and go back at another season.

Q. How cheap has the passage been at any time of rivalry, as Mr. Pixley puts it?—A. I think they have been brought from Hong-Kong as low as, perhaps, $25. I think never less than that; but we have taken from here to China at as low as $8.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. It is in evidence here that on one occasion of rival lines the Chinese were brought for $12 or $15?—A. Possibly, but I never heard of it. I think $25 is about as low as they have ever been taken from Hong-Kong. We have taken them back this year for $8.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do they learn trades and work in factories here?—A. I presume so. I really know nothing about that. I speak of the mercantile class principally, for I have no connection with any other.

Q. Suppose that our population in 1860 aggregated 350,000. We had at that time in the neighborhood of 70,000 Chinese here. Our population now, in 1876, is rated in round numbers at over 700,000; and it is estimated that we have 120,000 Chinese on this coast. Do you think that that is any too large an increase of Chinese in proportion to the increase in white population? Would it have in the future, or has it had in the past, a depressing influence morally or otherwise upon the people of this State?—A. I think that the Chinese who have come here have certainly added to the material prosperity of the State; but I think that there are quite enough of them here now. My impression is that the Chinese themselves do not care about any more coming.

Q. Your business relations here make you familiar with the Chinese merchants. Do you not think they can regulate the emigration of Chinese from Hong-Kong to this country a great deal better and more satisfactorily than legislation on that subject had by the Government of the United States? Taking in view the abrogation of treaties, the stoppage of commerce, would it be better to leave the matter with the Chinese alone?—A. I think it is better left with the people. If they do not employ the Chinese, they will not come here. I think the Chinese merchants are satisfied there are enough Chinamen here now, and perhaps more than can find employment. When people do not employ them they go home. I think the Chinese merchants are not anxious that any more should come at the present time.

Q. Do you think there is any necessity for placing any restriction upon their immigration?—A. There might be some restriction placed upon it if people are at all anxious about it.

Q. You refer to those who have real actual fears?—A. Yes; I am sure if the Chinese are not engaged here they will go away, and that is all of it.

Q. Do you find them generally an educated class?—A. O, yes. I never saw one who could not read and write.

Q. They are sober and industrious?—A. Yes.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How many were arriving here a month, last February, March, and April?—A. I think there were not many who came in February, but possibly in the latter part of February, and after that, perhaps 2,000, or 3,000, or 4,000 a month.

Q. It is stated that as high as 6,000 came in one month.—A. Possibly in one month there were 6,000, and in another month 2,000 or 3,000; but I think, on an average, for these three months there could not have been more than 3,000 or 4,000.

Q. I refer to about the time the Supreme Court made a decision showing that there was no power of regulation of it in the State, when the people here became alarmed and held large public meetings. Up to that time in those two or three months were not the Chinese coming in great numbers?—A. Yes; and that is the time they do come. They never come at other times of the year, to any extent.

Q. Was it ever known in the previous history of Chinese immigration that they came in such large numbers as at that time?—A. I think every year at that time they come in very large numbers, 1,000, 2,000, or 3,000 in a month.

Q. But at that time the immigration was extraordinary?—A. Yes, I know it was.

Q. Do you know what stopped that? Do you not know that the Chinese merchants here became alarmed on account of the great excitement in the city over the decision of the Supreme Court and the great numbers that were coming, and that they made exceptional efforts by telegrams to stop the Chinese from coming?—A. Yes; I am quite aware of that. They did stop it.

Q. They did not make any effort to stop it, however, until these circumstances to which I allude took place; that is to say, not until the decision of the Supreme Court and the great public meetings, and the great petitions which were sent to Congress? Then, what evidence have we that the Chinese desire to stop it except on account of this exceptional state of public opinion, or rather this working up of public opinion?—A. I do not know that they had any purpose in it. I simply state that, in my opinion, if the people did not want them here the Chinese would not come. If they did not employ them they certainly would not come, and those who are here would go back. At this time they are returning. The steamer yesterday took about seven hundred, and the other steamer, the City of Tokay, will take out about a thousand.

Q. Do you think that is owing to the opinion of the public that their presence is not desirable?—A. I think it is.

Q. Do you think that opinion is quite prevalent?—A. I think it is.

Q. Among the people generally of this State?—A. I know simply that a great many of the Chinese are out of employment. Of course when they find they cannot get employment, or see that there is very little chance of it, they return to China. Then this is the season of the year, in the fall and winter, when they usually go back.

Q. You express the opinion that there are quite enough of them here now?—A. I think so.

Q. You think there are quite enough of white population here?—A. Not at all; of course not.

Q. A very large increase in white population who come here and make permanent homes is desirable, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. You do not think the same desirability exists as far as the Chinese are concerned?—A. Not the same, of course.

Q. In other words, you think it is better for the civilization of our State that it should be settled up by white people?—A. Certainly. I think if more white people came here, then it would be no harm to have a few more Chinese come here.

Q. Suppose the white people come here and go to work for themselves, building up farms, starting manufactories, and doing their own work, do you think that is more desirable than to have a mere labor class that will not become permanent citizens?—A. Certainly.

Q. Then you believe in American civilization as against the Asiatic civilization?—A. I do, of course.

Q. You think its prevalence upon our coast would be better than the other?—A. I think there is no question about that at all.

Q. In your description of the peculiarities which you observe in the Chinese, I think, you stated that you refer to the merchant class with which you are brought in contact?—A. I do.

Q. Did you have an opportunity to see much of the lower orders of Chinese?—A. I have seen a good many of them.

Q. The gentleman who sits there, a Chinaman—I am sorry I cannot remember his name—(The CHINAMAN. Wa-Kew.)—stated to me the other evening in the presence of Colonel Bee, at a Chinese store, that a large part of those who come to this city in these passenger-ships are the Cantonese boatmen who live on the river, &c. I think I am correct in my recollection, that is, that they are of the lower classes. Does that correspond with your opinion?—A. Yes. They are not all boatmen, but they come from the different districts around Canton. The northern Chinese do not emigrate at all. I do not know that there are fifty men outside of the Canton province in the city.

Q. Does your impression concur with that which I stated what I understood the Chinese gentleman to say, that those two classes largely fill up the lower order of passengers who come across?—A. They are boatmen, I understand.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. They live in boats?—A. They live in boats; some of them are born there and never go ashore.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I do not speak of all of them?—A. I think very many of them are boat-people. They have streets of boats, the boats anchored together.

Q. Do you know the character of the people who thus live on the water?—A. I do not know their character more than the character of those who live on the land; they are poor people.

Q. Do you not know that they have the reputation of being thieves and pirates?—A. Not those people. You are thinking of another kind of men, what they call river-pirates there. Those are not the people who come here, in my opinion. These people who live in the boats are poor and honest and industrious, the same as the poorer class who live on shore. The boats are not moved; they are anchored there just the

same as our buildings where the city is filling up down here on the wharves.

Q. They do not carry on agriculture there?—A. No, but they have stores and houses and live there. The boats are never moved.

Q. It was stated that a large class of those who come are agriculturists?—A. I think there are quite a number of them of that class.

Q. If a large proportion of them are agriculturists, a large proportion of them could not come from the boats?—A. I do not know how many come from the boats, or how many come from the agricultural districts.

Q. Were you ever much in that floating town?—A. I have been through it a number of times. I never had any trouble in China. I never had anybody do me as I see people here very often do the Chinese, throw stones at them and bricks, and everything of that kind. I have been through the cities of Fuhchau and Canton, and I never was troubled.

Q. Have you never heard of foreigners being molested there?—A. I have read of such things. I have been in the tea districts, lived in the joss-houses there, saw the tea growing and picked, and they never troubled me at all.

Q. Have you heard of the massacre of the missionaries—men and women—at Tientsin?—A. Yes; but the Chinese do not come here from Tientsin. The northern races do not emigrate at all.

Q. Tientsin is an open port?—A. Yes, sir; it is up in the gulf of Pichila. It is the port of Peking.

Q. Do you know why others than the Cantonese do not come from the open ports?—A. I think it is a peculiarity of the Canton men that they like to emigrate, and the others do not. I do not know why it is, but such is the case. I have never heard of northern men going away—Fuhchau or Shanghai men.

Q. May it not be because these persons away from Hong-Kong and Canton have not heard so much about this El Dorado of ours, and consequently what we used to call the gold-fever has not carried them off?—A. I think it is one peculiarity of the southern people of China that they like to go abroad. Down in Singapore and Manila, where there is a large quantity of Chinese, they are all southern men.

Q. Did you hear, while in China, of a threatened disturbance by the Chinese at Singapore and other towns, so that the foreign men-of-war were requested to send their marines ashore to protect the foreign residents?—A. I do not remember anything of that.

Q. You have never heard of an instance of that kind?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Indemnity is pretty promptly demanded by foreign governments there when an indignity is shown to one of their people?—A. O, yes.

Q. And it is very promptly awarded, is it not?—A. I think so.

Q. Were you there at the time the Saco went up there under command of Commander McDougal, and demanded satisfaction for the stoning of a missionary?—A. I cannot say that I remember that incident.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Your house is one of the oldest and largest of the houses connected with Chinese affairs?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your business, your profit, and your interest are with that immigration to a considerable extent?—A. To a certain extent.

Q. You are engaged in carrying passengers and bringing merchandise,

chartering ships, and dealings of that kind with the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With a view to get at what number of Chinese might be brought to this country, let me ask you how many would a thousand-ton clipper-ship, arranged for passenger-traffic, carry?—A. Remember that the American law is much more restrictive than the English. Any vessel loading in Hong-Kong has got to come here under the American passenger-act. I think she could carry about 450 passengers.

Q. With a little pressure, a small percentage, she would carry 500 passengers?—A. There is no pressure, because the law is very strict here, and a person is liable to a fine of fifty dollars for every one carried in excess, and imprisonment in the county jail besides.

Q. If you could have a clipper-ship of a thousand tons capacity carrying 450 passengers, and you find a constant coming-and-going traffic for that ship in passengers, bringing them and returning with them, how many trips could you make in a year?—A. You would not make many more than two.

Q. Then, with two trips in a year, all things being favorable, 450 passengers going and coming, with a certain trade, what could you afford to transport those passengers for *per capita*?—A. The thing is not a supposable case.

Q. O, yes; I suppose the case.—A. Yes; but I mean to state that it is not practicable.

Q. But suppose you had your clipper-ship, and could go and come twice a year, and could have a cargo of passengers there ready to ship and a cargo here ready to return; in other words, an active passenger-trade between the two continents, could you afford to carry passengers back and forth for $8?—A. No, sir.

Q. For $12?—A. No, sir.

Q. For $15?—A. I should like to know whether you suppose that the ship is to find the food.

Q. No; I am talking of a clipper-ship?—A. Possibly it might be done at $15.

Q. I guess you would undertake to transport 50,000 of them if they would be provided for you in that way?—A. I do not know that I should.

Q. You would at some price, for that is your business?—A. Of course. I think somewhere between $15 and $20.

Q. Then it is between $15 and $20 that these passengers might be transported back and forth between these two continents, if there was a trade. In making your contracts with charter-parties, do you require any security?—A. No, sir.

Q. You require no security upon the freight and cargo?—A. No, sir; we sign the charter-parties ourselves when sometimes we have no interest in the charter of the ship at all.

Q. You chartered a line of English steamers last year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you make any arrangement with the Pacific mail steamships to keep up the rates of passage?—A. From where?

Q. From here there, or from there here?—A. We made an arrangement once to keep passage higher between here and Hong-Kong.

Q. To what figure?—A. I think it was $45; but it was only one steamer. After that we took the chances, and took them for $10 or $8.

Q. In the spring-time they generally come, and in the fall they more or less return; that is, the tide flows this way in the spring and backward in the fall?—A. Yes.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the reason that they come in the spring and return in the fall? What causes the difference?—A. The reason is that in the spring we have favorable wind to come—the southwest monsoon. When that comes up the sea, it makes a fair wind to come from China. They go back in the fall or winter, so as to get there in time for the Chinese new year, which comes generally about February. After the Chinese new year is over, some of them come this way.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The Chinese new year is a moving festival?—A. It comes with the new moon, the same as Easter.

Q. That is determined by a lunar calculation?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How many passengers are they permitted to carry upon a ship in proportion to her tonnage?—A. It goes according to the superficial feet, and it depends upon the height between decks.

Q. Take a first-class ship of twelve hundred tons.—A. If the between-decks are over 6½ feet, they are divided by one figure, and if they are another height, they are divided by another figure. That is laid down in the law.

Q. How many steamers had we arriving here in the months you mentioned to Senator Sargent of the large arrival of passengers—February, March, and April?—A. One Pacific mail-steamer; one O. & O. steamer; three, I think, that came to Parrott & Company, and one that came to us.

Q. Those that came to Parrott & Company were temporary?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. So that there were six steamers engaged in that traffic?—A. They did not all come in one month.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Besides sailing-vessels?—A. I think very few passengers have come this year by sailing-vessels.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are they American-built steamers or English?—A. They are all English except the Pacific Mail.

Q. How about the O. & O. line?—A. They are English steamers.

Q. I thought that was Colton's line?—A. So it is, but they are English steamers.

Q. Then out of six steamers, five were English?—A. Yes, sir.

FREDERICK L. CASTLE sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. About twenty-six years.

Q. What business are you engaged in?—A. In general merchandise, principally teas.

Q. The house of Castle & Brothers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that business?—A. Since I came to the country.

Q. You have had considerable trade and traffic with China and the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What has been your experience in that trade?—A. My experience has been good.

Q. It has been favorable to the Chinese as a business community and class?—A. My experience has been mainly with the mercantile community, and I have always found them very trustworthy and honorable.

Q. What is your line of business with them specially, if any?—A. My line of business with them consists of rice, teas, dried fruits, china, oil, and the majority of articles that they trade in.

Q. Do you import from China direct?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Through Chinese houses or American houses?—A. Through American and English houses.

Q. Do you import for the Chinese by their special order?—A. No, sir; not for the Chinese.

Q. You sell articles to them?—A. I sell to them, and buy from them.

Q. To what extent has your business been with them any year, as near as you can approximate it?—A. That is rather a difficult question to answer.

Q. How much, in round numbers, in dollars?—A. I suppose perhaps during the year I may buy and sell to Chinamen to the extent of from $125,000 to $150,000.

Q. Do you lose much by them?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you ever lost anything by them?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Silver is considered a glut in this market?—A. At times.

Q. It has been at a discount?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Do we not find a large trade of silver with China?—A. O, yes.

Q. It is our chief source of getting rid of our silver?—A. It is an article that at times is very much in demand for China. At other times it is in demand for local uses. I do not know but that China is the chief point, China and the East Indies. I presume the bulk goes from here to China.

Q. You are pretty well acquainted throughout the State?—A. I think so.

Q. They raise a great deal of fruit here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In former years did they utilize it or did a great deal of it go to waste?—A. A great deal of it has been going to waste.

Q. What is done with it as a general thing now?—A. The Chinese have this year more particularly engaged themselves in the occupation of buying trees, paying so much a tree and collecting the fruit. A very large amount of fruit that otherwise would have gone to waste, I think the Chinese have managed to utilize.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How do they utilize it?—A. When a man has an orchard of eight or ten acres, a Chinaman will go and make him an offer to rent the orchard of him, so much a tree, or a hundred dollars for the whole lot.

Q. What use do they make of the fruit?—A. They bring it to this market and sell it. A very large amount of fruit is now being shipped to the different western cities.

Q. East from here?—A. Yes.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Dried fruit?—A. Yes, sir; they dry it for sale.

Q. Do you deal with them for that fruit?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How much in tons has been your transactions this year in that line with the Chinese?—A. I suppose in the last sixty days I have purchased from six to eight car-loads of peaches and apples.

Q. Dried?—A. Dried. A car-load contains 10 tons.

Q. You are an old pioneer on this coast?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think the Chinese have been a benefit to this coast, or the contrary?—A. I think the Chinese in some vocations are a benefit, and in others I think they are a detriment. That is my impression about it.

Q. The committee are here to find out that fact?—A. I think as far as workers in agricultural pursuits they have been a benefit to the community. They have tended somewhat to interfere with the female labor here, and no doubt the mechanics have suffered somewhat from their presence, but it is a question that I have never studied to any extent. My experience has been with the mercantile portion. I am not prepared to say whether they are a benefit or an advantage to us or not. It is too serious a question for me to be a judge of.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you know anything about the business of Cutting & Co.?—A. Only to the extent of making purchases of them.

Q. Do you know whether they have abandoned their Chinese force and supplemented it with white labor?—A. I do not. I would state that my business is very largely in teas. That is a business which is supposed to be Chinese. I employ about a dozen white boys packing teas. They make an excellent substitute for the Chinese, which goes to show that if the boys have a wish for labor they have the opportunity. That is supposed to be a business that the Chinese have absorbed. In lieu of Chinese I have white boys, and I find they fill the bill very well.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You employ white boys in that business?—A. I employ white boys exclusively. I find them very apt. I really do not know why, if the white boys of this town imitated the Chinese, they could not supplement them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Two employers have stated here that the boys are worthless and they could not do anything with them; that they were unreliable; threw their property around, destroyed it, &c.; is that your experience?—A. My experience has been good. I have discharged boys for stoning Chinamen, and I think it was a good example.

Q. You do not think the boys are so bad that you must have Chinamen to take their places?—A. I do not consider that they are in such a condition as that morally.

Q. Is it not rather an excuse for those who wish to employ Chinamen? Your experience is that there are good boys?—A. There are good boys, unquestionably. I do not think the country is so bare of morals as that there are no good boys. I have an opportunity every day to get boys if I need them.

Q. And you find them as a rule good?—A. The boys I employ are good, for if they are not good they are discharged.

ARTHUR B. STOUT recalled.

Mr. PIXLEY. In the year 1871, Dr. Thomas M. Logan, M. D., permanent secretary State board of health of the State of California, addressed a communication to Dr. Arthur B. Stout, M. D.

["If we Americans of to-day turn from the splendid sunrise of our national morning to the misty veil that enshrouds the future, we shall see the giant spectre slowly defining its shadowy form against the western heavens."—*Pompelly, ch.* 19, *p.* 247, 3*d ed.*]

OFFICE STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Sacramento, March 1, 1871.

DEAR SIR: Knowing the interest you take in every subject involving the philosophy of medicine, connected as it is, on the one hand, with science, and on the other with the endless cares, the wants, and sufferings of humanity, and remembering the sounds of the tocsin you were the first to sound, some eight years ago, on "Chinese immigration and the physiological causes of the decay of nations," I take the liberty of addressing myself to you, in my official capacity, at this juncture of the Chinese-American question. It is not yet generally known, and therefore may be new to you, what I have already stated on taking the initiative, that the last legislature, with the broadest statesmanship, and regarding the personal and individual strength and availability of each and every member of the body politic—"the bone and muscle that create, and the mind and spirit that control, direct, and enjoy all earthly possessions"—as the essential element of the State, to be cared for as well as more material interests, has instituted and appointed a medical tribunal, or board of State medicine, for counsel and guidance in cases where the lives and health of the people are concerned As the executive of that tribunal, I am endeavoring to enlist the aid of the medical men disseminated throught the State, who are the proper censors of the public health, in the cause of sanitary science and the promulgation of hygiene. Occupying, as they do, to use your own language, a high and influential position, their counsels and their teachings are all-powerful in contributing to improve the health, the strength, the vigor, both physical and intellectual, of the people. It is with this understanding I propose to invoke your services for the good of the State in the discussion of the momentous question before us. It is true you have already consulted the writings and cited the opinions of the learned and scientific, and from this vast research have drawn certain conclusions and defined certain laws, which ages will never be able to controvert, but, as the world moves rapidly now-a-days, so there are new agencies springing into existence, and changes occurring in the civil status of the Mongolian, which may prompt you to reconsider what you have already advanced and qualify your inferences.

The opening up by steamships of a constant communication between the Pacific ports and China is flooding the country with hordes of pagans, who, by virtue of the triumph of republican principles, after a civil war of four years' duration, waged to break down the stratification of society, are, or soon will be, absolutely our equals before the law. Public opinion, swayed more or less by selfish considerations, is now severely exercised on this, the living question of the hour, which, if wrongly settled at this time, will be a disturbing power forever; while, with the history of the Spanish-American provinces before our eyes, degeneration must certainly pursue its course, in personal and individual antipathies finding its only check. I apprehend, however, that I am advancing upon ground covering questions the most difficult and complicated that can be found in the whole range of science, of philosophy, of political economy, or of morals—questions that would, perhaps, require more time and research than you may be able to bestow. Although, to one whose mind is so constituted as yours—never content with the mere practical part of your profession, but confessedly fond of wandering back into the æsthetic realms of archæology and ethnology—whatever concerns the history of a nation whose antiquity can be traced back, by a direct and connected series of events, almost to the creation of the world; whose vast extent of territory and resources, whose magnificent monuments, whose literature and arts, government and immense population, (estimated at three hundred and fifty millions,) cannot but constitute objects of exceeding great interest; still, passing by all these considerations, I desire more particularly that you should investigate the evils likely to result from combined influences of the intermixture of races and the introduction of the habits and customs of a sensual and depraved people in our midst. Coming, as they do, of all classes and conditions imaginable, with their hereditary vices and engrafted peculiarities, crowding our seaports and spreading through our inland towns and villages, they must become liable, like our Indian aborigines, to maladies consequent upon so great a change of climate, food, and general circumstances.

I may be allowed, in this connection, to state that Dr. Logan, now deceased, was eminent authority in all moral and social questions, and in all other questions touching the interests of this State, of which he was an old and very respected resident.

Look, besides, at some of the occasions and predisposing causes of disease existing in our more populous communities—narrow and filthy lanes, low-built, miserably-ventilated houses, small and crowded apartments, into some of which the light of day never enters; damp walls and floors, and uncleanliness of personal habits, together with insufficiency of pure water and of fresh, sound animal and vegetable food—these are the general conditions and surroundings of their miserable existence. In view of such inducements to disease and enemies to health, it is a matter of astonishment that a relentless pestilence does not arise every year, and with the fatal malignity of the late epidemic, small-pox, spread dismay and

desolation throughout all our land. Especially would I direct your attention to the habitual use of opium, which may be more readily communicated than, I am sorry to say, the practice of eating it already is, to our excitable community—it seeming to hold out a temptation far more powerful than that of any other intoxicating substance. The practice of eating opium, as you well know, has prevailed for more than a century in Persia and Turkey; but that of smoking it, to which I specially take exception, originated at a much later period, and has been confined mostly to China and its adjacent provinces. The manner of smoking opium differs materially from that of tobacco. The process consists in taking very long whiffs, thereby expanding the lungs to their utmost capacity, and communicating the influence of the smoke to all the air-cells, and at the same time retaining it there as long as possible. This explains, in a great degree, the almost instantaneous and powerful effect upon the whole system. When taken into the stomach, the influence is communicated from the sentient nerves of this organ to the cerebro-spinal system, and thence to the whole animal economy, by absorption into the blood through the veins by lymphatics. But when inhaled into the lungs, it comes into direct contact with a far more extended and highly-organized tissue, and not only enters the circulation more or less by absorption, but, by its inherent nature, contracts the air-cells of the lungs in such a manner as to prevent the blood from receiving its due proportion of oxygen. This deficiency of oxygenation of the blood must exercise a most deleterious influence.

These and other facts connected with the demoralizing and depraving habits charged against this people, must be brought fairly to the test. The lights of science challenge such a scrutiny; the interests of a progressive civilization demand it. If our Government has rashly committed itself to the flowery sentimentalism of the Burlingame Chinese treaty, surely Congress could have appointed, in the exercise of its high prerogative, (as any other deliberative body, the English Parliament for instance, would have done in a similar emergency,) a commission of inquiry to investigate and, if necessary, report on some means for regulating the evil we have brought upon ourselves. Failing to do this, it remains for California, exposed and threatened as she is, at the very dawn of her political existence, to avert, as far as lies within her power, some of the consequences of an unwise treaty. Laws should follow in the wake of science, modified and adapted to the advancing knowledge of the day.

At this stage of the case, I see, therefore, no more reason why you should not go over the same ground you have already traveled, and re-open the same issues you have already so logically met, than that we should be content to abide by the dogmas of religion adapted to a bygone age, without again and again searching the Scriptures for ourselves from an enlarged point of view, corresponding to the spirit of the times. Line upon line, day after day, must the holy words of wisdom be pondered if we would rightly interpret their full significance; and so it seems to be the order of Providence, in every phase of humanity, that great truths shall be disclosed gradually, and at different periods of the world's history. Should you, however, after weighing all these considerations in your own mind, determine not to accede to my request, and deem it inexpedient to renew your observations and bring them down to the level of the ever-expanding horizon of knowledge, then may I ask to be permitted to incorporate in my report to the next legislature the statesmanlike arguments you have already advanced, and which have been too little read, and, I fear, already forgotten.

With great regard, I remain yours truly,

THOS. M. LOGAN, M. D.,
Permanent Secretary State Board of Health.

ARTHUR B. STOUT M. D.

The time referred to, when Dr. Logan says Dr. Stout first sounded the tocsin of alarm, was in 1862. In reply to this communication of Dr. Logan, Dr. Stout, in 1871, reproduces the communication of 1862, and spreads it before the State board in this way, [exhibiting a pamphlet.] He refers to his authorities, showing that he had made a thorough investigation of the subject, as I may judge from the character of the authorities he quotes.

IMPURITY OF RACE AS A CAUSE OF DECAY.

PART I.

The medical men disseminated through a State are proper censors of the public health. It is their high province not only to cure disease, but to study and promulgate the principles of hygiene. In preventing the invasion of disease, they fulfill a more lofty, because more disinterested function, than in eradicating maladies already engendered. Occupying a high and influential position, their counsels and their teachings are all-powerful in contributing to improve the health, the strength, the vigor, both physical and intellectual, and also the endurance among nations, of their race. It is in this view that I propose to examine the various causes which combine to deteriorate the American people.

I may at once state, in acknowledging my indebtedness, and in offering my humble tribute of gratitude to the high authorities whence I have drawn information, that I have freely consulted and drawn from the works of—

Brasseur de Bourbourg, Histoire des Nations Civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amérique Centrale durant les Siécles Antérieurs a Christophe Colomb.

Types of Mankind, Nott and Gliddon.

Volney, Ruines des Empires.

L'Abbé Huc, Journey through China.

Morel, Dégénérescense de l'espéce humaine: Paris, 1857.

Combe on the Constitution of Man.

Michelet, La Femme: 1860.

Davis's History of the Chinese.

Martin's History of China.

Gutzlaff's History of China.

The comprehensive work of Nott and Gliddon, replete with research, contains ample citations from Morton, Humboldt, Agassiz, and all the great authors upon the subject.

Sanger, History of Prostitution: 1859.

Claiming nothing original, but that the knowledge of science when once published is the property of mankind, I hope by adducing these high authorities to obtain more appreciation of my views than if presented on my own unaided responsibility. If the State of California can receive benefit from medical research, it is chiefly by drawing attention to the discoveries of modern science in the matters I shall treat of, and at the earliest moment in its history engrafting them upon her institutions.

Over the world is fast extending what is termed the great Caucasian race of men. Children of migration, they move in vast waves over every continent. From the cradle to the grave they fluctuate in alternate ebb and flow over every region of Europe, vasts tracts of Asia, the north and south of Africa, nearly all of North America, and are fast encroaching upon the South American continent. This is the race created with the highest endowments, and greatest aptitude, under various circumstances, to encounter the vicissitudes of every clime and every soil. God speed it on its way!

One great division of this race, the Anglo-Saxon, is now occupying America, and the type thence arising is the one in which I am at present interested. The history of the rise and fall of empires sufficiently attests the migratory nature of the parent stock; and the American offspring appears abundantly imbued with the hereditary spirit.

In history, the brilliant details of wars and victories dazzle the sight and engross the mind. The student of history, in witnessing the origin, the glory, and the demise of a nation, is apt to attribute to these wars and their political sources the catastrophe which he mourns. In searching among the ruins of the past to discover a guiding principle for the future, it is to these causes that he looks for his material.

But, in truth, a deeper cause, of which these wars and world-spread dissensions are only the effect, lies at the root of the evil. This cause, the abuse of the human system, insidiously gnaws into each individual body, undermines the strength and beauty of God's noblest work, and thence penetrates, cancer-like, into the social, religious, and political system. Thus contaminated, all the systems, in fatally allied conspiracy, attack the solidarity of the nation.

The originally predominant purity of the animal economy and of the intellectual government offer a short-lived resistance. Internal dissension, fostered by a consequently invited aggression, exhausts the power of the race, and a nation, vanquished by itself, sinks into oblivion.

The action of the brain guides both the physical movements and the intellectual emanations. From the blood the brain derives its nutriment. If the aliment be rendered impure, the cerebral mechanism receives a corresponding alteration. As the blood degenerates so will the race of men; and a degenerate nation can neither dictate to nor survive one of higher physical and intellectual endowment.

To the Caucasian race, with its varied types, has been assigned the supremacy in elevation of mind and beauty of form over all mankind. High over the rest it surveys the field of life. Appointed by the Creator to wield all human destinies, He has endowed it with the power, above all others, to study, to admire, and rule such of his Almighty works as enter within the sphere of man. No new combination of distinct existing races can improve this Divine excellence. Whatever enters it tends to destroy it. In proportion to the rapidity with which deleterious elements are introduced, must be the ratio in the course of time of its degeneration and final extinction.

Our new American embranchment stands now isolated among nations in its purity and highest degree of cultivation and refinement, proudly rivaling them all. Yet, from the nature of its social and political institutions, more than all of their subject and exposed to a fearful pressure from without, it hence tends to destructive amalgamations and the ruinous influences of conflicting political systems. These conditions are magnified by the mercenary efforts of self-interest, by the abuse of a morbid philanthropy in liberal government, and by belief in the general equality of mankind.

The time to urge and impress the mind with the necessity of preserving the purity of race, is while the race is new, and thus close the door to amalgamations while the stock is

pure and young. To permit the ingress of an inferior race is to strike at self-destruction. A government, to protect its people, should strive to preserve the purity of the race; and, irrespective of political theories, should guard it from every amalgamation with inferior types.

No State of our Union is so exposed and threatened as California. At the very dawn of its existence it is menaced with the introduction of these pernicious elements; and if now the struggle for life be not commenced, it must forever be abandoned. The degeneration will pursue its course, in personal and individual antipathies finding its only check.

I am led to these reflections from the contest now waging in regard to the Chinese immigration. It is stated that the Supreme Court has decided that the legislative statute preventive of this immigration is unconstitutional. But little versed in legal lore, I dare not oppose the wisdom of the court in its constitutional decision. But, in a physiological view, the argument may yet be open. The first law of nature is to preserve the purity of the race—provided the race be of all others the superior. Self-preservation claims the first protective enactment.

If the world mourns the presence of a negro race in the Eastern and Southern States, what tears may be shed when, in the course of ages, the great West is overwhelmed with a Chinese immigration. Once permitted, it must be forever endured. The work of degeneration once commenced, its progress must pursue its insidious and empoisoning influence, not for a few years, but centuries to come. The legislation now enacted is less for our own than for generations which, in the future, by their purity shall bless, or in their degeneration shall curse, their ancestral stock.

Among the causes I have yet to enumerate, which together combine to exhaust and degrade a race, the intermixture of blood with inferior races is the most potent and the most deplorable. All the arguments of the advantages of commerce and the toleration of liberal government sink into insignificance in comparison with the primary law of nature, which teaches self-preservation in protecting the purity of type in the race and perpetuating the endurance of the nation. When we contemplate the ruins of empires, we read the neglect of these laws.

By the adoption of bad blood we voluntarily introduce the deadliest foe to our existence. If we but exclude this internal enemy, no outward force can crush our nation. It is in the healthful consolidation of all the means which invigorate the mental and physical energies, and the exclusion of all the constitutional destructive influences, that the highest type of mankind, all radiant with its manifold beauties, can be attained. All liberal laws are made special to the race which adopts them. There is no oppression in excluding inferior races from their enjoyment. By intermarrying with Europeans, we are but reproducing our own Caucasian type; by commingling with the eastern Asiatics, we are creating *degenerate hybrids*. We may seek to exchange commodities, but never to blend races. The argument that justice demands, while we are claiming free admission and intercourse with China, that we should freely open to the Chinese our portals and adopt them as our own, is not founded in nature. The Chinese may gladly court an American emigration to their land, for every combination improves and exalts their enervated race; while, on the contrary, every permanent settlement of a Chinaman on our soil creates a depreciation of the blood of our own. "Commercial alliances, if you will, with all the nations upon the earth, but political alliances and social entanglements with none of them."

In thus refusing to the eastern Asiatics the privilege of free immigration and permanent domicile in the land, I would not be thought to deny to an ancient and once enlightened race the merit due to their intelligence. Only it is vain for man to seek to unite that which the Creator has so distinctly divided. The Divine will has imbued every race with excellent qualities, but has shown, in the distinctions established in accordance with topography, clime, and physiological development, that they were not created to be indifferently blended.

* * * * * * *

A broadcast view over the country will show the progress of deterioration by the blending of races, as it insidiously but slowly advances.

To illustrate the ramifications which result from the fusion of three races—the Caucasian, the aboriginal American, and the negro—I take the arrangement of Tschudi, and adopted by Nott and Gliddon:

Parents.	Children.
White father and negro mother	Mulatto.
White father and Indian mother	Mestiza.
Indian father and negro mother	Chino.
White father and mulatto mother	Cuarteron.
White father and Mestiza mother	Creole, pale brownish complexion.
White father and Chino mother	Chino-blanco.
White father and Cuarterona mother	Quintero.
White father and Quintero mother	White.
Negro father and Indian mother	Zambo.
Negro father and mulatto mother	Zambo-negro.
Negro father and Mestiza mother	Mulatto-oscuro.
Negro father and Chino mother	Zambo-chino.
Negro father and Zamba mother	Zambo-negro, perfectly black.
Negro father and Quintera mother	Mulatto, rather dark.
Indian father and mulatto mother	Chino-oscura.
Indian father and Mestiza mother	Mestizo-claro, frequently very beautiful.
Indian father and Chino mother	Chino-chola.
Indian father and Zamba mother	Zambo-claro.
Indian father and Chino-chola mother	Indian, with frizzly hair.
Indian father and Quintera mother	Mestizo, rather brown.
Mulatto father and Zamba mother	Zambo, a miserable race.
Mulatto father and Mestiza mother	Chino, rather clear complexion.
Mulatto father and Chino mother	Chino, rather dark.

Here, then, are twenty-three varieties, or crosses, occupying our soil with their progeny, and multiplying their kind, to the continual detriment of the Caucasian race. "To define their characteristics correctly," adds the learned German, "would be impossible, for their minds partake of the mixture of their blood. As a general rule, it may be fairly said that they unite in themselves all the faults, without any of the virtues, of their progenitors. As men, they are generally inferior to the pure races; and as members of society, they are the worst class of citizens."

On some of these mixtures the author is doubtless too severe, for several of them possess commendable qualities, but are always far inferior to the pure white race. It will be seen that Tschudi gives the scientific definition of the term Creole. This does not regard the signification indulgently given to the term in some of the Southern States, where it is simply applied to the native offspring of foreign parents, even when the parentage is pure white. The author studied these amalgamations in Peru; but in the United States, where more benign institutions exist, their better qualities being elicited and their vices repressed, they appear in a more favorable aspect. These combinations, to the number of many millions, are now engrafting themselves, with their injurious tendencies, upon our race. Their increase is immense. However impossible or inexpedient it may be to disturb them, is a question of national policy, as "better to bear the ills we have than fly to those we know not of." Still, in the progress of ages, the pernicious element cannot fail to augment, and greatly to the detriment of the pure and superior race.

Let us now, in imagination, pass over a space of two hundred years, and observe the country when, in addition to the American Indian and negro amalgamation, the Asiatic Indian shall have had free scope; when in that time, which for nationalities is short, the Chinese, Japanese, Malays, and Mongolians of every caste, shall have overrun the land; when they, in their turn, have given origin to their countless varieties of hybrid creatures. As the locusts of California overrun the fields of the husbandman, will these swarms of beings degenerate our land. In the progress of this debasing alloy, and in the course of time, may another Volney follow his guiding genius from "those ramparts of Nineveh, those walls of Babylon, those palaces of Persepolis, those temples of Balbec and of Jerusalem," and after dwelling a time in mournful meditation over those yet more ancient forest-covered ruins of Mexico and Central America, come to pour out his last lamentations on the crumbling remains of our own republic.

The remedy.—What is the remedy for this vast evil? Early prevention is the only specific. Plant not the germs, and there will be naught to eradicate. While the Chinese immigration is controlled by a few leading men, heads of societies or Hong merchants, its restriction may be easily accomplished. The correction must commence at its source. Better would it be for our country that the hordes of Genghis Khan should overflow the land, and with armed hostility devastate our valleys with the saber and the firebrand, than that these more pernicious hosts, in the garb of friends, should insidiously poison the well-springs of life, and, spreading far and wide, gradually undermine and corrode the vitals of our strength

and prosperity. In the former instance we might oppose the invasion with sword and rifled cannon; but this destructive intrusion enters by invisible approaches; is aided and fostered in its advance by those who forget or never dream of their country's interest, while they seek to advance their private ends.

When the engrafting is thus perfected, eradication becomes impossible. Let the Attilas of Asiatic despotism appear, and every freeman will prove to be a Meroveg: but against a cooly who can struggle? What though the labor of coolies be cheaper than that of the stalwart men of our own race; we must, nevertheless, lose by the exchange. If the former drive back these hardy pioneers, who shall defend the land? Who shall whiten the plains with their homesteads? Who shall form the families of the republic? The vigorous strength of Caucasian labor cannot be nourished with a handful of rice, nor will their intelligence, for their own emolument or their aspirations for their children, accept existence in a state of protracted coolyism or serfdom Reduce their wages to the rates of coolyism, and you degrade them, physically and morally, to the state of coolies.

Our native and adopted people require the higher rates of wages, for they have higher functions than mere daily labor to perform. They are the volunteers in the promotion and the defense of the rights of man. To them we look for the maintenance of the Union and the progress of civilization. If, by inadequate recompense for their labor, we banish them eastward from our frontier, and adopt the Chinese immigrant in their stead, who will repel the foreign aggressor whom war shall invite to our shore? What part in the fierce drama of national defense will the cooly play? Why, exactly the part of the crow in an unguarded corn-field—to seize the grain and fly at the first sign of gunpowder.

The preventive remedies are—

I. The action of the General Government to reform our treaty stipulations with the empire of the East.

II. The intervention of the legislature of the State to enact such laws as shall be radical in preventing immigration.

III. The encouragement of local associations to elevate every possible barrier to its progress.

IV. The cultivation of a public opinion which shall be all-powerful to discountenance the employment of Chinese labor.

It is not my province to enter into the details of these four classes of remedial agents. I leave them to the more competent authorities in their respective departments, and respectfully invite all to co-operate therein, from the Executive at Washington to the humblest operative whose voice speaks by a ballot.

It is appropriate to ask, what is the position which the Asiatic stranger should receive in the State? What national view should be taken of his desire to visit the country? In what aspect should he appear to every generous citizen? The just reply would be, he should be regarded as a guest in a foreign land. "Stranger is a holy name." The munificent host should extend to him his cheerful and enriching hospitality. It may not be always requited here, but our adventurers on Asiatic soil may receive the reward. With the extension of commerce and the increase of associations which thence arise with this remarkable nation, the fairest facilities for the agents of both parties, and respectively in each other's country, should be encouraged. My arguments against extended immigration, permanent residence, or adoption as freeholders, are entirely distinct from these commercial relations.

I do not seek to embarrass trade, but I do desire to prohibit immigration as a national measure to obtain population; to dispose of public or private lands; to acquire cheap labor, or to consult the convenience of reckless speculators. Let us receive the Chinaman, whether mandarin or cooly, with a respect due to his ancient grandeur, his still existing power and ability. Let us refuse him permanent domicile, elective rights, title in fee to land, declare null by statute intermarriage, and compel the ultimate return of every trader to his native land. With a constantly-increasing commerce, his total expulsion is impracticable. Let us, therefore, receive him as a transient resident, teach him our language, inspire him with regard for our religion, instruct him in the principles of our sciences, initiate him into the details of all our practical arts, display to him our improved engines, manufacturing-machinery, improved implements of trade, and our economical modes of labor-saving husbandry.

Let us imbue him with a love of all the refinements of our social system, and a desire to adopt the extended comforts of our mode of living. Let Chinamen, thus accomplished, return to their native homes, and diffuse, broad-spread, the instruction thus acquired.

These are the influences which convert a nation. This is practical Christianity; this is the means to protect the purity of our own race, and elevate the other to the highest degree of attainable civilization. The history of China gives the most convincing testimony that the Chinese people, in earlier ages, received with welcome, and were exceedingly disposed universally to adopt the Christian religion. Its missionaries, pious, fervent, and devoted as individuals, were honored for their scientific attainments. Their knowledge in mathematics and astronomy promoted them to the highest places of preferment.

Emperors themselves were softened by their influence and yielded to their persuasion. Their Christian doctrine received a wide extension, and Christian altars arose among heathen temples. But it soon appeared that to accept the Christian worship it would be necessary to submit to Roman rule. The adoption of Christian rites involved the disintegration

of political structures. To save the empire they must reject the new religion. The snow-white robes of the church concealed in their folds the keys of emipre and an iron scepter. To escape the latter, they rejected the whole. As they had surrounded themselves with a material wall to exclude the inimical Tartars, so they enveloped themselves in political exclusion to evade revolutionizing doctrine. Chistianity was not offered to them as a heaven-sent boon, without a price. Its intrinsic worth and beauty was to cost empire and independence; to be harvested in subjection and to be mulcted by tyranny.

The Christianity we offer is for its own enlightenment. We ask no sway; we seek no territory; the seeds we plant offer their tenfold harvest for the benefit alone of the nation which reaps.

The anti-Christian religions of Asia should constitute an insurmountable bar to the free admission of Asiatics on this continent. While but few are here, the occasional appearance of an idol temple may not be of consequence; but when, ere long, the immigration, if not prevented, will be immense, these people will claim permission to worship according to their oriental doctrine.

In every valley and over every plain Christian churches and heathen temples, side by side, will offer their grotesque contrast to the sight. It may be safely questioned whether, in admitting into our Constitution the free toleration of all religions, the framers of our magna charta had any other than Christian doctrines in their view. Their attention was engrossed with the European systems and the controversies from which they had just escaped. Had they foreseen the extension of territory which their young Republic was destined to acquire, and the close intercourse with the Asiatic world which would ensue, they would have confined within Christian limits such universal toleration.

The population of China exceeds three hundred millions of inhabitants. The territory they occupy is scarcely large enough to contain them. Although the aggregate amount of their labor is immense, the great majority of them can only obtain a scanty subsistence by the most patient and incessant industry. Extreme poverty universally prevails, and a recompense inconceivably small is the reward of their toil. Hundreds of thousands of these impoverished beings would gladly escape to other realms if the opportunity was offered them to improve their condition. The overflow from their native land to this country, if no restriction withheld them, would be immense; and the Vanderbilts of commerce would even now have covered the seas with their fleets if no barrier intervened to prevent their transportation to our State. We owe to their own laws and to the peculiar tenets of their religion our immunity from this inundation. The very limited number of Chinese which, under special contracts, are permitted to emigrate, are compelled by law to return within a specified time, or, in case of death, the rites of their religion require that their remains be restored for interment in their ancestral grave-yards.

Thus are we indebted to foreign laws, and not to our own precautions, for the salvation of the country.

Let but these barriers burst and we have no protection from the hosts which will flow across the Pacific. That these barriers will burst is the manifest destiny of the Chinese nation. The most casual observer must easily discern that the entire social, religious, and political organization is in progress throughout the whole of Asia. This metamorphosis is her infallible destiny. If Asia is to participate in the refinements of civilization and the progress of human culture throughout the world, she must accede to and adopt this radical revolution. With or without her consent this destiny will be accomplished. Time is the only question. The encroachments of English power from the west, the gradual but certain approaches of Russia from the north, the allied fleets of England and France which hover along and seek admission by her eastern shores, must eventually overwhelm the Asiatic continent. India, crushed by the hand of trade, the Hindoos brutalized in their idolatry, and China torn by rebellion, poisoned with opium, and starving in poverty, must fall together in one general ruin. Railroads and canals will penetrate the deserts, the lightning telegrams will shortly flash through the Russian Empire of the North, and the navies armed with all the batteries of modern invention which invest the continent, all concentrate their intellectual and physical resources against the numerous but defenseless nations of Asia. If England and France, for their own aggrandizement, arested for a while the encroaching power of the Czar at Sebastopol, they gave to oriental exclusiveness its death-blow at Pekin. The former act can have but limited effect, but the second will be forever permanent.

Thus do all civilized nations, while advancing their varied interests, combine to destroy the ancient religions and idolatries of Asia and regenerate its exhausted races. Islamism and paganism must alike sink into oblivion, and Christianity enter, like sunlight into chaos, to illuminate and revivify this ancient world. Be it so; and when this destiny shall be accomplished will be the moment to review our national policy, repeal preventive laws, and admit Asiatics to the privileges of freemen.

PART II.

I have now to consider other causes which, singly or in combination, when acting upon the human system, impede its normal development or undermine and enervate its beauty and strength. Of these are, first, hereditary diseases, as phthisis or consumption, scrofula,

syphilis, mental alienation, and epidemic diseases; secondly, material agents deleterious to the human economy. The first class acts in a double manner on the individuals themselves subject to the maladies, and secondarily on their progeny. The second class, comprising active material agents used to excess, contains all the stimulant, as well as narcotic agents, resorted to by man to exalt his enjoyments or appease his miseries. They are opium, tobacco, fermented liquors, and all stimulo-narcotic agents more or less in common use as luxuries of life.

It will readily be perceived that each one of these causes is worthy of a monograph; but the present occasion compels me to group them, and sweep over the field with hasty speed.

Could I in one terse page exhibit all the miseries, all the degradation, all the ruin which the abuse of these agents has, in the great revolution of time, accumulated upon the human races, not all the famed artists of the past, nor the ambitious aspirants to future greatness, would suffice to portray the dreadful picture. Could I annihilate them, the arsenal of death would be well-nigh exhausted.

As the maladies indicated in the first class are in many cases only the effect of the agents enumerated in the second class, the above arrangement is not arbitrary, but for convenience alone.

Phthisis and scrofula.—Phthisis or consumption, and scrofula, are, of all others, the most destructive maladies of our country. To expatiate upon their insidious invasion, enumerate their manifold manifestations, describe the fear and anxiety which invests their suspected existence, or enter into their minute pathology, is foreign to my subject. To evoke their causes and indicate the mode to evade their intrusion upon the animal economy, is a matter of public hygiene. The individual who once so lives as to engender in his system the germ of these diseases, commits an enduring wrong upon his lineal successors. These diseases, in their chronic or hereditary condition, are diseases of debility, and entail upon the families they invade a successively enfeebling progeny. For the climatic influences which lay their foundation, men can scarcely be responsible, except in the careless neglect of the sanitary measures which protect the system from changes of weather. But other causes combine to give them origin. These are the gradual but long-continued introduction into the economy of agents which for a time stimulate, yet ultimately enervate its powers and radically alter the constituents of the animal tissues.

When a rich, healthful, normal blood no longer permeates the blood-vessels, distributing to the various tissues their quota of natural components, and when the brain no longer daily receives its adequate allowance of pure blood, its reflex influences upon the tissues are correspondingly altered and necessarily vitiated. Degeneration, with its series of hereditary contaminations of the pure type, commences. Thence may be traced the origin, in numerous instances, of miliary tubercles, whether of the lungs, brain, or bones, and the enervation of scrofulosis.

Syphilis.—Who can calculate the innumerable losses to society and its population which result from neglected syphilis? Its deeply ingrafted poison follows in the race to every generation, except in those instances where its immediate or hereditary presence produces sterility, and then the State loses a family.

How often are the best directed efforts of science, in curing uterine maladies and restoring fertility, rendered ineffectual! The latent virus has stricken its victim, and too often, even when suspected or detected, refuses to relax its grasp. The influence of this malady upon the uterus is either entirely to arrest development, to degenerate its product, or to produce the actual death of the ovum. Fortunate for society, except in a numerical point of view, when the arrest of development or the death of the progeny occurs—for its elaboration is always defective, and a race of a lower type produced.

* * * * * * *

Opium.—The Abbé Huc states, that "at present China purchases opium annually of the English to the amount of thirty-five million pounds sterling. Large, fine vessels, armed like ships of war, served as depots to the English merchants. These rich speculators live habitually in the midst of gayety and splendor, and think little of the frightful consequences of their detestable traffic. When from their superb palace-like mansions on the sea-shore they see their beautiful vessels returning from the Indies, gliding majestically over the waves and entering, with all sails spread, into the port, they do not reflect that the cargoes borne in these superb clippers are bringing ruin and desolation to numbers of families. With the exception of some rare smokers, who, thanks to a quite exceptional organization, are able to restrain themselves within the bounds of moderation, all others advance rapidly toward death, after having passed through the successive stages of idleness, debauchery, poverty, the ruin of their physical strength, and the complete prostration of their intellectual and moral faculties. Nothing can stop a smoker who has made much progress in this habit; incapable of attending to any kind of business, insensible to every event, the most hideous poverty and the sight of a family plunged into despair and misery cannot rouse him to the smallest exertion, so complete is the disgusting apathy in which he is sunk."

The use of opium, to an abuse, and as a deleterious stimulant, is becoming more and more familiar to Americans, but the vice bears no comparison to that of China. The moment to cure the disease is, however, to strike it in its infancy. With the fearful picture, then, of the destructive influence on the system of the abuse of opium in China, why should not a legal enactment restrain the sale of the fatal drug?

The remedy.—What barrier can be placed to the invasion and progress of these ruinous causes of degeneration? Several I have already proposed. The most important, however, consists in intellectual, moral, and physical education. The secret of public health and national endurance is in the promotion of public instruction. Our political and social organization is now the reverse of that of ancient times. Then, education and power were allied in the imperial court; and as in that was associated the idea of the Godhead, it comprised the unbounded influence of religious faith.

The chief of the nation was its divinity, and all laws for the happiness of the people, founded on justice and consolidated by idolatry, emanated from the throne. While the throne remained pure in principle and virtuous in act, the nation governed progressed in enlightenment, flourished in its institutions and population, was influential in peace and invincible in war. Its world-renowned monuments—the admiration of every age—attest the riches and grandeur of such a state. The moment corruption and licentiousness penetrated the palace, the nobility caught the rapid contagion. They quickly contaminated the public mind. and from that hour commenced the ruin and downfall of the nation. In our own republic, the wisdom of the public councils reflects only the knowledge of the people. As they are instructed in virtue and science will they select the representatives of their mind in senates and assemblies. From degenerate and ignorant sources cannot emanate the lofty principles and excellent laws which win the admiration of rival powers, and perpetuate the nation. Hence, it is in the deficiency of education, which should be all-pervading, that may be found the incessant routine of inoperative laws, unconstitutional enactments, time-wasting appeals, and decisions reversed. The greatest feature in the art of creating an enduring nation is in the radical education of its youth. Where and how shall this cultivation of youth commence? It is in the education of women. The matrons of a state form its heroes. Therefore should the cultivation of women embrace not only beautiful and graceful accomplishments, but substantial education, the acquirement of physiological instruction, and the care of the physical development of the form. The vigorous constitution begets the energetic mind. To quote a recent writer: "Specially should females be taught the responsible duties of maternity, in order that a race of better-developed beings may bless the world; one of fewer excesses; one of more harmoniously developed natures; one of more healthy progenitive or hereditary influence. When women are thus taught, no fear need be had for the youth." Says Michelet: "*Woman is an altar*, a pure and holy one, to which man, shattered by the vicissitudes of life, repairs, day by day, to renew his faith and restore his faltering conscience, preserved more pure in her than in him. *Woman is a school*, from whom, truly, generations receive their belief. Long before the father dreams of education, the mother has profoundly implanted her own, which can never be effaced." In the cause of public instruction, a state cannot appropriate its funds with too great liberality. There is more economy in founding institutions of public instruction than in building prisons and houses of refuge. Their growth decreases the never-ending expenditures on hospitals, asylums, and almshouses. Prominent in all education should be that of the physical development. Especially is the remark applicable to that of females. The institutions devoted to their instruction are neglectful of the appliances to improve their physical strength and health Pre-occupied in the rivalry of precocious minds, they forget that all their success is compromised by neglect of physical health and vigor. Great precocity in youth is seldom followed by healthful old age. It is in the well-proportioned development of both body and mind that the true progress of the people may be discerned.

The health, vigor, and beauty of the rising race of California's children might make these observations appear unnecessary. In San Francisco, at least ten thousand youth, the fairest of Heaven's creation, appear to prove the favorable auspices under which we live. The same ratio prevails throughout the State. To foster, improve, and exalt these by every care in mental and physical development, by every legislative enactment thereto conducive, and by any expenditure which can promote the object, is a worthy labor. If in my views I have taken a wide range, it is because the interest of our State has an equivalent magnitude—for the conservation of our race comprises centuries in its limits.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. I have read substantially all of your report which refers to the Chinese question. I omitted a portion of it that had reference to drinking whisky, and to smoking tobacco, and to things that were not immediately pertinent, but everything that refers to the Chinese question will go upon the record.—A. I am very happy that that is the course you have taken. It gives me an opportunity to say to the committee that as long ago as 1862 I took an interest in the question. At that time I had a very humble view of the Chinese; much such a view as that taken now by the factions who have raised themselves against them. I am not a man who is afraid to take back an opinion, if, after due consideration, I think it should be changed. I will say that the views I published in 1862, as

against the Chinese, were lost, because the legislature acted against all arguments, and the Chinese were then encouraged and invited. The city gave to an early Chinaman who came here a lot to build a hospital upon. That lot is still in their possession. Subsequently I found reasons from my study of them to change my mind. If the committee will permit the reading of that portion, (indicating,) I have there retracted what I found was cruel and wrong to them, and have maintained that which I found was true. Therefore, while I have taken back a portion of what I have written in this pamphlet, I also retained what I considered just. It is fair to say that the time at which the report was written ought to convince the gentleman that my action in the matter now is not, as he insinuated the other day, from mercenary motives.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You have modified your views on this question?—A. I have, in many respects. I then was under the impression that that portion of the nation which was coming in here was utterly degraded, and I had the idea of a population of four hundred millions flooding us with a tidal wave of two millions or five or six millions of people; but I have learned that all these things are impossible, and that there was no danger to be apprehended. I did not maintain in that pamphlet that all the Chinese are angels, but I think they bear a very fair and just comparison with those who criminate against them. They do not reply by recrimination. They behave in a quiet way on a neutral defensive ground; but if they should retaliate in the manner in which they have been attacked I think there would be severe riots and trouble; there would be an international war.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You put forth the views I have submitted here in 1862?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Nine years afterward, that is in 1871, you submitted a modification of those views?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In the year 1862 had you any Chinese tenants?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was your property then in the possession of Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. At that time was not your property threatened by the extension of the Chinese quarter, and was it not prejudiced by its proximity to them?—A. No, sir; there was not at that time what could be called an extension of the Chinese *en masse*.

Q. Between the years 1862 and 1871, they did extend *en masse* and accumulated so that they overrun your property and became your tenants?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But that, you think, did not modify your views at all?—A. I was compelled to rent my property to them. Their vicinity drove away others. I find that I gained perhaps two hundred per cent. by doing it.

Q. In the views submitted ten years subsequent, did you use this expression:

> Ten years, however, have not altered the views taken in 1862 on Chinese immigration as regards the physiological effects of the amalgamation of inferior stocks with superior varieties of men, and the decay of a nation effected by the introduction of degenerate species of men in vast numbers.

That was your view in 1871, and submitted in the part that modified your views of 1862?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you still modified those views further?—A. I have not modified them much further. You will perceive that I speak there of the

degeneracy that would come from the amalgamation of the two races, admitting that the amalgamation upon the Caucasian by them would be a degeneracy to the nation as an entirety, but I do not mention there what I have found since, that any such amalgamation which would take place would not injure the white race and would improve the inferior race.

Q. Have you altered your views since 1871, as regards the physiological effects of the amalgamation of the Chinese with the Americans?—A. That is what I have just answered. I say that the physiological effects would be less serious than I contemplated at that time.

Q. You called our people then a superior variety? Do you still regard ours as the superior variety or not?—A. I do.

Q. You spoke then of "the decay of a nation effected by the introduction of degenerate species of men?" Do you still consider the Chinese a degenerate species of men?—A. Quite a large portion of those who come here are even degenerate according to the view of their own nation. They are the rudest and poorest and most desperate of Chinamen. They have been up along the rivers of China and are called pirates, and they are often taken from Chinese piratical junks. Such men would be a ruin at home or here.

Q. Do you know that that is the class we are trying to exclude by legislation? Have you been so advised?—A. I have been advised that the effort now is to exclude all.

Q. No.—A. How are you to select them?

Q. I think it has been proved pretty generally that it is this class who are immigrating here?—A. Not at all; by no means.

Q. If this lower and inferior class of river-men were excluded, would not that encourage the coming here of a superior class of Chinese?—A. I do not think so; I think that the progress of the nation will encourage the better classes. Perhaps we will have mandarins here with their families, and that is a class which I think, if the gentleman were to go to China, he would be very glad to take letters to, and receive their hospitality.

Q. But so far it appears that none of the mandarins or literary class have emigrated to this country?—A. I beg your pardon; a good many literary men have come.

Q. Comparatively there are very few of the mandarin class?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And comparatively few of the mercantile class?—A. Probably so.

Q. The great bulk of the immigration is from the Cantonese and river districts?—A. Yes, sir. The great bulk are not the dishonest ones, because, the gentleman will remember that they cannot leave China until they have been investigated by our consul, and by those who act as agent to contract with them.

Q. After the expression that I quoted from your modified views of 1871, you stated:

On this subject I have nothing to retract.

A. That is as to the physiological effects of the amalgamation of the inferior with the superior.

Q. And you still believe that the decay of a nation will be effected by the introduction of degenerate species of men in vast numbers?—A. By degenerate species from the East or West in numbers. If we had a colonization from Africa I think we would suffer still more than we would from Asia.

Q. You state also in your modified views:

Extreme poverty, the most meager nourishment, insufficient clothing and lodgment against the inclemency of climate, have co-operated to impair their growth.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did that continue within the last ten years also?—A. No, sir; you must bear in mind that that is the state which has been prevailing with them in their own country to their own detriment.

Q. And that has gone on for some four thousand years?—A. I do not know. Allow me to say that their coming here shows that by superior nutrition, more labor, more comfort, and more space, they would improve physically and mentally, especially physically. Chinamen, now, in their every-day life get infinitely better nourishment here than they did at home on their small pay there.

Q. It improves such of the Chinese as come here?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. But do they not come and return, so that we have before us the prospect of a continual improvement of them by bringing the new ones here and sending them back improved?—A. Their going and coming is like the tide. It is like the going and coming of all Eastern people, backward and forward. My lessee has been back to China twice, and returned.

Q. Do you state now as among your views that—

This enervating agency,

referring to the influences I have stated,

more prevalent and more highly concentrated in Asia than in America, not only degenerates the body, but depraves the mind.

A. Undoubtedly; put the Caucasian on rice and wrong hygienic conditions, and you will find he will degenerate.

Q. That is their hygienic condition in China up to the present time?—A. Of a great many.

Q. You say:

Any one of these causes of decay is enough to destroy an individual. When they have all co-operated, during generations of men, to sap the vital vigor of the lower classes of the nation, the generally enervated and exhausted aspect may be comprehended.

That exists now as formerly?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you also state that—

This relief against the evil will act in a constantly increasing force and ratio.

using one of the expressions of your modified views.—A. Yes, sir. I do not think the gentleman should select from that report all the sentences that suit his side, and not contemplate the variations that must necessarily come upon the statement, or facts, or opinions.

Q. You stated in your views that—

The use of opium, to an abuse, and as a deleterious stimulant, is becoming more and more familiar to Americans, but the vice bears no comparison to that of China.

A. That is true.

Q. During the nine years between 1862 and 1871, has the use of opium as an abuse been continued?—A. All over the United States, not owing at all to the Chinese. It still continues and still increases. You have your morphine-eaters and opium-smokers in increasing numbers, and when our race go to Asia they generally take to it also.

Q. You also state—

The moment to cure the disease is to strike it in its infancy.

What did you mean by that?—A. At that time I meant the moment to cure it was to prevent the immigration. I was at that time opposed to Chinese immigration.

Q. You state—

With the fearful picture, then, of the destructive influence on the system of the abuse of opium in China, why should not a legal enactment restrain the sale of the fatal drug?

A. I asked the question simply because I knew the answer, that it was impossible, just the same as it is impossible to repress the much greater destructive agent called whisky. It is not the Chinamen who are likely to injure our race; it is the indiscriminate use of whisky which makes the laboring classes insubordinate, unable and unwilling to do their work, and quarrelsome.

Q. You stated, after speaking of the health, beauty and vigor of the rising race of California's children, that it was the duty of the State

To foster, improve, and exalt these, by every care in mental and physical development.

A. I did, and still say so.

Q. By every legislative enactment thereto conducive?—A. I did say so. I believe in compulsory education.

Q. Do you think it is desirable now to protect the health, vigor and beauty of our rising children by legislation upon this subject in reference to Chinese immigration?—A. I do not believe in protecting them by destruction or by wrong and violence to another people who have also their children to raise and civilize.

Q. You have in your modified view stated that—

In the short space of ten years time has developed new conditions of things in the relation of the human races. New views of the correlations of the varieties of man have been evolved.

Do you think there has been any material change in the Asiatic race as a race within ten years?—A. I did not refer to that point. What I referred to was the change in the nation by which the civil war was carried through; by which slavery was abolished; by which the fraternity of all nations was acknowledged, and that all people who came to this country for useful purposes would be allowed freely, and that our Constitution would be carried still further.

Q. You assume there that by the fifteenth amendment Chinese could be naturalized? You wrote your modified views in 1871 upon the hypothesis that they should become citizens?—A. I was willing that they should be.

Q. Do you not know that by law they cannot become citizens?—A. I was aware that by law they could not; but they can buy property, and if they can buy property and hold it, why not naturalize them?

Q. Then you are in favor of their being naturalized?—A. I am.

Q. Would you be willing to naturalize the river thieves and Cantonese pirates and boatmen?—A. Just as much so as thieves and scoundrels that come from other parts of the world. Mind you, I do not say that immigrants from all other countries are thieves and scoundrels. I am not here to detract from my race; but they do come, we all know.

Q. Do you know of any river thieves or pirates, or people of that class, who emigrate from any other country to this?—A. I presume they do, but they do not declare their former occupation when they come here.

Q. Do you think there is anything like an emigration of criminals from Europe?—A. I do think there are a great many refugees for their country's benefit who come to this country. Speaking of the naturalization of Chinamen, I believe in a modified naturalization. I do not believe this will be a happy nation until that is brought about. The tidal wave of bad emigration is just as strong from Europe and other countries as from Asia.

Q. You have quoted as authority for your reflections, which first ones I think were exceedingly wise and philosophical, Brasseur de Bourbourg, Nott and Gliddon, l' Abbé Huc, Morel, Combe, Michelet, Davis,

Martin, and Gutzlaff. Those are text-books from which you derived information upon which you based your then opinion?—A. Some of them in regard to diseases; Morel especially in regard to degenerations.

Q. Have these text-books any less value, or have any important facts changed since?—A. I think not.

Q. Then they are substantially authorities still?—A. I think they are.

Q. They are elementary upon the question of the amalgamation of races?—A. I think they are not written in reference entirely to the amalgamation of races. Most of them are written on the degeneracy of races. If we drink whisky to the extent we do, if we do not modify our laws so that that can be repressed and the milder wines introduced, the American race will become as low as the Chinese, or the low portion of them. I have quoted, I think, somewhat from the literature of China, which is very copious. The Chinese race go to the two extremes. You can get the highest enlightenment, according to their system of religion and their system of education, and you can get the most degraded. I do not believe that China has turned out bigger reprobates than England, or France, or Germany, or the United States.

Q. But more of them?—A. Rather more.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Was it not notorious that Australia sent her convicts here by the hundreds in early times?—A. They came, but I do not think it is notorious that Australia, by its government, sent them here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is it not notorious that we hung them?—A. I have heard a good many notorieties of that kind. I heard the notoriety of a gentleman who said he would like to stand on Telegraph Hill and see all the Chinese hung from the yard-arms and see the ships burned as they came in.

Q. Who was that gentleman?—A. Yourself, sir.

Q. Do you know whether you are mistaken?—A. That is what I have heard by rumor. If the rumor is wrong I take it all back and beg your pardon.

Q. I did not propose to stand on the top of Telegraph Hill to burn steamers, that I know of; but then I am not a witness.—A. I should like to make one remark, if I may be permitted, in reference to the charge that has been made against Chinese immigration as destructive and ruinous to labor. If the Chinese by their presence have enabled our present products to be developed to an enormous extent, and have built railroads and done work that we could not have done otherwise, I would say that all these great enterprises that have been accomplished are but trifles in comparison with the immense enterprises yet to be undertaken for this city and State. The Chinese have been charged as poltroons in war. That is a mistake. If they were here they would make admirable workers in sand-works or on fortifications. As sailors, I am informed by Captain Lappidge that they are excellent; that they are like cats in the rigging. To finish my view, we expect to make great water-works from Lake Tahoe; we expect to revolutionize the entire drainage and sewer system of San Francisco. All these are works that require enormous capital. They will require the capital of dozens of men like Ralston with his bank, and if it is not done through cheap labor the work cannot be accomplished.

Q. Those are questions touching the material interests of this country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your views in 1862 and 1871 seem to have considered the question from a much higher stand-point than money-making.—A. I have not excluded the money-making or commercial stand-point by any means.

Q. Do you think the other view, as you first considered the question, is much more important to the future welfare of the State?—A. I think that the prosperity of California depends much more on the Pacific Ocean and its shores than on the Atlantic Ocean and its shores.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have traveled in Europe?—A. I have been in Europe.

Q. What are the wages of the manufacturing classes in Europe?—A. Very small.

Q. How do they correspond with the wages in China?—A. I think they are higher than the wages in China.

Q. All things being equal?—A. All things being equal they are rather higher than in China, I presume. In Sweden the wages are exceedingly low. There are two gentlemen here who would give opinions on that, and I would propose that they be called before the honorable committee: Mr. Timothy Page and Mr. Calvin Page. Mr. Timothy Page is a very large landholder in San Joaquin County, and engaged in the wheat business. Calvin Page is a capitalist who has been East and returned recently, and he says the labor pays only about one-half there that it does here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How long has it been since you have been in Europe?—A. About twenty-seven years.

Q. That is almost a generation. Do you not know that labor has advanced very materially in Europe in that time, and especially in England?—A. Yes, sir; but nothing in comparison to what it has advanced in California.

Q. Which do you think is best in a country, dear wages or cheap wages?—A. Neither. I believe in labor which will compensate the person who employs the labor.

Q. Enable the laborer to support a family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To educate his children?—A. Yes, sir. I am perfectly willing that one man shall be paid enough to support a family.

Q. Do you believe that an American citizen or a European of respectability could live in California as the Chinese tenants are living in your dwellings?—A. No, sir.

Q. Would it be desirable that they should?—A. No, sir.

Q. Can they live upon the same standard of food?—A. No, sir.

Q. Can they sleep in the same places?—A. They can, but it is not agreeable.

Q. Can they, according to civilization, decency, and morality?—A. No, sir.

Q. In our system do not the husband and wife have a room by themselves, except for their young children, while their grown boys and girls have separate rooms?—A. That is desirable, but they do not always get it.

Q. Is it not indispensable to the morals of the nation?—A. It is desirable.

Q. Where they have been compelled, as in Scotland, to herd in small huts, has it not been so demoralizing as to call the attention of Parliament to the fact?—A. That may be, but I think the moral status of

Scotland is equal to the moral status of any European country. Who drives them into hovels?

Q. The Duke of Buccleuch is the Mr. Hollister of Scotland.—A. I doubt, if you would ask the Duke of Buccleuch, that he would acknowledge it.

Q. It is asserted, I believe, that thirteen landlords own half of Scotland. You have heard that?—A. I heard that.

Q. One of these peers owns from ocean to ocean?—A. The law of primogeniture in England and Scotland is the misery of life; it is entirely contrary to our laws, but it is a provision for the maintenance of nobility in order that great tracts shall be kept together.

Q. I ask you if that is not destructive to morals and the welfare of the laboring class. Would they be very much improved if it was all broken up into small pieces?—A. It strikes me if the Duke of Buccleuch's estate was divided into ten thousand holdings and each owned by families it would be very much improved.

Q. There was a gentleman here I think yesterday who owns 75,000 acres of land in California?—A. Three hundred and fifteen thousand.

Q. If he puts in his capital and supplies all his laborers, does he not support all those families; and in order to have the benefit of that labor, is he not compelled to support about twenty families?—A. That is just the point we are discussing; he hires Chinese labor; therefore I say that the necessity of labor is so great that every ounce is worth its weight in California; you cannot have too much of it, whether it is cheap or dear. The Chinese do not conflict, in my opinion, with the industries of the other laboring classes; they are entirely different.

Rev. HIRAM W. REED sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. How long have you lived in this country?—Answer. This is my third visit to California. I was here and staid a short time in 1854, and then in 1864, and returned again in 1874.

Q. What is your profession?—A. I am a minister of the gospel.

Q. In what denomination?—A. Baptist. I am laboring as an evangelist.

Q. Have you been connected with the teaching of Christianity or otherwise among the Chinese?—A. My labors have not been confined principally to the Chinese.

Q. Have you in your knowledge or experience known of the conversion of a Chinese woman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where was she a resident?—A. She lived in Sonora, and she is a member of the Baptist church there.

Q. How long has she been a member of that church?—A. I think about eight years.

Q. Have you ever met her?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How recently?—A. Within two months.

Q. Is she strong in the faith?—A. Yes, sir; as consistent a member as I ever saw.

Q. Do you think she would make a good Christian?—A. I think she is a good Christian.

Q. What success have you met with in reference to converting the Chinese men?—A. As I said, I have not been principally devoted to that work, but I have had some experience in connection with others. I have preached for the Chinese.

Q. In what part of the State?—A. Particularly in Sacramento, and

somewhat in other places where I have held meetings; that is an exceptional thing, however. I have heard others preach to them.

Q. They were anxious to become conversant with our mode of worship and religion?—A. Yes, sir; they have manifested such desire where I have been acquainted with them.

Q. Do you see anything very discouraging in the Christianization of the Chinese?—A. Not more so than among any other people who have no knowledge of our religion and the Bible; not more so than some other foreigners that I have met.

Q. Do you find them apt scholars?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they anxious to become educated?—A. Yes, sir; they have attended the schools that have been established and are maintained in the State in many places.

Q. Maintained by whom?—A. By Christians of various denominations.

Q. Do you know of any attending our public schools?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know the cause?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know that they are refused admission into our State schools?—A. I have heard so.

Q. Do you know that every one of them pays the school-tax?—A. I have heard so.

Q. Do you know of any exception in the Constitution and laws of the United States ruling out any class from receiving an education?—A. I suppose all are entitled to receive an education, but I cannot quote the law on the subject.

Q. You know of no law to that effect, making an exception of the Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any statement that you would like to make in regard to points upon which I have not questioned you?—A. I should like to add that I have visited some of the Chinese Sunday-schools in this city. I did so two years ago. I think it was in Dr. Stone's church, if I recollect rightly. I visited one at different times in the Baptist church, where we have a very flourishing mission. I established a school for them in the Calvary Baptist church of Sacramento myself. They were very anxious to learn; purchased their own books; defrayed all the expenses, and made great proficiency up to the time I left there. I am acquainted with the working of the Young Men's Christian Association among the Chinese, conducted by themselves, in Sacramento. That is a flourishing institution. There are a great many Christians there. Nine of them at one time were received, if I am correct about the number, into the Presbyterian church there as members in full fellowship, having been thoroughly examined by the pastor, Rev. Mr. Rice, and others as to their having become Christians in the sense in which evangelical Christians use the word. There used to be a Baptist church there composed entirely of Chinese converts. The pastor was Rev. Mr. Shook, who had been for years a missionary in China. I am told the church has been broken up in consequence of the members returning to their own country. The Rev. Mr. Simmonds said, in a sermon in my church in Sacramento when I was there, that as these Chinese converts went back to China they all became missionaries, and that he never knew of one of them converted in this country who gave up his profession after returning to China. He used that as an argument in favor of our inducing them to become Christians. The Young Men's Christian Association in Sacramento has a school which I have labored in a little. It is very promising, very flourishing. That is held every evening in the week, I think. Several churches there have Chinese Sunday-

schools. One of the young lads was converted, and a gentleman and his wife, a wealthy gentleman, whose name I do not wish to mention, took him to their family. They were not professors of religion themselves, but they said that he was so exemplary, so dutiful, so faithful, and acted so according to their views of what a Christian should do, that they in a sense adopted him. He maintained his Christian character until he died. They thought so much of him that they kept his room just as he left it, and visitors see it frequently just as he left it. They speak of him as tenderly and as affectionately as they would speak of an own child nearly.

Q. In your experience, do not the families who employ Chinese become very much attached to them?—A. So far as I know, I think that is generally the case where they prove themselves worthy of confidence. There are exceptions, of course; but for the most part I think that is true. While I was holding a meeting at Santa Cruz, about two years ago, one of the young converts of this place went down with Rev. Mr. Francis, who had charge of the Baptist mission here, and preached in the church where I was holding a meeting one Sunday night. He also preached in the Congregational church there. I could not understand his language, but evidently there was a very excellent impression made upon the Chinese hearers. I have become acquainted with him since, and learn that he is a very faithful and successful preacher. The last I heard of him he was preaching in Los Angeles. I know that the Chinamen whom we have employed simply as laundrymen, the only business we have had with them directly in any kind of labor, have been very anxious for us to teach them to read the Bible. Weekly it has been my wife's custom, when these men have come for the clothes or return with the washing, to give them a chance to read, at their request. They all appear to be very desirous of learning.

Q. Do they, within your knowledge, employ private tutors in the State?—A. I have known a good many Chinese to do that.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am an evangelist, a minister of the gospel.

Q. Of what persuasion?—A. Baptist.

Q. How long have you resided in this country?—A. This is the third time I have been in the State. I was in the southern part of the State a short time in 1854, and in 1864 I spent some time here.

Q. You have been discussing the question of the desirability or nondesirability of Chinese immigration from the stand-point of evangelism?—A. I have said nothing about the question of their immigration. I only gave my observation and experience.

Q. As to those who are here?—A. Yes; that is all.

Q. You think there has been one converted?—A. I spoke of one that I am acquainted with who is a worthy member of the Baptist church in Sonora, for which church I held a meeting last year.

Q. What was her condition in society at the time of her conversion?—A. I was not here then, as it was some eight years ago, but I have heard that she was kept as a mistress, a prostitute, or something of that sort.

Q. Was this the result of your exertion?—A. O, no. Mark, I have been in the State this time only between two and three years.

Q. Is this Chinese prostitute the only instance of conversion you know of in your church?—A. It is the only conversion of a Chinese woman that I am acquainted with, except that I have heard that there are others in Mr. Gibson's mission and elsewhere.

Q. Have you heard how many there are of this character of females in this State?—A. I may have heard, but I do not know.

Q. Say four thousand?—A. I have no idea.

Q. Assuming that there are four thousand Chinese prostitutes coming to this country and plying their vocation here in the last twenty years, and one of them has been converted, or we will assume that three or four more of them have been converted, then what is your estimate as to the desirability of encouraging this class of immigration?—A. I think it is very unfortunate that any such business is carried on as importing prostitutes.

Q. As to the desirability of this class of immigration, in view of these facts, what have you to say?—A. I condemn *in toto* the idea and practice of importing prostitutes from any country.

Q. Then you would disfavor clearly the importation of Chinese of this class to this country, notwithstanding some of them have been converted?—A. For that business, most assuredly. There is no righteousness in importing anybody for that business.

Q. What, in your opinion, has been and is likely to be the moral effect upon our country of the introduction of that class of people?—A. I think it is bad.

Q. Bad, and very bad?—A. Yes, sir; decidedly bad.

Q. What, in your opinion, will likely be the result to the morals and future of our people by the introduction here of the ordinary heathen Chinese, good or bad?—A. That depends upon how they are treated. If they were received by Christians in a spirit of Christian kindness, and presented with the offer of the Bible and salvation as we do to other impenitent people, and that work were faithfully prosecuted, I believe they would be converted as much as anybody else. "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

Q. Suppose that, unfortunately, this community of ours is not composed of a majority of Christians, and that they do not receive the Pagan with kindness, and do not extend the Bible and Christian salvation to them, taking things just as they are, humanity just as it is, and Californians just as they seem to be, what, in your opinion, is the result of Chinese immigration upon the morals and future welfare of this country?—A. I think in the main the influence has not been favorable, because they have been too seriously neglected by Christians. I think the fault is with Christians.

Q. In your Christian judgment has it not been a very bad thing for this State and to the morals of the State, so far?—A. I do not know. Taking the whole population, I cannot say.

Q. Do you know the general character of the Chinese who are in the city of San Francisco. Do you know that large numbers of them are gamblers and opium-eaters?—A. I have heard so.

Q. And tan-players?—A. I do not know anything about tan-playing.

Q. And prostitutes? And have you heard from the testimony of physicians that they give diseases to our boys?—A. I have seen it in the papers.

Q. And that they invite them, by window-tapping, to their dens?—A. I do not know anything about it.

Q. And give them bad diseases? Have you heard those things?—A. I have heard it.

Q. Then, assuming that to be true, is it not demoralizing to our people?—A. I believe so far as it goes it is bad. That business is bad all round; but there is a remedy for it.

Q. The influence on the rising generation is bad?—A. I do not doubt that it is bad on everybody.

Q. You would not advise or consent to the immigration of Chinese to this country if it was solely a question of material progress?—A. Leaving out that moral aspect of it, I do not see any objection to them.

Q. Do you not consider the moral as the higher and principal ground for you to consider this question?—A. Yes.

Q. You are not allowing yourself to be influenced by the fact that some people make money out of them?—A. O, no.

Q. Now, you are considering it as governed by the moral and religious views?—A. Purely.

Q. From your observation of them, from what you have seen and know, would you favor their coming here in unrestricted numbers?—A. If you mean by that that millions of them might come, and if millions of them were disposed to come if they were allowed, I would not favor it.

Q. We will say hundreds of thousands. Would you favor that?—A. My impression is, there are to-day no more Chinese on this coast than might be here safely and profitably to the country at large.

Q. Safely to the morals of the country?—A. Yes, if Christians will do their duty.

Q. But if Christians will not do their duty?—A. Then they are to blame.

Q. If Satan prevails, how will it be?—A. Then I do not think we can control them rightly.

Q. Do you not think Satan is pretty hard to manage?—A. I do; very hard.

Q. Do you not think he is harder to manage with 200,000 Chinese than with the same number of boys and girls brought up under Christian influences?—A. Very likely; but there is another view that influences Christians generally, I suppose. It is the duty of Christians to give the gospel to the heathen, and, as they are here providentially, I think we ought to meet them with the gospel, and do the best we can for them.

Q. There is a difference of opinion, of course. Some think it is better to meet them with the gospel, and some think it is better to meet them with a paving-stone. You think the gospel is the better?—A. Yes, sir; decidedly.

Q. Have you an acquaintance in the country, in farming communities?—A. I pass through the country sometimes.

Q. Have you ever had a rural or a country pastorate in this State?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know how the Chinese live and what they live on?—A. I have seen them eating frequently.

Q. What do they eat?—A. Pork, beef, vegetables, rice, and bread.

Q. Do you know at what price they can live per day?—A. I do not.

Q. You have never made any calculation nor had your mind directed to that?—A. I have not.

Q. Do you know in what way they live in tenements—how they sleep?—A. No, sir; I have never been in their sleeping-apartments.

Q. If you were informed that they could live on rice, desiccated vegetables, and dried fish, at ten cents a day, and could work as skillful and practical laborers brought up in our way from generation to generation, accustomed to the use of meat and vegetables, and if two or three hundred would sleep in a room like this while your family and mine would have to have a separate room for man and wife, and a separate

room for the boys and girls arriving at the age of puberty, do you think, under the conditions I have named for the Chinese, and the conditions you know to exist for the American laborer or poor man, the American can compete with them in any branch of business in which both are equally skilled?—A. The expense of living, I suppose, varies. Chinese can live on smaller wages than our people do live.

Q. Or can live?—A. I do not know. I knew a student once, in college, who lived on 18 cents a week.

Q. That would not buy mush and milk?—A. There is a good deal of difference between how we live and how we might live.

HENRY HART sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are a resident of San Francisco?—Answer. I am.

Q. How long have you been a resident of this city?—A. Going on two years.

Q. You have been a resident of China?—A. Temporarily.

Q. In what business were you engaged in China?—A. I was general agent of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company.

Q. Did you come in contact with the Chinese there in that capacity?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What has been your observation in dealing with Chinese in reference to their honesty and integrity in China?—A. So far as I know, they are straightforward in their dealings, as honest as anybody else, as prompt as anybody else.

Q. How were you treated in China by the natives?—A. I was treated very well.

Q. Did you travel there to any extent?—A. Not much away from the coast. I traveled along the coast.

Q. Was any indignity ever offered you?—A. No, sir; none whatever.

Q. You are familiar with the manner in which the Chinese come here through the American consulate in China?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please explain to the commission the mode in which these immigrants are shipped from China here; what has to be done, and how it is done.—A. In reference to the manner in which they are collected together?

Q. No, sir; in reference to the manner in which they get their passage-tickets and are examined, if they are examined, before being allowed to leave. What are the duties of the United States consul in the matter?—A. The law requires the United States consul to see that there shall be no departures from a foreign country to the United States of those persons likely to become paupers. At the port of Hong-Kong, which, so far as I know, is the only port from which we get any Chinamen, the American consul, assisted by the colonial surgeon, the ship surgeon, and, I think, the third surgeon, examines all the passengers, of course before their departure, and, so far as I know, very thoroughly, to see that they are healthy and able to perform work and sustain themselves when they arrive here, for which the company, if I remember rightly, pay fifty cents. A dollar has been claimed, but I think they pay only fifty cents now. At any rate the American consul at that port insisted, while I was there, on collecting that amount and I used to pay it to him. I do not know that it would make any difference about making the statement, but I never thought there was any law to authorize it. At any rate he used to collect it.

Q. One dollar?—A. We have paid as high as a dollar. I have paid fifty cents and I have paid a dollar.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is that for?—A. For the cost of examination.

Q. Of each Chinaman?—A. Of each Chinaman. I remonstrated with the consul, I remember, on one occasion, in the presence of Captain Cobb, on board of his ship, the Great Republic, due here to-night. On that occasion he threw out some Chinamen and said he would not allow them to pass, after the colonial surgeon and the ship surgeon had said they were fit subjects to come; that is to say, that they were able-bodied men and perfectly healthy. He threw out some men, saying one of them had sore eyes, and another one, I think, had a crooked finger. The consul seemed to be very particular on that occasion. It was soon after I first arrived in Hong-Kong. Mr. Bailey, the consul at that time, was in the city, and the deputy or vice-consul was on board. I remonstrated with him and told him that I thought my judgment of men was as good as his; that they were perfectly healthy, &c. At any rate he would not allow them to go, and I think they were thrown out. Subsequently they were allowed to pass. I was told those men had paid the necessary fee to the consul in order to obtain the certificate. I remember on one occasion some women were carried into court, and they testified that they had paid the consul the sum that was necessary to obtain a certificate. I will also state here that no woman can leave China until she has obtained a certificate from the American consul to the effect that she is coming here as a member of some respectable or honest Chinaman's family, and the consul has to become satisfied that they are not coming here for purposes of prostitution. Whether they issue that certificate believing that it is proper for them to issue it, or whether they issue it knowing that it is all a farce, I cannot say; but I assert most positively that no woman can depart from China without the consent of the American consul. During all my service out there I know that such was the case. I remember on one occasion when the Japan left there with 142 women. I presume all persons here remember the circumstances, for we refused to allow them to land. Each one of those women had a certificate from the American consul, Mr. Bailey, and I have known them to be refused certificates frequently. In fact, I never knew a ship to leave without there being applications made from women, and some of them were refused. That is about all I know upon that subject.

Q. Can any woman come to this country now, under the law, without first procuring a certificate that she is not a prostitute?—A. I cannot say anything about the manner in which the business is conducted now. The law may have been changed since I left, or the practice of the consulate may have been changed; but during my service such was the law, and it was enforced.

Q. Where was this examination made; on shipboard, or in the office of the consul?—A. The examination of the men took place on board the ship. Our rule was to take the Chinamen on board. The ships always departed from Hong-Kong at the hour of three o'clock in the day. We usually took the Chinamen on board the night before the day of departure of the ship, taking good care, of course, that no other persons than those who wanted to take passage should be allowed on board. About 12 o'clock in the day all were mustered on the lower deck. I was on board probably as many as a dozen times during my residence out there, and so far as I could see they submitted themselves to a very strict examination.

Q. The examination was made on board the ship?—A. On board the ship.

Q. Was it made by the consul personally, or by some one deputed by him?—A. I have seen the consul on board, but the vice-consul also was there. I think the vice-consul was supposed to attend to the duty.

Q. Was the examination made by simply looking at the Chinaman and asking him questions, or do they receive testimony from other persons in regard to his or her character?—A. The examination that I refer to is in regard to their condition bodily.

Q. Their physical condition?—A. Their physical condition.

Q. That is done by personal inspection?—A. By personal inspection.

Q. And asking questions?—A. Yes, sir, if there was any doubt.

Q. Was any Chinaman allowed to come who was apparently diseased in any way?—A. No, sir, not if they knew it. The ship surgeon would have thrown him out if the colonial surgeon or consul had overlooked him, because of the preservation of health on board the ship.

Q. Then no invalid Chinaman was allowed to come?—A. Not if they could prevent it. He was not likely to be able to pass such an examination as they all had to undergo.

Q. He was not allowed to come if it appeared by looking at him in any respect that he was an invalid from any cause?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did the ship surgeon also make an examination?—A. Always.

Q. Is that made at the same time with the examination made by the consul? Did they both examine at the same time, or was it a separate examination?—A. To explain to you, so that you may better understand it, I will state that the men would pass, the ship surgeon would look at them, and then they would pass on to the colonial surgeon, and from the colonial surgeon to the consul, who was also present.

Q. Do you mean by "colonial surgeon" the surgeon of the port?—A. The port surgeon; that is, the harbor-master surgeon.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. He is an English official?—A. An English official. I may add, that the harbor-master was also present, probably more to look after the condition of the ship at the time of her departure, to show that she was properly provisioned and that the Chinamen had the allotted space required by their own laws, as well probably as by our laws.

Q. What experience did your company have with Chinese as sailors, favorable or unfavorable?—A. I have never heard any complaint as far as I know. I think they were good sailors.

Q. How did your captains speak of them as sailors?—A. They would have less trouble with them than with European sailors. They are not the equal of European sailors, in my judgment, but I think they are preferable, certainly, for that trade.

Q. You have resided in Yokohama?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you not have a little experience there with a cargo of Chinese wrecked or in distress? I have some faint recollection of your connection there with that affair.—A. I have shipped them around there. I remember on one occasion we had about seven hundred on board, and we lost the ship. We put an extra ship there for the purpose of connecting with the ship, but the ship failed to reach there. She came in probably five weeks overdue, and I had them there in harbor about five weeks.

Q. Were they coming this way?—A. They were bound this way.

Q. How did they behave under those circumstances?—A. They behaved very well. I remember the authorities of Yokohama objected to their coming on shore, and I had to provide for keeping them afloat. It was rather expensive to keep them aboard, so I hired a hulk and kept

them there, I believe, about seven weeks. There were seven hundred of them.

Q. Were there any riots among those seven hundred who were penned up there for seven weeks?—A. None whatever.

Q. They were well-behaved men, all of them, and seemed to take the circumstances as they found them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you transact business with Chinese in China? How do they get passage and ship their goods?—A. It may not generally be known, but I do not suppose 3 per cent. of the Chinamen who come to this country secure their own passage-tickets. That is done by merchants.

Q. Advancing money?—A. Yes, sir. For instance, a man will come down and say to-day that he wants ten tickets for such a ship. You give him ten tickets. You never know anything about who the passengers are or anything about them.

Q. About what class of Chinese emigrate to this country from China?—A. It would be very hard for me to say, so that you would understand. There are a great many grades of society in China, probably more than in any other country that I know of. I hardly know, but I think that by no means the lowest class come here. I know there is a class far below those who generally come here, what is termed the cooly class in China. I do not think any of them ever come here. I have never seen any here, nor knew of their coming. When the cooly-trade was in operation from Macao—I presume you know a great deal more about it than I do—there was a class of Chinamen went to the Brazils and Cuba and Peru, far below and inferior to those who come here. When I was in China the cooly-trade was stopped. You are aware that the only outlet to Chinamen now is to this country. No Chinaman can now leave China for any other country, unless a few may go to Australia. Those who go to Australia, I think, are about the same class as those who come here. As I stated before, the class of Chinamen sent to Brazil and to Peru are inferior to those who come here. I have tried to see if I could notice that class of coolies immigrating to this country, and I have never seen any of them. I think it is fair to say that 90 per cent. of those who come here are far from being of the upper classes. Again, I will say to you that during all my residence in China and my connection with the Chinese, and I have had a good deal of steamship experience, I have never known them to travel in cabin. The only instance I have ever known of Chinese traveling in cabin has been in the case of students. We used to send over students, and the government always required that they should be sent first-class. The merchants here, no matter whether well off or poor, always go in the steerage. There are a great many of the better class of Chinamen in the steerage that we never know anything of at all. I think that they behave themselves all about alike. I have been shipmate with them and never saw any difficulty. I have been shipmate in my youth in European steerage, and I will say I would rather be shipmate with a cargo of Chinamen, such as the class who come here, than with a cargo of European steerage. I think they are equally cleanly. I do not know that they are more so. They are very orderly people so far as I know. I do not know anything of the Chinamen here. I never was in Chinatown here unless I passed through on the street-cars. I never hired them here, and have no experience with them at all. I was remarking to a gentleman the other day, from my experience and the experience of other agents in China, what I think is rather remarkable. The Pacific Mail Company has been doing business now since 1867, in China. Whatever I may say is in reference to busi-

ness up to the time that I left. I do not know anything of course that has happened there since I left. Our business was an exclusively credit business with the Chinese; that is to say, we did nothing for them for cash. If we delivered to a Chinaman freight we countersigned his bill of lading and gave him his order for the freight, and when we wanted the money we sent for it. If a Chinaman came down and wanted a hundred tickets to ship to-morrow, we gave him a hundred tickets, and when we wanted the money we sent for it. We had only two uses for money, one to remit home and the other to pay our own bills. There are plenty of banks there, and we could have the money whenever we wanted it. You can understand something of the extent of the operations of the company when I tell you that six months in the year the average number of passengers was a thousand.

Q. Each ship?—A. Each ship. I have known 1,400 to come. Take a thousand, that is $45,000 a ship. The other cargo of the ship is sometimes as much as a hundred thousand dollars. That money we always had due us. Sometimes we would wait a month for it. Generally the courtesy extended to merchants is a month, and sometimes if you do not need the money you wait two months. If you had the Pacific Mail Company's books here to-day to examine them, I do not think you would find that they ever lost a farthing by a Chinaman. There has never been one farthing carried to profit and loss, to my knowledge. I think that is perfectly remarkable when you consider that our business during the whole period from 1867 up to a year ago (and I presume that the same state of affairs exists now) was exclusively on credit, and we never lost a cent.

Q. Your business would aggregate a good many millions?—A. I gave you some figures so that you could form some idea of the business. The same may be said of inwrad as well as outward carrying. That is about all I know about the Chinamen. I never ate with them and never drank with them, and know nothing about them, (producing a paper.) I have heard much said about Chinamen having no regard for truthfulness or honesty. I remember that on one occasion one of our agents was leaving Hong-Kong. They regarded him as a very high-minded and honorable gentleman, and thought proper to present him with an address. That is a translation of the address they presented him with. I thought I would bring this copy down and let you see it and look at it. I do not know that it would throw any light particularly on this subject.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. When you speak of the integrity and honest dealing of the Chinese, you speak of the merchant class?—A. That is the only class I know anything of.

Q. Then you do not know anything of the common class of immigrants to this port?—A. Very little, indeed. You know more about it than I do.

Q. They are from Canton; river-men, boatmen?—A. No; I do not think they are. I think that the major portion, a large percentage of them, are from the interior of the country. They are from the farming districts. There are some artisans, of course.

Q. Did you ever find any difficulty on your steamers with stowaways?—A. Not any difficulty, but we have found them.

Q. A great many of them?—A. Yes; we have found them. I think the Chinamen were not to blame for that.

Q. If the habit was to stow themselves away, then a class of people could come who would avoid the consular certificate?—A. Yes; but

that never was carried on to any great extent. It was found out about a year and a half ago that some of the officers of the ship stowed them away at times. Of course you are aware of the fact that only a limited number of passengers are allowed; that is, the law prescribes a certain number for a given space. Take the months of February, March, and April, when we have had only one ship a month, and even when we have had two ships a month, we were unable to bring the number of passengers wanting to come. It is singular, but I have known Chinamen to pay a great deal more to stow away than the passage would cost.

Q. Pay to whom; to the officers of the ship?—A. Yes; they must have paid it to the officers of the ship.

Q. And those officers knew they were violating the law, of course?—A. Yes, sir; of course they must have known they were violating the law and the rules of the company.

Q. And they were rendering the ship liable under the law?—A. We have had serious difficulties here with the State and city authorities on many occasions.

Q. You say that the consul there exacts a dollar as a fee?—A. They have exacted a dollar.

Q. So that for a ship bringing away a thousand passengers the consul would exact a thousand dollars?—A. When I first went to China Mr. Edwards Pierrepont was solicitor of the Pacific Mail Company. I looked into the law, and from my own interpretation of it I thought that the consul had no justification for the amount claimed by him. In fact there had been other consuls there, predecessors of Mr. Bailey, who had permitted ships to depart without exacting this fee. From my interpretation of the law he was only entitled to charge the sum of two dollars for the certificate. I argued the point with Mr. Bailey. Of course I give him credit for being conscientious about it, but he insisted upon this fee. I refused to pay it on one occasion, and he sent me a message that if I did not pay it he would not allow the ship to depart. At that time there was no admiral out there. Captain Calhoun was the naval officer of the port. I made up my mind that I would not pay it. I met Captain Calhoun and stated my case to him. I showed him the law. He told me he thought I was right. I then told him what the consul said, that he would not allow the ship to depart; and I said, "There is no way in the world that he can prevent this ship from going to sea unless you stop her. You are in command here." Captain Calhoun told me that he would not stop her. I said, "Very good, the ship shall go to sea without his certificate." I was a little hasty about it. I found out afterward that the ship's papers were in the hands of the consul, and he did not give them up, and I was not disposed to send the ship to sea without her register, proper papers, &c. I sent the consul word that I would pay the money, but should pay it under protest. The consul sent me the ship's papers at the proper time, and the ship departed. I continued to pay him his charges. I am sure now that it was a dollar. I know we did pay as much as a dollar. It may have been half a dollar on these occasions. I continued to pay him for two or three months under protest. I then went back and looked over the company's books, and ascertained the exact amount of money that we had paid the consul for such service from the inauguration of the company up to that time. I sent these statements on to the managing director with all the particulars, and requested him to hand over my letter, protest, &c., to Mr. Edwards Pierrepont and ask him to present the case to Mr. Hamilton Fish, the

Secretary of State; to protest against it, and get the Secretary to give instructions to Mr. Bailey to stop making the charge. I received a reply from the managing director, stating that the papers had been handed over to Mr. Pierrepont. I think he said Mr. Pierrepont had gone to Washington in relation to the business. He said that he had asked Mr. Pierrepont's opinion about it, and Mr. Pierrepont had sustained me in the view that the consul had no right to make that charge. The money amounted to probably as much as $18,000, and we were in hopes that we could get it refunded from the Government. I was engaged in my business out there at the time. I felt that I had discharged my duty in presenting what I thought to be an outrage upon the company, an exaction by the consul that he was not justified to make according to law, and I came to the conclusion that if the company did not look after its interest any more closely than handing it over to their solicitor, and have it pigeon-holed in the State Department, I had discharged my duty. I never heard anything more of it afterward.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You do not know whether the money was ever refunded or not?—A. The money was never refunded. I am sure of that.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are you not aware that all moneys collected by consuls as fees go into the Treasury of the United States?—A. I am aware that it should be so.

Q. Are you aware that that money did not go there?—A. No; I am not aware of that fact.

Q. Are you not aware that the revenue of the United States from the consular-service is some $70,000 over and above the expenses of the whole consular-system?—A. I only know that the consuls receive a fixed salary instead of fees and commissions, as they did formerly.

Q. And the fees and commissions go into the Treasury of the United States?—A. I suppose they ought to go there. I do not know anything about it.

Q. So that, when Mr. Bailey insisted upon the payment of these fees, he was simply insisting upon the right of certain moneys to be collected to go into the Treasury of the United States?—A. I stated that I believe he was conscientious about it. My object in making this report was that, if he had misconstrued the law or had exacted from the company more than what he had a right to exact under the law, the Government would refund the money, under the supposition that it had gone into the Treasury of the United States, and that the Government is just.

Q. Do you not know that Mr. Fish, the Secretary of State, is a very attentive man to business and does not pigeon-hole matters, but attends to them?—A. I may have hastily spoken about pigeon-holing matters in Washington. I suppose unless there were some one in Washington to follow up this thing and to bring it to the notice of the Secretary of State, with the immense business he has, it would simply lie away and be forgotten.

Q. Do you think a grave matter involving $18,000, or thereabouts, formally presented by Mr. Pierrepont to the Secretary of State, stating that money was being illegally collected by one of the consuls abroad, would have been pigeon-holed and forgotten?—A. I should think not. I sent it to the managing director, and I have only got his say-so that it was handed to Mr. Pierrepont, the solicitor, to be attended to. I know nothing beyond that. I never followed it up; it was not my duty

to follow it up. I merely thought it was due to Mr. Bailey that I should call attention to the fact that these fees go into the Treasury of the United States. I had frequent conversations with Mr. Bailey about it, and Mr. Bailey always took the ground that he had a right, under the law, to make the charge; there was one consul in Hong-Kong, though, six years ago, who permitted ships to leave there without making that charge. I think his name was Turner, but I will not be positive about it. He stated that he did not believe he had a right to make the charge. There was another consul, I will state, who made a charge of $2 a head; the company has paid different sums.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You say the company did pay those fees?—A. Yes, sir; they have paid them.

Q. And that the money never has been refunded?—A. Not to my knowledge. I think if it had been refunded I would have heard of it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Was the protest against a fee of one dollar or was it against any fee at all?—A. It was against anything being paid. I do not know where you would find the law exactly, but the law is subject to different interpretations. In fact, the merchants of Hong-Kong have remonstrated on more than one occasion against the charge. It is a well-known fact to more than one gentleman here that the representatives of Chinese houses remonstrated against the charge made by Mr. Bailey and other consuls. Messrs. Macondray & Co. could tell you something about it, and also Adolphe C. Low & Co. It is a well-known fact in China. There was an indignation meeting of merchants held there on more than one occasion; but I suppose this matter is entirely foreign to the investigation.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are you not aware that there is an annual statement published by the State Department showing the amount of fees received by each consul?—A. I suppose there is. I know that all the money collected by the consul should go into the Treasury.

Q. Would it not be very easy to ascertain if moneys did not go into the Treasury by simply referring to the table?—A. I hope you will not understand me to say that the money did not go into the Treasury. I have not intimated that it did not go into the Treasury. I did not mean to reflect upon Mr. Bailey at all. I started off by saying that he thought conscientiously he was doing right to collect it.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Did they keep up that collection as long as you staid there?—A. Yes, sir. I also stated that there have been different sums paid.

Q. Does the law fix any sum?—A. Yes, sir. As well as I can explain that to you I will do so. According to my own interpretation of the law the consul is only justified in collecting $2 for the certificate of the whole ship.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That is for the clearance?—A. For the passenger-clearance, not for the ship's clearance. But consuls besides Mr. Bailey have taken the ground that they had the right to collect $2 for each passenger. Mr. Turner, if my memory serves me faithfully, was the consul previous to Mr. Bailey. At any rate he was consul there during the time the company has been operating, and he used to make a charge of $2, and the

company used to pay it. There was another consul who succeeded him who, upon reading the law, thought he was not justified except in collecting the sum of $2 for the passenger-clearance. He was there but a short time. I think after three months or five months he was taken ill and had to return home. Then he was succeeded by Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Bailey has always collected this sum. I know positively that it was fifty cents at one time. I could tell by reference to my letters. I have a copy of all my letters here. I think it was $1 that was collected at the time I made the protest.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Does the law provide for that sum under any circumstances?—A. The law provides for it, as I told you. In fact, Mr. Bailey showed me on one occasion a letter from Washington City, in which he told me that he was sustained by the State Department in making that collection. When I made reference to this matter it was for the sole object of giving Colonel Bee a satisfactory explanation of how the Chinese are embarked at Hong-Kong, not with a view of making any complaint against the consul, or the State Department, or the Government at all. I only made the statement with the view of enlightening you as to the manner in which immigrants are embarked from Hong-Kong.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I see you are not sure about the name of the consul. Was it not J. C. Allen?—A. I am not sure about it being Turner. I cannot say. If I saw a list I might tell.

Q. Do you know a consul by the name of Allen, who ran away with about a hundred thousand dollars of illegally-collected fees? A.—It occurs to me that I have heard that; but I know nothing about the fact. I will tell you, moreover, of an occurrence that took place in Hong-Kong while I was there.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me this is rather immaterial, and we had better not protract it.

By Mr. PIPER:

A. Are you an American by birth?—A. I am; I was born in Virginia.

Q. You said, I think, that you would rather be a steerage-passenger with a cargo of Chinamen than with a cargo of Europeans?—A. I did not say I would rather. I said that I had been shipmates of both, and one was about as cleanly and orderly as the other.

Q. Did you ever travel steerage with a cargo of Chinamen?—A. I used to go to sea in my youth. I made several voyages. I was before the mast in Liverpool, and we used to bring passengers over.

Q. Do I understand you to say that you would as soon be a steerage-passenger with a cargo of Chinamen, whose habits are not like yours, whose language you do not speak, as with a cargo of Europeans?—A. I hope you will not change what I said. I said that I have traveled with both, and I have found one just as orderly and quiet as the other.

Q. Then you would just as soon be with Chinamen as with your own race?—A. If you would like my views, I will tell you.

Q. I do not ask your views.—A. I wish to make a statement.

Q. Do you prefer Chinese as companions on board ship to Europeans or Americans on the ship as fellow-passengers?—A. I certainly would prefer the Americans.

Q. I want to know if you have traveled in the steerage with them,

not what you prefer.—A. I will state that I have crossed the Pacific more than once with large numbers of Chinese.

Q. As a steerage-passenger?—A. No, sir, never; but it has been my business to know something about them.

Q. Did you eat at the same table with the Chinese steerage-passengers?—A. Never.

Q. You were cabin-passenger?—A. Always. I have eaten some of the food given to Chinamen. For instance, Chinamen live on rice, and I would eat rice.

Q. Everybody likes rice. Did you ever cross the Atlantic with a cargo of steerage-passengers?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. As a steerage-passenger?—A. Not as a steerage-passenger. I never was a steerage-passenger.

Q. What do you know about steerage-passengers, whether they are agreeable or disagreeable?—A. I will explain that as well as I can. I think if you were an officer of the ship the chances would be——

Q. Were you an officer of a ship?—A. I have been an officer of a ship.

Q. What officer?—A. I was second officer of a ship on three voyages across the Atlantic. I sailed before the mast three years of my life, and I think I probably know something about it. It was my duty to know something about it.

Q. Then you would just as soon associate with Chinamen as with Americans or Europeans?—A. No, sir; I have not said so. I do not think any gentleman in this room would charge me with having made any such assertion except yourself, and I would like it clearly and distinctly understood right here that I did not say so.

Q. With all due respect, you did make that assertion. I ask the reporter to read your language.

The reporter read from his short-hand notes as follows:

"I have been shipmates in my youth in European steerage, and I will say I would rather be shipmates with a cargo of Chinamen, such as the class who come here, than with a cargo of European steerage."

A. Now, I will state that it was not my intention to say that, and I do think the gentleman should permit me to correct the reporter's statement. I did not aim to state it. I do not believe it.

Q. Then you ought not to have stated it, if you do not believe it?—A. If the reporter has got it down in that way, I state it differently now.

Q. I want to know if you prefer Chinamen to Europeans?—A. I have stated to you emphatically that I desire to correct the statement if I made it.

Q. Correct it then. It is precisely what we want to know whether the American people of California are preferred to Chinese?—A. When you first asked me, it was not my intention to make such a statement.

Q. You now state that you prefer Americans and Europeans to associate with on shipboard to the association of Chinese?—A. I do not think there is a gentleman present but what would prefer them. I do most assuredly. I never associated with Chinese, and that is an evidence that I do not prefer their company.

Q. You said before that you did?—A. I am not here, as I understand it, to vex you or get you out of fix, Mr. Piper. I do not want to vex you at all.

Q. I simply want to know whether Chinamen are preferred to Americans by you?—A. I came here to be as agreeable as I could be.

Q. When a gentleman comes here and says he prefers to associate with Chinese rather than Europeans or Americans, I want to have it known.

—A. Will you allow me to say that I think I have a right to express my opinion in regard to it, and I do not think you have a right to continue to assert that I said so. Will you insist upon my having said such a thing?

Q. You did say it?—A. Have I not explained it.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this matter is fully explained.

The WITNESS. I hope you will so consider it, Mr. Senator.

Q. (By Mr. PIPER.) The idea is a disgrace to this country.

A. Mr. Piper, I was born in this country, and I think you were too. I am as proud of my country as you are, and I would be as far from saying anything against my country as you. I do not think that you have a right to insist that I made such a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. (To the witness.) I think we understand you.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. In the testimony given by Captain King in reference to this act which enables the consul to collect fees of immigrants, he states:

"This cooly act enables the consul to exact large fees from every cooly, which the ships pay, and requires them to charge more charter-money."

Do you know that to be so?—A. No, sir; I know nothing about it. I do not know anything about that of my own knowledge at all. I have only heard these things.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The seven hundred Chinese that you kept on the hulk at Yokohama, you say were perfectly quiet and docile?—A. Perfectly so.

Q. If the same number of Americans had not been allowed to go on shore, but had been confined to a hulk there, would they not have been likely to have made some complaint, and would they not have objected to that condition of acquiescence?—A. I do not know whether they would or not. Probably they would. They might have done so and might not.

Q. Do you not think that there is a strain of enterprise and independence on the part of the average Americans that would have made that confinement so very irksome that they would have protested in some way?—A. I am quite sure if it had occurred with that number of any other people they would never have had to remain there. It was only on account of their being Chinese that they were not allowed to go ashore.

Q. Do you think that people having such different characteristics in that respect from Americans are by nature and habits such as a free, independent republic could be safely founded upon or would be likely to rise upon?—A. I think not.

CHARLES SONNTAG sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are a resident of San Francisco?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Chief deputy of the license department.

Q. Have you any data to give to the commission as to the amount of licenses paid by the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir. [Producing a paper.] This is only an approximate, but is pretty nearly correct. The amount of license we collect from Chinese peddlers, who peddle fruits and vegetables in baskets suspended from a pole that they carry on their shoulders, is $11,820 for this year.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. For how long a time?—A. That is for this year. We collect the licenses quarterly. Every three months we sell them a metallic tag

showing the months for which the license is paid, which tag they put on their baskets. That is evidence to the police-officers and license-officers that these men are duly licensed. We collect from store-keepers and persons who sell liquor about $3,000 a quarter, about $12,000 a year in round numbers. I suppose it does not vary $500 from that in a year.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. That is for liquors?—A. Chinese liquor and store-keepers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. That makes $23,000 or $24,000 for the whole?—A. Yes, sir; about $24,000. There are five hundred and twenty-one store-keepers that we license.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. There are other taxes that they pay.—A. Yes, sir. Then Chinese pawnbrokers and Chinese restaurants and lodging-houses.

Q. Is that through your office?—A. Yes, sir; they are all licensed.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. They are all included in one or the other of these statements?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the tax a quarter for the Chinaman who carries a basket?—A. Ten dollars a quarter, the same as any person who sells products or vegetables from a wagon; wagon or basket, it is all alike, $40 a year.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do I correctly understand you in saying that pawnbrokers, restaurants, &c., are included in these two sums?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under the head of peddlers, store-keepers, or what?—A. Store-keepers and restaurants and bars; not saloon-keepers, but persons who retail liquor.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. That is $12,000?—A. $12,000. That is exclusively of $11,820 collected from basket-peddlers.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What other licenses do the Chinese pay?—A. They pay licenses to sell merchandise at permanent places of business.

Q. Besides the license for laundries?—A. We do not license Chinese laundries, as they employ no vehicles in their business. There was an attempt made to license the laundries.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you license peddlers who employ vehicles?—A. We do; but no Chinese employ vehicles.

Q. These peddlers carry their own goods?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What license do they pay?—A. Forty dollars a year, $10 a quarter. All peddlers who peddle products from a basket—meats, provisions, or vegetables of any kind—are required to have a metallic tag or plate on their basket. These plates or tags are changed every quarter. They are sold at $10 each, and it shows that every Chinaman who has one of these tags has paid his license for the quarter.

Q. Is there any considerable number of peddlers of that kind who pay taxes who are not Chinese?—A. The Chinese are the only ones who carry products in baskets. A great many Italians peddle in wagons.

Q. What tax do they pay?—A. The same tax, $40 a year; but they get a regular paper issued to them.

Q. The man who carries baskets pays the same tax as the man who drives a wagon?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you put the license at $10 a basket?—A. Ten dollars for two baskets. Every Chinese peddler carries two baskets.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. That is $10 for an individual?—A. For an individual. The object of having tags is that all Chinamen look alike and one will steal another's license. They have all about the same name, Ah John, Ah Wah, Ah Sin, &c. It would be great trouble to find out the man who has paid and the man who has not paid; they all look alike to us.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How many licensed whisky-dealers are there with regular whisky-bars?—A. There are 46 who pay a license of $64 a year of Chinese.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Forty-six what?—A. Forty-six Chinese bars. They pay a license of $16 a quarter; $64 a year.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How many are there, in your opinion, who deal that way who do not pay licenses?—A. I guess fully that amount. You see the Chinese do not sell whisky or liquor by the glass, but they sell it by the measure, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 cents' worth at a time. I am so told by the deputies who have those Chinese quarters in charge. They sell liquor from little stands where they sell provisions, dried fish, and other things. Sometimes you find three, four, and five little saloons in one store. They all sell liquor.

Q. You say they have a pawnbroking business among them also?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many licenses are there for pawnbrokers?—A. We have eighteen Chinese licensed to do pawnbrokers' business.

Q. In doing the business with them, does your office exact an oath as to the character and quality of their business?—A. No, sir; we do with whites, but not with Chinese.

Q. What is your observation about the Chinese in respect to the obligation of an oath?—A. I do not think they value the sanctity of an oath. I would not believe a Chinaman anywhere under oath.

Q. You think they have not an appreciation of the solemnity or binding force of our ordinary oaths?—A. No, sir.

Q. And are not entitled to credit even when speaking under oath?—A. No, sir. The white merchants make a statement of the amount of business they do and they pay a license upon that amount. You see in our merchandise licenses there are eleven classes, ranging all the way from $4 to $151 a quarter. A merchant brings in a statement of the amount of business he has done during the time covered by the license, which is inspected, and he pays a license upon that basis for the succeeding quarter, and he makes a sworn statement to that effect.

Q. Do the Chinese make these sworn statements?—A. We have sometimes found where they would pay a license of $16 a quarter they would bring in a statement where they would have to pay a license of only $4 a quarter. A license of $4 permits them to do a business up to $1,250 a month, and a license of $16 permits them to do a business of between $5,000 and $10,000 a month. I have known a Chinaman to bring in a statement of about $1,200 or $1,300 manufacturing business, and of course we would not accept it; but we make him pay the whole license.

Q. Do you accept their statement as conclusive or claim the privilege of further investigation and fixing an arbitrary license?—A. We never had any trouble with them; we just tell them $16 and have no trouble. We think that is about right. If they wholesale, we charge a larger license than for a little provision-store.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Does the law give you that privilege?—A. It is discretionary to a certain extent.

Q. That you are not bound by the oath of the applicant?—A. If they would insist upon a sworn statement, of course we would accept it.

Q. Does the law give you the privilege of going outside of a sworn statement?—A. That question has never been raised. I suppose that if a Chinaman insisted upon making a sworn statement, and insisted on our receiving it, we would not refuse it, unless we believed it was fraud, and then he would be punished for perjury.

Q. That is your only remedy?—A. That is our only remedy.

Q. But if you say $16, he pays it?—A. Yes, sir. We do about what is right.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the highest license that you have required?—A. One hundred and fifty-one dollars, although $23.50 is the highest license paid by Chinese merchants.

Q. I mean paid by anybody?—A. One hundred and fifty-one dollars a quarter.

Q. It may be as low as $4?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You fix the uniform license for Chinese at $16?—A, No, sir; from $4 up to $16, which allows a business of from $5,000 to $10,000. That is the highest they pay. It has been rather agreed with them that they should pay that license, although I do not think it is enough.

Q. I understood you, a while ago, to say that you did not swear the Chinese, but that you fix their license and set it at $16?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that the usual rate which you require them to pay?—A. O, no, sir; in some instances we fix the rate at $4. I said in some instances where the Chinese have paid a license of $16 a quarter for business between $5,000 and $10,000 we have sent them off to make a sworn statement, or a statement in detail, and they have brought in reports of business of $1,250 or $1,300 a month. There are large concerns on Sacramento street which do a business of probably $20,000, $30,000, or $50,000 a month.

Q. Do you find that white people generally make correct statements?—A. We have found some instances where they have made false statements.

Q. I am speaking of it generally.—A. Generally they make correct statements. Sometimes it is a great task for a person to foot up his books and ascertain just the amount of his business. In those instances,

if we feel satisfied that he comes within a certain class and cannot give the exact figures, we issue the license in that way.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You would charge an Italian or American or German who carries baskets the same license that you charge the Chinaman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If a Chinaman had a wagon would you charge him any more?—A. No, sir.

Q. It is perfect equality?—A. Perfect equality.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. It has been said that the Chinese merchants are among the leading merchants of our town, doing a large and most successful business. What is the largest license any Chinese merchant pays in this city?—A. Twenty-three dollars and a half.

Q. What business does that authorize?—A. Between $10,000 and $20,000 a month.

Q. Then if there are any Chinese who do more than a business of $20,000 a month, they make incorrect statements?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do these six companies pay a mercantile license?—A. I do not know what constitutes the six companies. Yeong Wo & Co., Tuck Chong & Co., and Wo Sang & Co. are the only ones who pay twenty-three dollars and a half.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the next highest?—A. Sixteen dollars.

Q. What business does that allow them to do?—A. A business between $5,000 and $10,000 a month.

Q. So that by their statement there are only three Chinese merchants in San Francisco who do a business of over $10,000?—A. Only three who do a business of over $10,000 a month.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are there many merchants who pay a license of over twenty-three dollars and a half?—A. O, yes, sir; all the prominent merchants of the city run from $40 to $151. Take Levi Strauss & Co.; they pay $151, the highest, that being for a business of $100,000 a month.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How many here pay the highest license; can you conjecture or guess at it pretty nearly?—A. I suppose about eight of them—Murphy, Grant & Co., Wm. T. Coleman & Co., Castle Bros., and some others that I cannot recollect now.

Mrs. ANNA F. SMITH sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. Fifty-two Second street.

Q. In this city?—A. In this city.

Q. Have you had any experience with Chinese servants in this city or coast?—A. I have not had any special experience with them; that is, I have not employed Chinamen myself since I have been in California.

Q. Where did you employ them?—A. I lived in Colorado two years in business for myself, and there I employed a number of Chinamen at different times.

Q. How did you find them as servants in Colorado?—A. I found them

honest, truthful, fair, and straightforward in their dealings with me on all occasions.

Q. Have you had any experience here where you have lived or come in contact with them as servants?—A. I have seen them in the houses of my friends as servants, and I have seen them in houses where I have been working and living.

Q. Is there any complaint in reference to them as domestic servants, or what is their reputation as domestic servants?—A. Their reputation varies. Chinamen as servants vary as much as whites, that is relatively to each other. Chinamen are good servants and there are poor servants among Chinamen, but I think my experience is that they compare favorably with whites. As far as regards some white persons that I have hired I should prefer them. I always prefer them, and I have hired both.

Q. Are there many Chinese servants in Colorado?—A. No, sir; not any great number.

Q. What employments are they in there generally?—A. A few are employed as house-servants, but the greater number are carrying on laundries for themselves.

Q. What do they pay them there as house-servants?—A. Their prices there are the same as the whites, so far as I know. I paid them the same wages that I paid to white persons.

Q. Was there much opposition to Chinese in Colorado when you were there?—A. No, sir; not the opposition that there is here, because there are not so many of them, and there are not so many other persons who need labor; that is, not as many who have to earn their living by working for other people.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Are you not a housekeeper here?—A. I am a housekeeper in one sense. I have a family and room.

Q. You are a married lady?—A. I have but one child. I am a widow, and I am a housekeeper in a limited sense.

Q. All you know about Chinese is your own experience in hiring them?—A. My own experience in hiring them, and what I have seen of them here in working.

Q. What business did you do in Colorado?—A. I carried on a laundry.

Q. With Chinese help?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you were an employer of Chinese?—A. I was an employer of Chinese.

Q. What business do you do here?—A. Here I am what you might term a general working woman. I do whatever I can get to do.

Q. What is that?—A. My principal business is in taking care of the sick.

Q. In that you do not come in competition with the Chinese?—A. No; not as a nurse.

Q. Do you know that the laboring-women of this city in other avocations come in competition with the Chinese?—A. I am aware of it. I have come in competition with them.

Q. In what respects?—A. I was a seamstress when I first came here. As I tell you, I am glad to get anything to do that I can do which is honest and honorable.

Q. Did you work a sewing-machine?—A. I have worked on a sewing-machine.

Q. Who works the sewing-machines now as a rule?—A. I have found

women working sewing-machines so far as my acquaintance goes. I worked for Mrs. Robinson, who carried on dress-making on Market street, and hired 31 girls.

Q. When was that?—A. Two years ago.

Q. How many does she hire now?—A. She does not hire the same number now, but she has never employed Chinese. White women do her sewing.

Q. Generally, have the Chinese invaded the domain of female labor in this city?—A. I suppose they have in a general sense.

Q. What effect has that had upon working-women who are not nurses?—A. It has reduced the prices of their labor or the opportunity for them to get labor.

Q. Has it thrown many of them out of employment?—A. Not to my certain knowledge.

Q. But to your general knowledge?—A. I cannot say to my general knowledge, except as I read it in the papers, and hear persons speaking who are opposed to the Chinese.

Q. Are the working-women generally opposed to the Chinese?—A. I cannot tell you. That is a question that I cannot answer only as I answered the other, because I have not a great acquaintance in that community.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. I have here a petition sent to this commission, or a member of it, signed by 59 working-women. I should like to read you some of the statements in this petition, to see if your judgment differs from the statements which I shall read to you.—A. Very well.

Senator SARGENT. It is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 15, 1876.

We, the undersigned, sewing-women of San Francisco, present this petition to you in the hope that you will be pleased to forward our views in regard to the much-argued question of Chinese labor. We as a class of respectable and working women are treated by our employers worse than the Chinese, insomuch as we cannot live by the labor of our hands and compete with the Chinese; their expenses and habits differ materially from ours, a great many of us having large families to support, and we cannot stoop to live in squalid and ill-ventilated rooms, where a Chinaman can live in luxury for from twenty-five to thirty cents per day. Manufacturers taking advantage of us, being unprotected and therefore at their mercy, places labor so low that it is almost impossible to get a living, even by working at these prices. The prices are as follows:

Chemise trimmed handsomely, &c., 65 cents per dozen; ladies' wrappers, 20 cents each, and all other underwear in proportion.

Remember that two-thirds of us are American women, Christians, and not heathen, and draw some distinction between them and us.

That the Chinese are ruining all business (where decent women and men could support their families) by underworking, and thereby letting the manufacturer get all the benefit of it, and our children running the streets for want of employment, to be in a little while either dependent on the Magdalen Asylum or the Industrial School for their education.

We therefore ask for your kind co-operation in forwarding this petition, and holding it up as a banner hoisted against white slavery, that our labor may not be in vain, which it will if not upheld and protected by the laws of civilization, and respect for our own people, in preference to Chinese.

Yours, respectfully,

The undersigned working-women of San Francisco.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. This petition is signed by 59 working-women of San Francisco. Among others I see Rose Angell, Alice Hodgson, Jane Anderson. Do you know any of those?—A. No, sir; I am not acquainted with any of them.

Q. What do you say with reference to their statements here?—A. I should say that while I admit that the condition of the working-women

and the working-men in San Francisco is deplorable, and certainly those prices do not indicate that there is much humanity in the employers of those women, yet I would offset that statement if I were permitted to ask a question, and that is, why the condition of the working-people in the East, where there are no Chinamen, is worse than it is here?

Q. You ask a question of me. I do not know that it is worse, or that anything could be worse than this picture that they painted.—A. I think the condition of the working-people, according to the New York papers, is equally as bad as it is here.

Q. Do you think that twenty cents for a lady's wrapper is the price in Boston or Philadelphia, or in Chicago or Cincinnati?—A. I think that it is equally as low, and I think the fact that so many white people come here to find employment is a proof that it is as bad in the East as here.

Q. Suppose that even the low prices which they are now receiving there were still further reduced by a class who worked under them, would that tend to improve their condition or not?—A. No; it would not tend to improve it; but I do not say that the condition of the working-people is caused altogether by the Chinese.

Q. I do not suppose it is altogether; but suppose a woman with a family of children, a widow, who has no means of supporting herself excepting by her labor, and she finds in competition with her, in doing the same article of work, a Chinaman who can live on one-half or one-third what it would cost her to live on and support her children, how is she to get along if the manufacturer avails himself of this cheap Chinese labor, and tells her he cannot pay the price which is necessary for her to live and support her children decently?—A. All I can say is, it is hard on the working-people; but, Senator Sargent, I think that white boys and white girls can get employment here if they are desirous of employment. My little son works every day, and he never has any difficulty in getting labor.

Q. Your son may be a very good boy, and there are exceptional cases, perhaps, which do not prove anything.—A. I do not think that he is remarkably good, or that it is an exceptional case.

Q. I do not insist that he is better than you say he is; but here is a scale of prices. Can any woman maintain a family on those rates?—A. She cannot if she undertakes to live as the wife of a millionaire, or the wife of a man who has an income of $50,000 a year.

Q. Suppose she does not want to do that. How long would it take to make a lady's wrapper?—A. About two hours. It would depend on the amount of work on it, of course.

Q. Suppose it was a chemise handsomely trimmed, how long would it take to make it then?—A. Those are questions it would take me a long time to answer, because some persons can work much faster than others. I find women who can make garments in one-third of the time that I can, and of course they have the advantage of me.

Q. Suppose a Chinaman can make this article in one-half the time at one-half the price?—A. I am not an advocate for the importation of the Chinamen here in droves, but if you will allow me to express my views, I believe in the brotherhood of man, and I cannot believe that we have any right to exclude one race of people for the sake of building up another.

Q. You do not think that we owe anything to the protection of our own American civilization, of our own American men and women?—A. When we force a nation to open their ports to us, that we may do

business with them, I think we ought to be willing to take the consequences.

Q. Suppose we lay aside that matter, which perhaps you are not called here to testify upon, and answer the question in reference to the effect of the Chinese coming here in unlimited numbers upon our own women, and taking up these employments which the women would be able to keep if the Chinamen were not here. What is the effect as to making it harder for the American women to get along? Do you think it tends in that direction?—A. It will make it harder so long as people crowd into cities just as they crowd here into San Francisco; but if women would go out on to ranches in the country and work, they would get employment.

Q. Will you tell me how a widow with five or six young children can go out on a ranch and work?—A. I think they could if it was a question of starvation with them.

Q. Then it is fleeing from starvation, is it?—A. It would be better for them to go than to starve here.

BENJAMIN S. BROOKS affirmed and examined.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Question. How long have you lived here?—Answer. Since 1849.

Q. What is your profession or occupation?—A. I am a lawyer; admitted to the supreme court of New York, and of this State, and of the United States.

Q. Have you practiced law here ever since you have been on the coast?—A. I commenced to practice law here on the first of January, 1850. When I first arrived here I had a ship on my hands, and after my arrival I attended to that until the first of Jannary, 1850, a little over a month.

Q. You have been present here examining witnesses. In what capacity do you appear here?—A. I really do not know. I appear here because I saw by the newspapers that the commission had been kind enough to mention my name among those who would be permitted to be present.

Q. Are you employed by anybody to appear here?—A. No, sir.

Q. Have you any fee promised or in expectation from any quarter?—A. No, sir, I have not been requested by anybody to appear here. I am a pure volunteer. I felt constrained to come when I saw my name mentioned, because while I was at the East, during the past summer, going there with my wife on a jaunt of pleasure, I saw in the newspapers a copy of the memorial filed by Messrs. Pixley, Casserly, and Roach. I thought it was incorrect, and I wrote a letter addressed to the chairman of this committee. I sent it to my agent at Washington, and requested him to see the chairman of this committee personally with it. He was too much engaged at that time to attend to the matter, and the letter was communicated to other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I afterward wrote a reply to this memorial, which I sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. It was printed; I had it printed just as I was leaving; in fact, the proof was sent to me on my way, and I corrected it on the railroad. Having done so much in recommending, as I did, in addition to communications, that the Senate, before proceeding to legislate or to make treaties, should inquire into the facts concerning the matter, I felt somewhat in duty bound to give such assistance as I could to the committee in ascertaining the facts.

Q. Are you employed by Chinamen as their attorney in their own affairs?—A. No, sir; I have no Chinese clients whatever.

Q. Have you paid much attention to this Chinese question for some time past?—A. Yes, sir, I have paid a good deal of attention to it. I have grown up with the place and the country, and I feel interested in its welfare. As the question was started here, I felt inclined, of course, to consider it. It is one that involves the interests of all, mine as well as the rest, and I paid some attention to it.

Q. What has been the influence of Chinese and Chinese labor upon the growth and prosperity of the State? What part has it played?—A. I have no doubt that the importation, or rather the immigration, of Chinese to this State has increased its wealth at least one-half; I think a great deal more. In the first place, the works which they have constructed, and which I think would not have been constructed without their aid, have immediately increased the taxable wealth of the State at least one-half. In addition to that, I am satisfied that they have increased the white population of the State in almost the same proportion, if not quite. I think, without their aid at the present time, the population of the State could not be maintained at more than one-half its present amount, if to that extent. I am satisfied from the inquiries that I have made from all parts (and it is impossible for me to present all these witnesses before you) that the product of the State, its chief export, wheat, cannot be produced at the price at which it can be exported if the cost of production is increased at all. There is a considerable portion of the State, including land that has been cultivated, which will not bear cultivation at the present time; that is to say, the crop which it will produce will not pay at the present price of wheat here for export, and it will not pay the cost of its production. The yield of wheat from these lands, as every one probably knows without my testifying to it, steadily decreases. What Colonel Hollister said agrees with my own experience in that respect. I have been in the habit of traveling from this city to the different county-seats in different parts of the State, and I have observed a gradual decline of the product of the land. I think a great portion of the land that is within reach of the market by water communication, by natural communication, ceases to be productive. I have had here for two days, waiting to testify, an Irishman, a small farmer, who lives near Livermore, within easy distance of the railroad. He cultivates his own farm with his own family. He had his accounts for the year with him. He is a very prudent, saving man, and his wife is as hard-working as he is, and his children assist them. He gave me the figures. I forget what the figures are now, but his expenses were considerably above his income, and he told me he should have to discontinue the cultivation of his farm. He has a mortgage on it, and he has no hopes whatever of paying the mortgage, and he says he must give it up. That is a farm within easy reach, and it is not an exhausted farm by any means; it is new land, comparatively.

Q. You have spoken of the effect on the growth of the State and its material prosperity. What is the effect upon the character of the community in a moral point of view?—A. I certainly have seen no deleterious effect. I cannot say that I have perceived any effect whatever. I should think if it had any effect, it would be a good one. All of us agree that these people possess a great many qualities which were in my youth considered virtues. I do not know whether they are so any more. Their economy, their perseverance, their industry, their thrift, their patience, their reverence for their ancestors, their family affections, their

patriotism, and many other qualities which they possess—their faithfulness in keeping contracts, their trustfulness in regard to work confided to them, honesty—all these things, it seems to me, are examples that the laboring class of our people might follow with profit.

Q. What is their character for keeping contracts?—A. I have always found them faithful to their contracts. Every person I have ever heard speak of them, who had anything to do with them, spoke of their almost religious faith in keeping contracts. I remember, some years ago, this matter was discussed between the late Mr. Ralston, Ex-Senator Williams, of Oregon, and myself. We were discussing the matter, and I asked Mr. Ralston for his experience. He gave a number of incidents in regard to the bank of which he was the cashier and manager, and the large business that he did with that people. In fact, his business with them was so great that he kept a Chinaman there on purpose, Mr. Lee Kan, who is still a clerk in the bank. Mr. Ralston said he had never known an instance of a Chinaman failing to keep his engagements. Then he spoke also of a gang of servants that he employed, obtained through a Chinaman from China, under contract with them to work at a certain rate of wages for a certain length of time. He spoke of the difficulties that his Chinese had with servants of other nationalities that he had, their dissatisfaction, and their desire to leave, but he said it was only sufficient to show the Chinamen a contract in order to stop it at once, and they would go back to their work without a murmur.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you speak of a contract made in China?—A. Made in China, but with Mr. Ralston. It was their bargain with him. He said that it was only necessary to show their contract to them and they would go back to their work.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you somewhat familiar with the character of the civil litigation in this city?—A. I probably have had about as much to do with it as anybody here; or at least there are very few at the bar who have had more to do with it.

Q. What do you know in regard to Chinese being sued for the non-performance of contracts or the non-payment of debts? What is their condition in that particular?—A. I never knew an instance of that kind. It was with a view to get at the matter precisely that I directed one of my clerks, now here, (Mr. Armstrong,) to make the examination which he did, and he gave you the result of it. You have the figures. My memory is not good at figures.

Q. How many suits do you know of that have been brought against Chinamen for the non-performanee of contracts?—A. I never knew of one. I never saw one, nor was I present at the trial of one, nor heard of one.

Q. What do you know of suits against them for the non-payment of debts or obligations against them?—A. I never heard of one. My clerk mentioned finding a certain number upon the books. What they were I do not know, for I did not look at them; but in the course of my practice, almost daily in the courts, I have never met with them either in these courts or in interior courts. I am in the habit of attending the courts in many counties.

Q. Do you attend the supreme court?—A. Regularly; that is to say, there is no term of the supreme court that I have not some cases on the calendar.

Q. Do you know of any appeals in that court in which Chinese are defendants in civil cases?—A. I do not remember any where a Chinaman was a party defendant. I have seen suits where he was a party plaintiff. A few years ago I myself had some business with the firm of Hop Kee & Co. It was an admiralty suit. They were libellants of a vessel. I have seen them plaintiffs in that case; but that is one of the character of cases where a suit was necessary.

Q. In regard to criminal prosecutions, what is their character as violators of the law?—A. I have never had anything to do with criminal prosecutions or defenses, except as a matter of charity. I have sometimes defended a man as a matter of charity. I never received a fee in a criminal court. Therefore I am not as competent to speak of the criminal portion of the Chinese population, which I have no doubt exists, as some other parties; but I sent a printed circular to all the district attorneys in this State, requesting them to give me the number of arrests and convictions, the number of foreign cases, and the number of Chinese cases, and I find from all parts of the State about the same return that there is here. The proportion of Chinese adults arrested is far less than that of the corresponding portion of the foreign population anywhere in the State. I find that the portion of convictions is about the same as the proportion of convictions to white arrests. There appears to be just about as many convicted in proportion.

Q. Do you mean the proportion of one population to the other in point of numbers?—A. No, sir; I do not place the Chinese population against the entire white population. I do not consider that to be a fair comparison at all. You may compare the Chinese population with the white voters, and the proportion of Chinese arrested is vastly less than the proportion of the whites; or you may compare the Chinese population with the white population, cutting off a fair proportion for the women, who are rarely ever arrested, comparatively, and the old men. Taking the population with population by numbers, the proportion is about equal, rather in favor of the Chinese if anything; and if you make those deductions, it is vastly in their favor.

Q. Comparing Chinese adults with male white adults, what is the proportion?—A. Vastly in favor of the Chinese; two to one in their favor, at least.

Q. State whether there is or is not a strong public sentiment in this city, beginning first with the city, against Chinese immigration, either opposed to it altogether or in favor of its limitation.—A. I think there is no such public sentiment. There is a very strong, violent, and loud public sentiment in a certain class of the population, but I do not think it is a large class. In the country I think it is a small minority. I took considerable pains to ascertain the sentiment as I came down across the country, conversing about the matter with every one I met on the road and at the hotels. I have continued the practice since I came here, inquiring of every one that I met. The people that I meet and converse with probably do not represent the entire people. I do not suppose that I am in the habit of meeting all classes of the people; but, so far as my observation extends, this opposition is confined to a class.

Q. How numerous is that class? Take, for instance, the city of San Francisco.—A. I think that the class in this city is large. I think that the foreign voting population in this city outnumbers the native.

Q. You think that the foreign voting population here outnumbers the native?—A. Very considerably. I had the register looked over with a view to ascertain the fact; the proportion of foreign-born voters is about 55 per cent., and that of course gives in this city a preponderance of

that element; it is mainly in that element that this violent opposition exists; but not all of that class are in this opposition. A good many of them are quite content to take their chance with the Chinese or any other immigrant who comes here.

Q. You say that not all the foreign element is in that opposition?—A. No, sir; not by any means; but I should think that very nearly all of the Catholic Irish are in that class. I think it would be hard to find a Catholic Irishman who was not an anti-coolyite. That class, of course, is very considerable. I think all the hoodlums of the city are anti cooly, and think all the bummers are anti-cooly, and those are two classes which are quite numerous in addition to the Catholic element.

Q. How is it among the German-born element?—A. I think the German-born population as a class are not opposed, or, if they are, it is in quite a mild way, and not in this violent way that is manifested in the opposition; the Germans are generally moderate in their views and conservative on all questions.

Q. You do not confine this opposition to the foreign population?—A. No, sir; the bummers are not foreigners as a usual thing; so far as my observation of them extends they appear to be Americans. They are a class pretty well known in this city, and I suppose in other places.

Q. What is the origin of this opposition? What is the moving cause of it? What is it founded in?—A. So far as that element is concerned, the same sort of feeling has always existed against anything that appears to them immediately to depreciate the rate of wages; it is the same spirit that existed against labor-saving machines, the same spirit that prevailed against the Irish when they first began to come and against the Germans when they first began to come. That was the underlying uneasiness and discontent. I think it was fanned into a flame intentionally and purposely for political purposes, and made a stepping-stone to preferment.

Q. You state that those who are opposed to Chinese immigration in the country are a small minority?—A. I think a very small minority.

Q. Does the same feeling that pervades in this city also pervade in other California towns, as, for instance, take the larger towns, Sacramento and Stockton?—A. In proportion as that element forms a part of their population. In Sacramento I have no doubt that it prevails quite as greatly in proportion as it does here, but as you get more into the country, the farming towns, you see less and less of it.

Q. What would be the effect, in your judgment, of allowing Chinamen to become citizens of the United States?—A. I think it would have no effect whatever, or very slight; a few, comparatively few, Chinamen might in time become citizens. They would not become citizens until they had become thoroughly Americanized, until they had learned our language and thoroughly understood our laws. I doubt whether any would become citizens until then, and when they had become so thoroughly Americanized you would not distinguish them from any other citizens. It never has been understood that a Chinaman could become a citizen. At the time Mr. Clarke spoke of in his testimony, there was some question raised in regard to it, but I think the attempt that he made and the refusal that he met with settled the question for that time; at least I heard of no further effort from any one to become naturalized until after the amendments were made to the Constitution. Then it seems to have been thought that Chinamen had the same right as anybody else, and several of them applied to the United States courts to be naturalized. I think that was about the commencement of the present Congress; it raised a ferment at once; the newspapers came out with edi-

torials against it. I think there was a lithographic caricature representing Mongolians sitting in the board of supervisors. At the beginning of the present Congress the United States code was amended so as to exclude Mongolians from naturalization, and that ended the matter of course. I think there were some half-dozen who applied for naturalization; it always seemed to me that it was quite unnecessary to place this exception upon our statute-book. Plainly it seems to me an insult to that nation, excluding them as being particularly unfit for naturalization as American citizens, when in all human probability the number that would apply for naturalization you could count on your fingers; scarcely any of them would apply.

Q. What, in your opinion, would be the wisdom of restricting Chinese immigration?—A. I can very clearly say that, in my judgment, it would be very unwise. There are several reasons, political and sentimental, financial and moral. I have no doubt that the same reasons which have made them an element of wealth to the State in the past will continue to make them an element of wealth in the future. The same cause will produce precisely the same result, and I am inclined to think in an increased degree. We have in this State a hundred millions of acres. There are about four million acres of that land cultivated. There are hardly 20,000,000 acres that are incapable of cultivation. The large margin between those figures is capable of being used by men.

Q. What is the whole number of acres?—A. One hundred and one million and a fraction.

Q. How many acres are in cultivation?—A. About four millions. Perhaps four million and a half are under cultivation.

Q. And you think that all but 20,000,000 are susceptible of cultivation?—A. Susceptible of use. There is a portion of that land covered with forest. Of course that could not be cultivated and improved otherwise than to utilize the forest upon it. There is considerable more that has had no trees on it that could be converted into forest-land. Then there is a large strip of foot-hill land that could be devoted to the culture of various products that are cultivated by hand, mulberry silk, coffee, tea, ramie, and various things of that kind. Then there is a large portion of the State that could only be cultivated by irrigation to any advantage. There is a very large portion of the State which is capable of irrigation, and with irrigation it produces large crops. Then the tule-swamps and overflowed lands are very extensive.

Q. Is there an apprehension here among well-informed people—or among people, I will not use any qualification—that the State is liable to be overrun with Chinese; that there is danger of that?—A. There is no such apprehension among educated people. I doubt very much whether there is such an apprehension among any people to any very great extent. I think the opposition to the immigration does not arise from that source or from that cause.

Q. You think it does not?—A. No; I think it arises mainly from the causes that I before stated—rivalry in employment and the fear that they will reduce the rate of wages.

Q. What cause, or law, if there be any, is it that regulates Chinese immigration?—A. I have no doubt at all that their labor is like any article of merchandise, that the demand will regulate the supply at all times. I do not think that the Chinamen stand in the same position with white men in respect to emigrating. I think the white man always has vastly the advantage. I think he can much more easily raise the sum to bring him here. If either has to borrow it, the Chinaman may have an advantage on account of the greater confidence that is placed

in his promises; but so far as raising the means to come, I think the white man in the States can much more easily raise the sum from his own earnings, save it, that he has to pay to come across the continent by the railroad, than the Chinaman can raise the sum that he has to pay to come in a ship. Then when the white man gets here he understands our language, he is familiar with our way of work, while when the Chinaman comes here he is worth very little, he cannot speak to anybody, he can only be employed in a gang with some overseer who can talk with the employer, and he has got to learn all our ways of doing business, and for a long time he is able to learn very little indeed, so that the white man always has vastly the advantage over him. It is only to fill a place that the white man will scarcely occupy, a vacuum, a place that is not filled, that the Chinaman will ever be employed to fill.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You speak about the Chinese being a patriotic people. Are you a patriot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What constitutes patriotism?—A. Love of country.

Q. And being willing to die for it?—A. I think it a great deal better to live for it.

Q. You are a patriot, then?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I am glad to hear it. Now, Mr. Brooks, it has been proven here that the Chinese empire consists of from three hundred and fifty to four hundred millions of people?—A. Evidence has been given to that effect.

Q. You admit that as a fact?—A. I am not in a position to admit anything.

Q. That is a recognized fact, is it, or is it not?—A. It has been assumed here as a fact; but it is not an admitted fact, it is a very much disputed fact.

Q. What is your opinion on that subject?—A. I think the population is about 300,000,000.

Q. Do you know that less than twenty-two thousand Europeans sacked their capital and levied an indemnity upon a people of three hundred millions; that they marched into the interior three hundred miles; and yet they are a patriotic people, you say?—A. Which question am I to answer?

Q. The question is whether a patriotic people would submit to any such thing as that?—A. I say I know they are a patriotic people; but those facts you state I do not know anything about.

Q. You do not know that twenty-two thousand Europeans marched up to Peking, and took it, and sacked it, and levied a contribution upon it?—A. No, I was not aware of the fact.

Q. You are an intelligent man?—A. I do not like to blow my own trumpet. I would rather take your opinion upon that point.

Q. Is that a fact or is it not?—A. I do not know, I tell you.

Q. On your oath you do not know?—A. I have not taken any oath; but still I do not know that that is the fact.

Q. You do not?—A. No.

Q. Is it not a historical fact?—A. I have no doubt it is, because you say so.

Q. Independent of my say-so?—A. I must say, as I said before, I do not know.

Q. Do you believe they did; that a few French and a few English went up there a few years ago, took Peking, burned the summer palace, and levied a contribution on the Chinese empire, which you say is com-

posed of three hundred millions of people?—A. I should believe it if you said so. That would be quite enough for me.

Q. Do you believe it or not?—A. If I understand you to make the assertion, I believe it.

Q. You believe that is so?—A. I believe anything that you say.

Q. In your opinion, would any patriotic people of three hundred millions of people submit to any such indignity?—A. From what I have read of the Chinese military organization, and its performances, I should think it is very likely.

Q. I am not talking about their military organization. Do you believe any patriotic, country-loving people would submit to any such thing?—A. Yes, I think they would. I think the indemnity levied upon France was larger. I think they submitted to it because they could not help it, and I suppose the Chinese submitted to it for the same reason, if they did.

Q. Did the same circumstances obtain as between France and Germany?—A. The same; the absence of capital in both instances, from what you say.

Q. Did France contain three hundred millions of people and did Germany go there with twenty-two thousand?—A. No, sir; as I said before, from what I have read of the Chinese military organization and its exploits, I should think the thing might happen.

Q. Then you, in your evidence here, say they are equal to Americans morally, physically, and in every other imaginable virtue?—A. I have not said anything of the kind.

Q. You have proven it here over and over again by your witnesses.—A. I am very glad to hear it; but I was not aware of it. I have not attempted anything of the kind or asserted anything of the kind.

Q. You think they are a patriotic people, however?—A. I have no doubt about that.

Q. And patriotism admits of twenty-two thousand foreigners, eight or nine thousand miles away from their homes, going into the capital containing a million and a half, or two, or three millions of people, and looting their palaces and levying a contribution and walking away with their loot?—A. I can imagine circumstances in which patriotism would even submit to that.

Q. You say that the opposition to the Chinese emanates from the Catholic Irish. Did you say that?—A. No, sir.

Q. In the main you said that it did. You have used that word "Catholic" here about forty times in your examination.—A. I do not think so. I think you are mistaken.

Q. Did you use it at all?—A. Yes, sir; I did once.

Q. Did you not say just now that the opposition to these Chinese emanated principally from the Catholic Irish?—A. I do not think I did.

Q. I ask the reporter to read your language.

The reporter read from his short-hand notes, as follows:

I think it would be hard to find a Catholic Irishman who was not an anti-coolyite. That class, of course, is very considerable.

Q. Are any other Catholics opposed to them except the Irish?—A. I have not seen any. I do not think the other Catholics at all are opposed to them.

Q. Are the Catholic Irish all bummers?—A. None that I know of. I said the bummers were Americans, native-born.

Q. Now what is a bummer? I should like to know what a bummer is. Give us a definition. You are a wise, intelligent, educated man. This seems to be a war against workingmen, laborers and mechanics, by

the so-called intelligent people. Tell me what a bummer is.—A. I think myself that this is a war against that class, and I propose to defend that class against the attack made upon them.

Q. What is a bummer?—A. A bummer is a man who pretends to want something to do and does not want anything to do. He never begs, but he borrows, with no intention of repaying. He hangs around saloons with the expectation of somebody inviting him to take a drink. Those are his principal characteristics. If there is a building being erected, or a dog-fight, or if a man falls down in a fit, or a drunken man is carried off, it is necessary for him to be there to see that it is all done right. That is a very large class in this city. They pretend to want something to do, but if you proffer them a job they will ask all sorts of questions, and when you have explained it all they will find some reason for declining.

Q. You know so much about this class, you are not a bummer, are you?—A. I do not think I come in that description.

Q. Do you run to every dog-fight that you see?—A. I never run to any of them, and I never superintend any buildings.

Q. Now come down to the facts. You say that is a class of men who are bummers. How do you know they are bummers if you do not go there yourself and see the class of men who go there?—A. I have walked the length of Montgomery and Kearny streets every day of my life, almost, for the last twenty-five years, and I see these people all along the streets just in that way.

Q. Have you seen them at a dog-fight?—A. Yes, sir, and I have seen them superintending the laying of the foundations of buildings, and I have seen them when a man tumbles down in a fit. There are a great many more symptoms about them if you want them. They have got a shuffling gait. They shoot along with their hands in their pockets and their hats back on the top of their heads, and they always smell of whisky—they are literally perfumed with whisky.

Q. Do you go up to them?—A. They come to me and want two bits to get a breakfast with; and their breath is strong enough with whisky to disgust even an anti-coolyite.

Q. Do you usually give them two bits?—A. Yes, I usually give them two bits.

Q. To how many of them have you given two bits in your life?—A. Upon my word, I could not tell you.

Q. How many?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Have you given two bits to one in the last month? In the last thirty days have you given one two bits?—A. I do not know, really; I do not remember.

Q. Then with these assertions, you do not know that you have given one man, a bummer, two bits in the last thirty days, and yet you come here and swear that there is a class of bummers who run around and ask every person for two bits.—A. Why do you address me in that manner?

Q. I want to know the fact, and I want it to go in the record. You have designated a class of men, my fellow-citizens, my constituents, as bummers, and I want it to go in the record.—A. If your voice and manner could go down on the record I would be perfectly willing to give an answer. I do not think when a witness is invited before this commission he should be accosted in that manner.

Q. You were not invited here.—A. I was invited.

Q. Who invited you?—A. The chairman of the committee. I did not offer myself.

Q. You did not offer yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. I am very glad of that. I want to know to how many bummers you have given two bits in the last thirty days.—A. I have already answered.

Q. You have not given two bits to any of them?—A. I do not know whether I have or not. I will say that I do not at this moment recollect.

Q. You say you see them around the foundations of houses when they are being laid?—A. I did not say that.

Q. I think you said that.—A. I did not.

Q. What did you say?—A. I said I saw them standing along the line of the street when they were laying the foundation. I do not think they get down to the foundation.

Q. You said they were in that neighborhood, looking at it?—A. The street is as near the work as they care to get.

Q. How do you know they were not the proprietors of that building?—A. I do not know they were not, but I formed an opinion upon the subject as I went along.

Q. You stopped and examined them critically, did you not?—A. I did not; I went along my business as fast as I could; but they are pretty apt to encumber the sidewalks, so that a person going about his business sometimes has some trouble to get through them.

Q. You generally go in a carriage?—A. No, I do not, except in a car, if you call that a carriage.

Q. You spoke about religion?—A. I did not say anything about religion.

Q. Yes, you did. What did you say about religion?—A. I did not say a word about religion.

Q. You said that this class opposed to the Chinese was principally composed of the Catholic Irish.—A. I said that Catholics outside of them generally were not opposed to the Chinese; that I never saw any evidence of it.

Q. You stated, and it is down in the record, that the principal portion of the people who are opposed to Chinese immigration to this coast are Catholic Irish. I refer now to the record. Did you say so, or did you not?—A. Refer to the record, it will speak for itself. We have already discussed that once, and you heard read what I said.

Q. Are Catholic Irish as respectable as Protestant Irish?—A. I am sure I do not know. I do not wish to draw any distinction between people.

Q. Do you say that Catholics are generally as respectable as Protestants?—A. I make no distinction.

Q. In the whole course, from the inception of this investigation, your effort has been to throw a stigma upon the Catholic religion.—A. Is that a question?

Q. No; I am stating what you have been doing.—A. Well, the statement is made.

Q. Is Mr. Donahue, the banker here, an Irish Catholic?—A. I do not know.

Q. Mr. Peter Donahue?—A. I do not know.

Q. Is Mr. Cornelius Sullivan an Irish Catholic?—A. I believe so.

Q. You know these gentlemen?—A. I know them very well.

Q. They are respectable people?—A. Highly; there are no better men in the community. They are men that I entertain the highest esteem for. I have said nothing about them. I have said not a word against any Catholic. Mr. Sullivan entertains a different opinion, per-

haps, from me on this subject. I do not know whether he does or not, but that does not alter my opinion of his respectability, nor the respectability of his religion. I have said nothing about my religion or his.

Q. What is your religion?—A. I am sure I do not know. I was brought up as an Episcopalian, but that is about as near as I can get to it.

Q. Do you go to church now?—A. No; the bishop says he never sees me, except at weddings and funerals.

Q. You worship vicariously?—A. Yes, I suppose so. I suppose I ought to go; but it is not my custom to go.

Q. Now, I ask you this question, and I want an answer: Have you a prejudice against Catholicism, or the Catholic religion?—A. I am, as I said, a brought-up Episcopalian.

Q. I am asking the question in view of this fact: the whole tendency of your examination of witnesses here was to show that this opposition to the Chinese was principally from the Catholic population of this city and State, and the tendency of your whole language was that they were not a respectable people, nor good citizens; that they were, as a political and moral proposition, injurious to the State.—A. I deny that entirely and *in toto*.

Q. Then we will see. That shows for itself. Do you think that the immigration of Chinese to this coast is of as much advantage to the State of California, politically, morally, and socially, as the same number of New England Protestants, or Catholic Frenchmen, Irish, and Germans?—A. I do not know that I have an opinion upon that subject. I think it would require a good deal of calculation to say which was the most advantageous.

Q. It would?—A. Yes.

Q. A mathematical calculation you mean, I suppose?—A. No, I do not mean that.

Q. A metaphysical calculation?—A. I do not know what that is. That is a very good word, but I do not know what it means.

Q I supposed a man of your intelligence knew what "metaphysical" meant?—A. A man who is pretty well read is never ashamed to confess his ignorance of anything. I have read a good deal in the course of my life. A man who has read a little is always afraid somebody will find out he does not know something.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What greater inducement could be held out than there has been for the past twelve years for Chinese immigration to come to this State in the future coming twelve years?—A. I should not think it was likely that there would be any greater inducement. I should hardly think it likely that there could be as much inducement. I think the giving out of the placer-mines is a good deal of lessening of the inducement, and then I could hardly think that the accounts the Chinamen carry back from this country in regard to the treatment they receive in this city would be likely to increase the immigration.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the treatment which the Chinese receive. What do you mean by that?—A. They have been in this city insulted, assaulted, beaten, and killed. In the interior, probably, they have suffered more even than here. As I came down across the country I saw a great many Chinamen at work in the worked-over placer-beds. I was told then and I have always heard it said that if they happen to strike anything worth a white man's working, the whites take it.

There have been a great many assassinations. In the report of the senate committee in 1861 you will find a statement made of the number of assassinations in the mines, and they were mostly by officers of the State.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you mean the assassinations were by officers of the State?—A. Yes, sir. I refer to the report of 1861, which has been put in evidence here.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I have not seen that report I believe.—A. It is with the reporter, and is to go into the appendix. A short time ago at Truckee the cabins of some Chinese miners were set on fire and the Chinamen shot as they emerged from the blazing buildings. There was an effort to punish the perpetrators. Some parties were arrested. Upon the trial of the cause some white men swore distinctly to the fact of the killing, and an equal number of white men swore that the evidence given by the former witnesses was untrue in every particular; they denied directly and distinctly everything, and of course the perpetrators escaped; there were none punished. I have myself seen the Chinese when they landed at the foot of Second street. I live upon Rincon Hill, and I used to come up Second street on my way to the city. I have seen them when coming from the steamer, and I have seen boys along the street striking them as they went along, others throwing things at them—potatoes, stones, anything that came handy. I have often seen Chinese boys with their heads cut and their faces bloody; and instances of that kind I have heard very frequently from my friends who were eye-witnesses of similar scenes, but I have never heard of any effectual punishment. The instances that Judge Dwinelle gave of trials in his court were unqualified murders, without the slightest particle of mitigation; but you cannot get a jury to hang a man for murdering a Chinaman, I think, in this State.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Of what character of citizens are petit juries generally made up?—A. O, of all classes of the community.

Q. Of all classes? Are they not freeholders?—A. Not necessarily, I think.

Q. They are not this bummer class that you speak of, are they?—A. I have seen them on the jury.

Q. You do not often accept them, do you?—A. Not if I know it; but the man who goes on a jury to perjure himself will stand a pretty severe examination. I have been fixed that way. I have had two jurymen put onto a jury who swore they were entirely disinterested, and they would hang a jury for three days.

Q. That is a criminal jury?—A. I never had anything to do with criminal cases, and I do not know anything about them.

Q. Why do you swear about them?—A. I do not swear about them.

Q. You said a white jury would not convict a Chinaman?—A. I am not swearing particularly about criminal cases. I do not know that that would make any particular distinction. Capital cases are tried by the same jury that tries civil cases unless the panel is exhausted and they have to summon more.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not know that men are serving out sentences for life and long terms of imprisonment for wrongs committed on Chinamen?—A.

I know those men Judge Dwinelle spoke of are in prison, but I say if the victim had been a white man they would have been hung.

Q. How do you know?—A. I do not know. Nobody knows but God Almighty.

Q. You state, as a fact, that no man has been hung in this State for the murder of a Chinaman?—A. I have no recollection of a white man being hung for it.

Q. Are you prepared to say that none have been hung?—A. No, sir; I am only prepared to state my recollection.

Q. You referred to the case at Antioch?—A. No, I did not; but now I recollect there was such a case.

Q. The Truckee case was another, and I think there was a case at Los Angeles, quite reprehensible, which occurred two or three years ago?—A. Yes.

Q. You referred to those cases as evidence of the treatment of Chinese in the interior towns. Did you hear of such an outrage at the city of Nevada?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When?—A. About the same time that the outrage occurred at Antioch. You mean Nevada County.

Q. We are talking about this State. Did you hear of a similar outrage at the town of Auburn?—A. I have no recollection of it.

Q. At Placerville, Downerville, San José, Santa Clara, or Marysville? Name any other town except those you have referred to where such instances as you mention have occurred.—A. I have not kept an account of those; but I have got in a scrap-book at home that I have clipped a number of items collected touching the subject since this agitation commenced. I did not attempt to keep any record of them before that time.

Q. What does your record say? Go through the different towns.—A. It shows outrages almost daily.

Q. In the interior cities of the State?—A. I think so.

Q. Name the cities or towns.—A. I cannot do it.

Q. Mr. Bee has handed you some newspaper extracts?—A. Yes; cases in this city since the committee commenced its session here.

Q. Since we commenced the session of the committee have not the papers contained accounts of Chinese burglaries and other crimes committed by them? For instance, did not the Chronicle this morning contain three separate statements of outrages upon property committed by Chinese of this city, amounting to felonies?—A. I did not see the Chronicle this morning.

Q. Would it be fair to infer from that fact that the Chinese are generally engaged in crimes against property because three cases are reported in the Chronicle this morning?—A. I think not. I think it would be fair to take the police report every morning and see who they are who commit the offenses.

Q. And not stigmatize the people generally for it. For instance, in the Post published this afternoon:

HEAVY BURGLARY BY CHINESE THIEVES.

Chinese burglars entered the store of M. Berkowitz, on Stockton street, near Washington, on Wednesday night, by removing the bricks supporting the iron shutters on one of the rear windows. They carried off eight hundred dollars' worth of silks and shawls, and got off unharmed with their booty. The same store was entered through a sky-light and robbed by Chinese about a year ago of several thousand dollars' worth of silks.

Is it fair to infer because that thing occurs that as a rule the Chinese are burglariously inclined?—A. I think not.

Q. Is it any more fair because an outrage occurred at Antioch and

one at Truckee and one at Los Angeles to infer that in the interior towns of the State the Chinamen are generally outraged? Could not the same rule of charity apply to the interior towns that you claim for the Chinese here?—A. I should think so; but such is not the case.

Q. I have named quite a large number of towns.—A. I cannot locate them.

Q. Name any other town where an outrage upon Chinamen has occurred during the last twenty-five years.—A. I have already stated that I could not name the towns.

Q. If you cannot name them, they cannot come within your category.—A. I know that the instances exist. That I state positively.

Q. Do you know that they exist in the town of Nevada?—A. I have already said that I cannot name the towns. I cannot remember the names of the towns.

Q. You say that as a rule, if I understand you, in the interior, if a Chinaman finds a mine and it is worth a white man's having, he takes it away from the Chinaman and there is no protection in law for them. Is that what you said?—A. I said I was informed that in the placer-mines if a Chinaman got a mine that would pay white men to work they would jump it.

Q. Are you not aware of the fact that in our interior courts the rights of Chinamen in their property are as much protected as the rights of white men?—A. No, sir; I am not aware of it.

Q. If I state to you that my experience as a lawyer for fifteen years in one of the populous mining counties of this State shows that to be the fact, and that I have often tried cases in which the Chinese were concerned and vindicated their rights before American juries, do you think the statement incredible?—A. I should not think anything incredible that you state. What county is that?

Q. Nevada County, one of the largest mining counties in the State.—A. I am happy to hear it.

Q. Are you not aware that there are upon our supreme court decisions cases where litigation was between Chinese and Americans for the possession of mining-claims, and that the supreme court has decided in favor of the right of the Chinese to have their claim? Are you not aware of decisions of that kind?—A. No, sir; but I have no doubt that if such a case went to the supreme court of this State, and the merits were in their favor, it would be decided in their favor. I think that the judges of the State have acted justly and impartially.

Q. Allow me to testify a little in the way of a suggestion in behalf of the juries of this State in the interior; I do not know how it may be in San Francisco. Are you not aware that what is called "jumping" among miners was a practice formerly quite common? That where men went off and left their claims for a little while, under the mining-laws they were supposed to be open for location?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that it made no difference whether the claimants were Chinese or Americans, that that jumping was quite common and considered legitimate?—A. No; I do not so understand it.

Q. The mining laws of this State, you remember, were a code, a kind of common law, enacted by the miners themselves.—A. Precisely.

Q. Those mining-laws provided for a long series of years that if a claim was not worked once in ten days, others once in thirty days, the claim could be relocated by others?—A. Relocated.

Q. Was not the term "jumping" applied?—A. I do not understand it in that sense.

Q. Are you not aware that by miners' parlance and by miners' custom

the retaking of a claim in that way was perfectly honest?—A. Relocating; yes.

Q. Jumping?—A. Not jumping.

Q. Jumping, because the other's right had expired?—A. That I cal. relocating. That was perfectly correct.

Q. Are you not aware that miners saw it in the light that squatters are considered on agricultural lands?—A. I do not understand the meaning of the terms as you use them. I do not understand squatter and jumper in either case to be the same. I understand the squatter to be a man who settles on land he has a right to settle on.

Q. I have heard that term used differently.—A. If anybody attempts to take possession of that land he is a jumper. A jumper is a man who jumps another man's claim, whether mining-land or any kind of land. If he settles upon it he is a squatter, and has a right to be there. He is the lawful owner.

Q. Are you not aware that these men on being sued in trespass or ejectment would set up as a defense that the other party had forfeited his right by lapse of time and non-user?—A. If he was a relocator he had a right to do so.

Q. A jumper. That was the ordinary defense.—A. It may be a perfectly good defense, but I do not understand the term in that way.

Q. Have you ever had practice in the mining regions?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then perhaps you have a little hesitancy in expressing an opinion on that matter?—A. I have no doubt that your opinion on that subject is better than mine.

Q. I only want to call your attention to the fact that jumping is not confined to claims owned by Chinamen.—A. I use the term in the sense in which you use it here, only I do not apply it to the taking of a claim under the miners' laws.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. When you speak about jumping a Chinese claim, do you mean that they would take it by force?—A. That is what I mean, by force or fraud, not that they had honorably used any mining rules or regulations, which I call relocating.

Q. It is a case, then, where the Chinese have left the claim?—A. No, sir; I do not refer to a case where they have left the work, but where they have found it was making money enough to pay white men for working it. As I was coming down from Oregon I rode on the box of the stage with the stage-driver, a very intelligent man, indeed, through a country where we were continually passing these mining-claims. I conversed with him on the subject, and he gave me the same information, although he said the business of the stores and the towns was mainly dependent on Chinese mining, and if they stopped their mining their business would be about gone.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you not heard of a case where white men drove white men from their claims and held possession of them with shot-guns, and that they would meet under ground and fight each other in tunnels where tunnels happened to meet? Have you heard of those cases?—A. No, sir, not of the kind we have been speaking of. I have heard of cases where parties making adverse claims to mines on mining-grounds have contended in the way you speak of, under ground and above ground, with shot-guns and everything.

Q. Have you not heard of a case where it was the question whether the original proprietor should hold it or the subsequent claimant?—A.

I am hardly familiar enough with those things to testify to them in any manner.

Q. Are you not aware of cases where Chinese were driven off of their claims by the whites, and the courts have given redress to the Chinese on complaint made?—A. No, sir.

Q. Are you prepared to deny that statement?—A. No, sir, I am not prepared to deny it. On the contrary, I should think that in any case where the matter was fully proved to the court, to any judge in this State, he would give redress.

Q. Or to juries?—A. No, sir; I am not so confident about juries.

Q. Are not those cases always tried by juries?—A. No, sir.

Q. Is not mining litigation always tried by juries, ninety-nine cases out of a hundred?—A. I do not know. We do not try ninety-nine out of a hundred of the cases here by a jury. I presume we try more than half our cases in this city by the court without a jury.

Senator SARGENT. They are tried there almost universally by juries.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. In your opinion, can Chinamen have a fair and impartial trial before a San Francisco jury, a petit jury?—A. No, I think not.

Q. You think they cannot?—A. No, I think not.

Q. Take the jurors for a year or two years in the city of San Francisco, both grand and petit, do they or do they not represent the average intelligence and respectability of this community?—A. No, sir.

Q. Who does represent the average intelligence and respectability of the community?—A. Those who escape jury duty, who manage to get off, somehow.

Q. Are they the most honest and worthy citizens who escape it by some hook or crook?—A. I think they are the most intelligent, the most enlightened, and have the most at stake, because I think probably they would not be so well off if they were not pretty smart.

Q. They are not so patriotic, then, as others?—A. I do not say that.

Q. What, in your opinion, constitutes a good citizen here among us in San Francisco?—A. A man who performs all his duty to his neighbor.

Q. Is that all?—A. Yes, that is all.

Q. Then a man who shirks jury duty does not perform his duty to his neighbor, does he?—A. No; I do not think he does, nor to his country; but still I think that the members of the bar will bear me out in saying that the most enlightened and the most intelligent citizens and the wealthiest do not serve their country in the jury-box.

Q. Do you consider them the best citizens, then?—A. I did not say they are the best, Mr. Piper.

Q. Do you consider those good citizens who do not shirk jury duty and other duties imposed upon the citizens by law and by the necessity of carrying on our government in our courts and our system of justice, who honestly and faithfully perform their duties and do not shirk them?—A. I think they are the best citizens. I do not think the amount of intelligence and wealth is any measure of it.

Q. You admit they are the better citizens?—A. Yes; I think they are the better citizens. I think there is more patriotism in that class.

Q. You say that people who oppose the Chinese in this city are the most worthless and ignorant class?—A. No, I do not say so. On the contrary, I said nothing of the kind.

Q. I think I will leave that to the reporter.—A. If I said that, it is down, and I do not desire to correct anything that I have said.

Q. Then you think that the people who honestly perform their func-

tions as jurors and other duties imposed upon them by the laws of the State are good citizens?—A. I say they are the best.

Q. But you think our juries are not competent to decide cases impartially as between Chinese and white men, or between the Chinese and the State?—A. That is my opinion.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You recognize this question of emigration from Asia to America as a new question, do you not?—A. I think it a very new and a very important one, and a question upon which wise men and good men can differ without any reason to call each other names, or to be angry with each other about it. I do not feel angry with anybody who differs with me, or think the less of him for it.

Q. It is a novel proposition, and one that statesmen and thinkers have got to meet, what is to be the effect of the meeting of the two kinds of civilization here upon our Pacific shore?—A. Very much so.

Q. It is a matter upon which there might be honest difference of opinion whether any Chinese should come?—A. Unquestionably.

Q. Whether they should come in certain numbers?—A. Most undoubtedly.

Q. And whether legislation might not be properly directed either to the restriction or government of that immigration?—A. Undoubtedly so.

Q. Then jumping from that issue to the fact as you state it, that there is a wide-spread prejudice, if you please, against the Chinese by the laboring classes and by our bad classes, extending to the bummer class—— —A. I have not said those things. I prefer to frame my own answers. I do not want my ideas framed for me. I know them and know how to express them. I do not care to have them changed. It seems to me that you must have misunderstood me. I have by no means said that the prejudice was confined to those classes. On the contrary, in saying to Mr. Piper, as I did, that I thought a jury here would not sit impartially in a case against Chinese or where the offenders had perpetrated an outrage upon Chinamen, I mean that the prejudice against Chinamen is general, but that while the prejudice is general this opposition is confined to the classes I named.

Q. Recognizing the fact, as I understand you to do, that there is a general prejudice against Chinese on the part of thinking and intelligent people—— —A. All people.

Q. And that there is a bitter prejudice and partisan feeling on the part of those less intelligent and who are interfered with in their labor—— —A. Yes.

Q. And that there is a brutal feeling and prejudice on the part of what you may call the bummer class, the bad element of our community, and that it resu‌lts in collision between these two races, that it results in the disagreement of juries, the inability of the law to enforce actual and equal justice to all parties, does not that of itself convey to you an idea that possibly Chinese immigration may be hurtful to our people in the future?—A. No, sir; it conveys to me the very opposite. I would rather live under the despotism of a Russian Czar than to be under the despotism of a mob. If the laws have got to that condition that our courts cannot enforce the rights of the humblest individuals in the land, I want them altered, and I want the cause of the trouble removed, not the victim.

Q. If the cause of this trouble lies in Chinese immigration, might not that be an element for desiring legislation to remove the cause?—A. No, sir; you might as well punish a man who has been knocked down

because he excited the passion of the man who knocked him down. I would punish the man who knocked the other down.

Q. Is that a fair illustration of the meeting of these two great continental races?—A. I think it is. I do not think the continental races come in contact in that way. I think there is a certain element in our community who undertake to rule by force. They rule the capitalists; they rule in Pennsylvania; and they attempt here by intimidation to stop people from employing Chinese, threatening them with vengeance in all sorts of ways.

Q. I am not defending them.—A. I know; but you want us to remove the exciting cause. I say no; I would remove the disposition that leads people to such a thing. I think it is time that law was supreme, and that the humblest individual, no matter where he comes from, had the entire and complete protection of the law and stood equal with any other man before the tribunals of the country.

Q. You are getting up a man of straw to fight. I quite agree with you?—A. The thing exists.

Q. Then, because it exists, I say do you not think that is an incident tending to show that there may be unpleasant relations and unpleasant future entanglements growing out of the immigration of these people?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you believe abstractly that this side of our continent should be thrown open unrestrictedly to Chinese or to eastern immigration?—A. That is the opinion I entertain, that there should be no restriction, even if it was an inconvenience.

Q. No legislation on the subject?—A. No; I believe in the universal brotherhood of man, and I believe in the principle that our doors are open to all God's creation equally, and I would not discriminate against any nation.

Q. Then, if I understand you, you would not legislatively discriminate in favor of your own race to the prejudice of all of the Asiatic race?—A. I would not.

Q. You would give them each equal justice, if you please to call it, under the law; each equal privilege of immigration, each equal privilege of the possession of our soil, as far as that will hold out?—A. Certainly, I would do that; but I would even go further. When a nation that kept its doors closed and denied the right of emigration had been forced to acknowledge that all men had the right to emigrate freely from one nation to the other, I should not certainly then undertake to pass laws to fine them for coming here, or prejudice them for coming here, or shut them out.

Q. How do you look on the idea that a man has always to prefer his own family and his own interest to the interest of strangers; could you recognize that as an inherent and natural instinct?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then do you regard the country as the domicile of our own race, or is it equally open to the immigration of another race?—A. I think it is equally open to all. "The earth is the Lord's."

Q. And not the American Government's?—A. No, sir; it does not belong to the American Government in that sense.

Q. And California is not the heritage of American people, any more than it is the heritage of Chinamen?—A. No, sir; it is the heritage of mankind. I do not think God made it for us in particular.

Q. So that your views are upon the broad idea, and the very generous one. If you will recollect, in my opening argument I said I took the narrower and more selfish ground?—A. Yes, I know you did.

Q. You take the broad view that all have the right to come here, and

all have the right to enjoy the earth. I suppose that, in your opinion, and in the opinion of a vast number of intelligent people, the contact of these two races is likely to result in the amelioration of the Asiatic and in the deterioration of our race. Which, then, would you favor? Could you say still that we had a right so submit to deterioration and injury for the sake of benefiting them?—A. Yes, sir; I should not believe anything of the kind, or have the slightest fear of anything of the kind; but if it was so, it would make no difference with my action.

Q. If, then, as the result of this immigration our people are to suffer in a greater degree than they are to be benefited, you would still keep this immigration open and allow the Chinese to come to the country?—A. I am not in the habit of forming opinions upon things that do not exist, upon mere hypothetical cases.

Q. We have had a great many hypotheses here to illustrate principles?—A. I know you have, but I do not think such things are worth a straw. An opinion formed on the spur of the moment is worth nothing.

Q. Suppose a band of American-born laborers who depend upon their daily industry for their daily bread, by the influx of an equal number or more, of Chinese, would have their employment taken from them and their daily bread taken from them, would you regard that as a wrong to our race, that would not be compensated by a benefit to the other race?—A. That is also one of those cases which seem to me not to exist.

Q. But suppose it did exist? It is our theory that it exists.—A. If the bread were taken from a white man and given to a yellow man?

Q. Yes.—A. No; I do not think that would be any reason why the yellow man should be deprived of his chances for it. I think they should rival each other; and if the yellow man is able to get it, I think he has a right to get it.

Q. If this, then, was a case of shipwreck at sea, and one life-boat could hold but so many, and the struggle was between Americans and Chinamen, you would not favor your own race?—A. I would not—not my own brother.

Q. The one who should struggle in first would have your aid?—A. Precisely.

Q. How would it be if it was your own family?—A. Not even if it was myself would I make any distinction.

Q. You would not fight for your own protection?—A. No, sir.

Q. You would not fight for the raft?—A. No, sir.

Q. I am embarrassed by your superior generosity.—A. I would have no more right to the raft than a negro or any other human being when it comes to one plank.

Q. Then your testimony is all upon the principle of the broad and equal rights of the Chinese to our country as much as we have a right to our own?—A. No, sir.

Q. They have not the same right to our country that we have?—A. I said "no, sir" to your question.

Senator SARGENT. Your question is, "Your testimony is all upon that principle." It is a play upon the word "all;" that is all.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. We have one hundred millions of acres of land in California—four millions under cultivation, and eighty millions out of the whole which are capable of useful occupation. These are your figures. Do you think the future welfare of our State would be as much advanced by the occupation of all those lands and all the industries that are incident to

them by Chinese as by Eastern or European immigrants?—A. I think it would be better to have a mixture.

Q. How would you mix them—in what proportion?—A. I would mix them.

Q. But you would allow the Chinese to come without restriction?—A. I would allow Providence to mix them.

Q. Then, if there are three hundred million Chinamen, according to your computation, and they might be brought from China here for fifteen or twenty dollars apiece—— —A. Which I do not believe.

Q. Or thirty or forty dollars?—A. I do not believe that, either.

Q. Fifty or sixty dollars?—A. I do not believe that, either.

Q. You do not believe they could come?— A. I do not believe that number of people could be brought here for $1,000 apiece. A vessel coming with a cargo may take a certain number of passengers, but if you would bring passengers alone there is a difference.

Q. I think you estimate that there are three hundred million Asiatics?—A. More than that.

Q. Three hundred and fifty millions?—A. More than that.

Q. Four hundred millions?—A. More than that.

Q. Chinese?—A. O, Chinese! I put them at three hundred millions.

Q. What other nations do you refer to?—A. Tartars, Siberians, Hindoos, and Persians There are many other Asiatics.

Q. There being three hundred million Chinamen against forty million Americans——A. That is not so. You start off wrong.

Q. There being a population of three hundred million, of which a portion have shown——A. I do not think you can say that. It is only a certain province that has shown the slightest disposition to come here, and they have been emigrating for the last century.

Q. Where?—A .At the time that Napoleon was a prisoner on the island of Saint Helena there were quantities of Chinamen there.

Q. Do you know what has been the effect of the emigration of Chinese to Manila?—A. No, sir. I never was there.

Q. Or to Peru?—A. I never heard there were any there.

Q. Or to Cuba?—A. I never heard there were any there. To Manila there is a large emigration of Chinese, but I never heard there was any emigration to Peru, or Cuba, or Chili from China. I have heard of Chinamen going from here to Cuba.

Q. Do they not go from the Portuguese colony of Macao to Peru?—A. I think not. I think they are taken from there, transported, which I think is a very different thing from voluntary emigration.

Q. You have heard the testimony of a former consul in China, who said they went on board voluntarily or consented to go on board, by their own statement?—A. Yes, I heard his testimony.

Q. Whether taken voluntarily or otherwise, they go?—A. Can you say when a man is taken to prison that he goes there?

Q. I think so.—A. I think not. Say that they have been taken from there, that they are imported.

Q. Then we will confine ourselves to Manila. Do you know that large numbers of them go to Manila?—A. Yes, sir; and all these countries.

Q. Do you know what effect it has had upon the trade and commerce of Manila?—A. I think it has largely increased it.

Q. Have they occupied it almost exclusively?—A. The trade?

Q. Yes.—A. I think so. I think a Chinaman is a much smarter man than a Manila Spaniard.

Q. Is it possible for them to take the same possession of this western empire, the United States, as they have taken possession of Manila?—A. No, sir.

Q. And establish the same relative relations here as there?—A. I should think not.

Q. Why?—A. I think the Americans are a superior race to Manila Spaniards.

Q. Is that the reason?—A. Yes, sir. I think the Chinaman is superior to the Manila man; that is, the Chinese merchant.

Q. And he is not superior to an American?—A. No, I do not think he is. Our civilization is much more advanced in the arts and sciences than the Chinese.

Q. If I do not mistake, you said the Chinaman will only come here bringing his labor as merchandise, speaking of how immigration would regulate itself by the supply and the demand?—A. I said something of that kind.

Q. Is my memorandum correct?—A. I think the idea is the same.

Q. That the Chinaman will come only bringing his labor as merchandise?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that, you think, desirable for a republican government like ours?—A. I think all labor is merchandise. I do not see that his labor is any different from any other.

Q. Then you make no difference between the laborer who would bring his toil here for merchandise, with the intention of sending his earnings away, and the immigrant who would come here to live and make a permanent domicile?—A. Nearly all the French and English merchants here are of that character. They never become naturalized that I know of. They send all their money home.

Q. Then we should exclude them?—A. I do not think we should exclude them. I do not ask to exclude them.

Q. I confine my question to those who come here in the lower fields of labor?—A. I think it preferable, decidedly, that the foreign immigrant should remain here, and bring his wife and settle down and raise his family here.

Q. Would you make any difference between the Chinaman who would bring his wife and children, settle down and live permanently upon our coast, and the white man from New England who would bring his wife and his children for the same purpose?—A. Undoubtedly I would.

Q. And why?—A. Because one is an American and the other is not. That is the only reason. One is brought up under our laws and the other is not.

Q. Then, if I get the logic of your statement, you would still favor white immigration as against Chinese immigration?—A. No, sir, I would not.

Q. You would prefer it, then?—A. I would not make the slightest distinction in the law.

Q. You would prefer it, as an individual?—A. As an individual, certainly.

Q. You think it would be a better immigration?—A. No; I do not think it would be any better.

Q. Then why would you prefer it?—A. Because a Chinaman has got to go through a considerable course of instruction before he gets up to the point where the white man is when he comes here.

Q. Then a white man is better in that respect?—A. In that respect he is. As I said before, our civilization is more advanced in arts and sciences, and every white man who comes here is, to a certain degree, near that point. The Chinaman has got to go through it. In the first place, he has got to get to the ladder. He has got to learn his alphabet before he can begin to get into the sciences at all. Therefore the white man is, as an immigrant, more valuable to us.

Q. Which is the most desirable, that the emigrant from China who comes here and by reason of his not knowing our language becomes a gang-hand, using your own expression, should be benefited or that the other emigrant from the East should be benefited?—A. Looking at them simply in that view, I have said already that immigrants from the East I prefer anyway, in all respects.

Q. I do not know that you have. You said that they had not any better rights.—A. That is another thing. I prefer them, though. I prefer any kind of a white man to a Chinaman. I have my prejudices the same as other people. I do not think I am unprejudiced against them, and I do not think any white man in the State is. That is the reason why I say no jury tries a case impartially, because we all have some prejudice of race; we cannot help it.

Q. You know the fact that a petition was circulated here some time ago said to have numbered some 20,000 names. Mr. Winn testified that the petition contained 20,000 names, and contained the names of a great majority of merchants and business men along Front, Battery, and Sansom, and Kearny streets, and embraced a majority of the best names in our community. Do you think that would be evidence of an intelligent popular opinion opposing the immigration of the Chinese?—A. I think not.

Q. Would it be evidence of the opinion of the men who signed it?—A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?—A. Because in the whole community there is a great want of confidence in the anti-coolies or anti-coolyites, whatever you call them. The friends of the Chinese have been afraid of having their houses burned down. They are afraid of being assaulted and defamed, and having their business injured. The letter we offered here had been signed by the secretaries of one of these companies, and was sent to one of the best men in this city, who employs Chinamen in his establishment. He is threatened with the loss of business; to have his name placarded in business. There is not a newspaper that can express itself freely on this subject, and I do not think a witness has been before this commission that would express himself freely, with very few exceptions.

Q. Would you have refused to sign or have signed a petition governed by any such motive?—A. No, sir; I would not by any such motive be governed.

Q. Do you think you are the exceptional gentleman in this State who is so independent, who is not to be governed by personal considerations?—A. I do not think that is a fair question; it is personal.

Q. Take the April meeting, that was presided over by the governor of the State and the mayor of the city, with the names of some fifty or sixty of the best gentlemen of this town as vice-presidents and other officers. Do you think that is any evidence of intelligent public opinion on this subject?—A. I do not.

Q. And the late meeting?—A. Where they burned in effigy the Rev. Mr. Gibson?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. No, sir; I think no intelligent man has tolerated any such thing. It is that sort of thing that prevents people from coming here and testifying. I have had a gentleman out canvassing the city to get information to lay before the committee, and I know from his reports how unwilling gentlemen whose opinions are opposed to this movement are to come here and testify. It is for that reason I asked to be subpœnaed.

Q. How are the commission to obtain reliable evidence of the popular

opinion of the State?—A. I think by sending a commission out here to take testimony, and when witnesses are brought before them by invitation to testify to treat them with courtesy. I think that is the way.

Q. The commission have not done otherwise, I hope.—A. I do not think any witness who has been examined here feels that way. That is my impression.

Q. Feels in what way?—A. That he has been treated with courtesy. They may be mistaken; they may take an erroneous view of their position and rights.

Q. In reference to the influence of political parties, their platforms, and their declarations, the orations of their speakers, do you think that is any evidence of popular opinion?—A. No, sir.

Q. And the press, the daily and weekly press?—A. For the same reason I have stated, Mr. Pixley, there is no press in this city that has reported the testimony before this committee with anything like fairness. That has been a matter of common comment.

Q. It has been reported perfectly so far as the amount goes?—A. No, sir; they do not report the testimony fairly by any means. I have said before that the anti-coolyites are active, positive, proscriptive. The other side are simply negative and indifferent; they simply have an opinion. The anti-coolyites think it is their bread and butter. Any paper that takes the side of the Chinese will earn not a copper; they will not get another advertisement, nor circulate another copy among these anti-cooly men; they will lose a great deal in all respects.

Q. If it is true, as you say, that the business interests of the community favor your views upon this subject, it would strike me—would it not you?—that it would be the popular side to take?—A. Yes; but it does not make any difference to the other side; they are not proscriptive. I shall take the Bulletin, because it gives me the fullest information on all subjects, whether it agrees with my views or not; and if its political views were opposed to mine it would not make any difference to me. In any other respect, it would be the best paper, I think.

Q. Governor Irwin, Mayor Bryant, Senators Casserly and Hager, our candidates for Congress of all sides, political men of all sides, the proprietors of our press, Messrs. Pickering, Finch, and De Young, and all these other journals assuming that position, advocating those principles, writing in that direction—does it all evidence no popular opinion that ought to govern or influence a commission of legislators?—A. That is my view.

Q. That is your view?—A. Yes, sir. There were many good men who went to that meeting and made speeches with no other view than to calm, to curb, and control that excitement. If you will read the speeches, you will find that there is no inflammation in them at all. At that time some of these societies had started to organize in a military fashion, with officers, and to arm themselves. The Chinese were in a high state of excitement; they expected to be mobbed. The mayor had taken proper precautions to prevent it, and when this meeting was held there were a great many who went there for no other purpose, I think, (I think I do them justice in saying so,) than to prevent the excitement from being carried to an extent to violate the laws, and if I am permitted to give what I think is the current understanding about that movement I can do it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I hope you will go on and give it, Mr. Brooks.—A. I understand the fact was this: There was a certain amount of this excitement, this

underlying sentiment. I understand that one party, the democratic party, thought it would be a good movement to avail themselves of it, and they started up these anti-cooly societies to control them. As a check to that, as a counter-movement, the republicans introduced various bills into Congress on the same side of the question. Then the democrats started this big meeting, and the republicans insisted that they should have half the speakers; and, having gone so far, it actually became necessary for both parties to put a plank into their national platform for the same purpose.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What was the decision of the Supreme Court made about the time of that meeting, denying the power of the State with reference to the landing of criminals and paupers, and other undesirable classes on our shores, and especially with reference to the Chinese? Do you think that had anything to do with the excitement at that time?—A. Nothing whatever.

Q. Do you think the fact that they were landing on our shores from four to six thousand Chinese within a month or so, which was understood to be an unusual number, had any effect?—A. I think those things were made use of to stir up all the excitement with the idea of using it.

Q. You think that these two facts alone, a feeling of the powerlessness of the State, and the enormous influx just in those months, had no natural connection with the excitement?—A. I do not think it would have excited anybody, if the politicians had used these facts for that purpose.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you not think it would be more generous for you to assume that gentlemen who differ from you might differ quite as honestly in entertaining their opinions as you claim for yourself?—A. I think I have said so.

Q. You modified it very much, indeed, by assuming that all this was for a political purpose. Of course I cannot be altogether removed from the idea that, in your opinion, everybody who does not think with you has some sinister or partisan end of this agitation.—A. I said that I agreed fully with you that it was a great and important question, upon which gentlemen might entertain diverse views without the slightest imputation upon each other or without any reason for supposing that each was actuated by any improper motive. I do not question anybody's motives who thinks differently from me, and I know a great many who do.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you not think that the statement that the large political meeting that was held here, the action of Senators and Representatives of this State in Congress, the tone of the press, their discussions of this question, &c., sprang from an unworthy motive, and was simply designed to get a partisan advantage, some reflection upon the character of those gentlemen who differ from you in opinion?—A. I do not think I stated it in that way.

Q. You elaborately stated, if I understood you—I do not wish to misrepresent you—that the movement was for partisan purposes?—A. I said that this movement here was stirred up, and that politicians availed themselves of a sentiment already existing to obtain the votes of a party which was sufficient to throw the balance of power on one side or the

other. You know our vote is so nearly equal that the vote of this class, now known as anti-cooly, is of very considerable consequence.

Q. But here was a decision of the Supreme Court which overthrew certain State legislation, which the State had endeavored to enact in order to remedy what was supposed to be an evil, and which a certain class of people you admit thought was an evil.—A. No, sir; I do not think so.

Q. Please hear me for one moment.—A. If you ask me a question, you ought to let me answer it.

Q. Would it not be fair to let me ask the question?—A. I think you are discourteous not to allow me to answer the question you put to me. I said "no," and I was going to show why I said "no," and now you go on to another, and that does not represent me fairly.

Q. It will be your own fault if you are not fairly represented.—A. Entirely. I wish to say that I did not mean to say anything that would offend you at all.

Q. You made the remark a moment ago that the commission treated witnesses discourteously.—A. I said I thought so; that I only knew of that from the remarks which the witnesses made.

Q. I am sorry if the commission has acted discourteously. I do not think any member of the commission is inclined to be discourteous.—A. What I wished to say was this, that I do not think with that class so wildly agitated the presence of these prostitutes in the city is the motive of any great magnitude, or that they care particularly about that. The thing that gets them principally is the competition of their labor, the lowering, as they think, of the rate of wages, while I really think that the presence of this Chinese labor increases their wages and increases the employment. It is there that we differ. I do not quarrel with them in the views they take in feeling as they do, but I think they are mistaken.

Q. That is your view of the matter, probably conscientious; but here is a large class who think their labor is interfered with.—A. Certainly.

Q. A large class represented by Senators and Representatives in Congress, an important element in the constituency of Senators and Representatives. May it not be possible that Senators and members may think that this class have reasonable cause of complaint, and therefore, in order to save evils which are overtaking this class, introduce bills without an idea that thereby they might get more votes? Can you conceive that that is possible?—A. Certainly. I did not impute any such motives to them.

Q. You spoke of the introduction of bills in Congress as being a political motive.—A. But not a personal motive. I think a great many men would sacrifice the Chinese or anybody else rather than that the country should go to ruin. I think a great many good men think upon the issue of this present election the very existence of the country depends, and I think if the count was made that they thought would give an unfair advantage to one side, they might very honestly think that they should meet it without any unworthy motive.

Q. Whether that motive was worthy or unworthy, I wish to ask you whether it might not be that those who represent these parties might believe that the complaint of those parties was well founded, and, therefore, for the sake of the furnishing them relief from calamity, introduced such bills?—A. And they had introduced such bills before, very good bills, very proper bills. There were causes of complaint. So you had done, and Mr. Page had done so; but I think the movement at that particular time that stirred them up was political.

Q. Do you say that this motive stirred up Senators and Members?—A. I do not say so.

Q. But you spoke of bills introduced in Congress.—A. I said they were introduced with a view of meeting this movement by the other side.

Q. May they not have been introduced with a view of remedying what they believed to be a reasonable cause of complaint among the laboring class?—A. I have no doubt they were.

Q. Then why not seek another motive?—A. I think another motive was apparent upon the surface; the motive of the movement at that particular time.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You speak of this rather as a new movement. Is this a new excitement? Has it not continued almost ever since the State was organized?—A. I think not.

Q. Do you not know that twenty years ago there was a public meeting in Sacramento having the same objects in view as this April agitation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know that this feeling has been many years existing in this city?—A. No; I do not know of any such feeling as that. I said before that this movement took advantage of a sentiment already existing.

Q. Is this a growth since last April, or is it not the culmination of twenty years? The Senator suggests to me that there was a petition presented in Congress two years ago which had 27,000 signatures.

Senator SARGENT. It was presented by me; and I made, in 1871, some remarks on this question similar to those which I made in my speech the other night.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) Do you know, in the supreme court, the case of Washburn *vs.* Lin Sing, reported in 20th California, more than sixteen years ago, was based upon the same movement then, the endeavor to tax the Chinese a per-capita tax, which was resisted steadily, and went to the supreme court?—A. I knew of those things, but I do not think they furnish any parallel to the present movement.

Q. It is evidence of this pressure or feeling from a very early time?—A. Undoubtedly; I have said that it existed.

Q. Then this is not a new thing altogether?—A. It was a new thing to take advantage of this sentiment to make a stalking-horse of it.

Q. How was it in 1868; was it not a political issue then?—A. I am not a politician, and do not remember those things.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In the Gorham and White campaign?—A. I remember Mr. Gorham speaking in favor of the Chinese at that time. I honored him for it. I understand he has backed out now, and I do not honor him so much.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke of clubs here first proceeding to organize as a military club.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you refer to these anti-cooly clubs?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When were they first organized?—A. I do not remember the date. It was a short time before the April meeting.

Q. Within a year or two?—A. O, within a year.

Q. Was the military part of the organization afterward abandoned?—A. Almost immediately. The papers came out very strenuously against

it, and said they would injure their cause by that course. Ostensibly it was abandoned, but they are still a secret society. These clubs are organized as secret societies. I have endeavored to obtain a list of their members and their constitutions. I found, as I said in my opening remarks, one list, and that is the only one that I have been able to obtain.

Q. Is that class of public opinion intolerant?—A. Exceedingly intolerant. If you go along the street you will find placards every little distance stuck up, "We employ no Chinese here," and all that sort of thing is done, because they have declared in these clubs that they will not deal with or patronize any person, as stated in the letter which has been offered here, who employs Chinese at all. Men who have large factories here employ additional watchmen to guard their places from incendiarism in consequence of threats which come to their ears of burning their places down because they employ Chinamen.

Q. Do you entertain the opinion that in that way they exercise an influence over people who are not really hostile to their cause?—A. Undoubtedly. Everybody has more or less fear of them and uneasiness about them.

Q. Do you mean to convey the idea that people sign petitions on that account?—A. Yes, sir; a man comes around as the agent and he has to take the names not only of those who sign the petition, but if a man refuses to sign it he is reported as refusing.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Did the petition containing over 20,000 names come under the name of an anti-cooly association?—A. I do not think the anti-coolyites existed then. I should like to say something in regard to the question of wages. I differ from the gentlemen on the other side and those who move in this matter. I do not think that the wages of anybody is lowered by the employment of Chinese. In the first place, they open a great many avenues for employment which would not exist except for them. I have canvassed the State very thoroughly, and every trade that is established employs a certain number of white men. Take, for instance, the washer-woman. We had no washer-women here formerly, that is to say, the class was exceedingly small and the expense of washing was very high. All the poorer classes of the community did their own washing. In 1849 there were very few white women of any kind here at all. There were some men engaged in washing, Frenchmen, and I think some of the natives. The Chinese did not take the place of any three thousand, or two thousand, or twelve hundred, or any other number of washer-women. They now do the washing in great part for small house-keepers, and they reduce in that way their expenses of living very greatly. Where a man has a wife and one child he can get along without any servant at all if he puts out the washing. If he has a larger family than that he can get along with one servant, if he will put out his washing. If he has his washing done at home he cannot get along with that help. The Chinese laundries enable a great many mechanics to keep house pretty well who otherwise would live in tenement-houses. As has been stated here, there is no such thing as tenement houses known here. All the mechanics keep house themselves; and I do not think they could do it if it was not for Chinese washing. There are the cigar-makers. I do not think it is much of a business for an able-bodied man any way, but I do not think there was any great number of cigar-makers here before the Chinese began. I think there are three times as many white men engaged in cigar-making now as before the Chinese went into the trade.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were the Chinese the originators?—A. No, sir; the Germans originated it, but the Chinese went into it and developed the business. It was originally a very small business. We did a little, and competed a little with the eastern market; now we not only compete with the eastern market, but I think we export very largely. I have no idea we consume half the cigars we make here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you remember the testimony on that subject?—A. Yes, sir; I heard the testimony.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where is the tobacco produced?—A. Some of it in this State, some of it is imported from Kentucky, and some of it is imported from Havana. There are cigars made here that sell at a very high price—over $100 a thousand. I think the Chinese make a better cigar than the Germans; it is a smoother cigar, and one that smokes very freely. I am of the opinion that the wages of all classes are increased by the employment of Chinese here; I think everybody's interest is involved in their labor. I feel very confident that if they were withdrawn we could not export a grain of wheat, and if it were not for our wheat-trade there would not be a building built, there would not be a lot graded. I do not suppose one out of a hundred of this large army of white men here who are opposing the Chinese would find employment without them. It is the grain-trade that supports the State, that employs the railroads, that builds our warehouses, and builds up our cities and employs all this vast army of foreign immigrants. I think that I am advocating their true interests in opposing their wishes. I have no doubt they are very honest about it, but I think they are mistaken.

GEORGE W. ANTHONY sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are a resident of this State?—Answer. I am.

Q. Were you vice-consul in any of the ports of China under the United States Government?—A. I was acting vice-consul at Bangkok, in Siam. I was also acting United States consul at Yokohama, Japan.

Q. How long did you reside in Japan?—A. I was in Japan, in 1866, about five months, and in 1867 about two months, and then I went to China.

Q. Are you familiar with the Chinese?—A. Somewhat.

Q. How do they compare with the Japanese?—A. In what way?

Q. As to character and business capacity and habits. You have come in contact with both of them.—A. I think the Chinese are equal to the Japanese. I was away from China about a year, and my observation, on returning to Hong-Kong and Shanghai, was that they are equal to the Japanese in trade, in keeping their promises, and as to their integrity in fulfilling their contracts and being diligent and assiduous in business callings.

Q. How as to their intelligence?—A. As to their intelligence, I think that the Chinese are fully equal to the Japanese.

Q. The Japanese think there is nothing to choose between them as to intelligence.—A. I do not think that one race is superior to the other in their own countries. If you gentlemen will indicate what you want me to state it will be better.

Q. What I wanted to get at was whether the Chinese are a superior

race to the Japanese, in your experience.—A. In some respects they are superior. I think they are more diligent, more assiduous, and seem to be more thrifty.

Q. What race do you mean now?—A. The Chinese. That is my observation; but I think in domestic life the Japanese are the equals of the Chinese, and in their intelligence I think that they are their equals.

Q. You have traveled in Japan?—A. I have been into the interior of Japan a few hundred miles. The first time I was in Japan, in 1866, I went there when Mr. Burlingame went over. He was minister to China at that time.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In reference to the habits of the Japanese, do they not more readily adopt our inventions and show more progressive spirit?—A. I believe they do; I think they show more of an inclination to adopt our customs, our dress, and our mode of thinking, our style and our accommodations.

Q. How is it about our finance system, our code of international law, and things of that kind?—A. I am not particularly posted in regard to the Japanese in that respect. I was only a short time in Yokohama.

Q. Do you think they show more adaptability to American ideas and European ideas than the Chinese?—A. I think they do. I observed in Hong-Kong that the Chinese are kept in subjection by the British laws. There are only about four or five thousand Europeans in Hong-Kong and some 160,000 or 170,000 Chinese, yet the Chinese there seem to obey the laws much more readily than they do in other ports, because the law is more stringent and more strict. I have observed in Canton in three or four cases Englishwomen married to Chinamen who had brought them up there from Australia and had their families, and they seemed to be respected by those there.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do you not know that the Japanese have adopted our international code of laws?—A. I believe they have to a certain extent.

Q. Do you know they have adopted our revenue and financial system?—A. Of that I cannot speak. That has been done since I have been here.

Q. Do you know they have sent embassadors to our country?—A. They have.

Q. Do you know they have built a man-of-war, a ship like ours in all respects, equipped and manned like ours?—A. I believe they have.

Q. Do you know their naval officers, middies and all, are costumed like the Yankee tar?—A. I will not say that I do.

Q. Did you see them in this port?—A. I saw them in Yokohama and Nagasaki.

Q. Do you know how they dress on board their men-of-war?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they preserve their national costume?—A. It is a mixture between Japanese and European. They have somewhat changed their attire to conform.

Q. To the western and European nations?—A. Well, it is just half and half; not wholly so.

Q. Are not the Japanese princes and the better class there adopting European clothes and European costumes very extensively?—A. I have observed an inclination in that respect. I have noticed Japanese in Yokohama radical, as you may express it, to such an extent that they

have worn these high hats, and I have even seen a little Japanese boy wearing a high hat.

Q. All those Japanese who come to this country buy our costume?—A. Those that I have observed in San Francisco do. Mr. Yung Wing, who is in Connecticut now, married an American lady. I was in the auction business at that time in Shanghai, and this Mr. Yung Wing resided opposite to me. He had an extensive library, and I will say in his favor what little I can say in favor of the Chinese; but, so far as an example of the race is concerned, he was one of a hundred thousand, and when he is held up by many witnesses here to be a fair example, I think it is not fair. Mr. Yung Wing was educated in Yale College, if I am not mistaken, and returned to China, and, of course, he had that advantage over other Chinamen.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 18, 1876.

JOHN MCHENRY sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. What is your business?—Answer. I am a lawyer by profession.

Q. How long have you lived in this city and practiced law here?—A. I have lived here since the middle of August, 1850. That is, I have lived in the city all except four years. From 1854 to 1858 I resided on the other side of the lake on a farm.

Q. From what State did you come?—A. I came from Louisiana.

Q. Did you hold any official position there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was it?—A. I was on the bench of the first district court for four years previous to my leaving the State.

Q. You have been residing in the city here during the last year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What, in your view, is the cause of this agitation and movement in regard to the Chinese question?—A. There may be a number of causes that have contributed to it; but I think politics is one of them.

Q. In what way?—A. Men who desire office try by this means to get office; they are office-seekers, and they want to get elected.

MORRIS LESSLER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. (Presenting paper.) Did you collect those statistics?—Answer. I did. (See Appendix S.)

Q. In reference to all the manufactures of the city?—A. All those that I could find.

Q. It is statistical throughout?—A. Yes, sir; numbers, day, and everything.

Q. It gives a full statement of every one, white children, Chinese, and the rate of wages?—A. Yes, sir; I have been all around.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. These statistics have been made out carefully and correctly?—A. Yes, sir; I have been to every house.

Q. Do you live here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Nearly sixteen months.

Q. From what source did you derive the information contained in these papers?—A. I have been around to all these places myself and inquired personally. I saw those gentlemen myself.

Q. You saw the persons yourself?—A. I saw the persons myself.

Q. This is a true statement of the answers made to you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you come to do this?—A. Mr. Brooks sent me out.

Q. How long ago?—A. On the 20th of last month I commenced.

Q. How long were you engaged in preparing these tables?—A. Up till yesterday.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Observe this—it is not all statistics:

All the stump-speakers in the country, whether republicans or democrats, dare not mention before the farmers that they are against Chinese labor; otherwise they will not listen, and pull the speaking-places down.

A. Mr. Curtis said so.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Where were you from before you came to California?—A. China.

Q. How did you come to leave China?—A. I came home on a visit.

Q. Were there any charges in China against you?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were there any reasons for your hasty departure?—A. O, no; there never was any hasty departure.

Q. Were you ever engaged in the cooly-trade in Hong-Kong?—A. Never in my life.

Q. You never engaged in the cooly-traffic or acted as agent for it?—A. No, sir.

Q. What was your business there?—A. I was commission-agent in Formosa.

Q. Do you know Mr. Torry in Hong-Kong?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Who is Mr. Torry?—A. He was, I believe, a partner of King & Co.

Q. Were you engaged with Messrs. King & Torry in Hong-Kong?—A. I was not. I sold Captain King some blankets once.

WILLIAM W. HOLLISTER recalled.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. I wish to ask you if the large land-owners, the large farmers, employ as a general thing Chinese labor?—Answer. As a rule the large farmers of California employ the least number of Chinamen. They are generally employed upon the smaller farms. You can understand that very readily, because the large farms require teamsters, men who can drive teams, plow, and harrow, and all that kind of work, which the Chinamen cannot do. It is very rare that the Chinamen work upon the large grain-fields, except occasionally in harvest, when sometimes there is such a paucity of labor that it is impossible to gather the harvest without the Chinamen, as a rule.

Q. Do you want to make a correction of any of your testimony?—A. I wish to say, in regard to a remark made by Mr. Pixley, which seemed to impress the mind of a gentleman who has been testifying here, that I had stated that the small farmers are always bummers and drunkards, I made no such assertion as that at all.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. We had very great difficulty to get from you the admission that it was not the rule, but the exception.—A. Not as applied to that class of men.

Q. Then I misunderstood you for half an hour.—A. I know it is not true, because I have no such knowledge of them.

MORRIS LESSLER recalled.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. Did you at my request go to the cemetery and count the graves of Chinamen there?—Answer. I did.

Q. [Presenting a paper.] This is the list of them, with the names of the different companies.—A. Yes, sir. (See Appendix T.)

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. How do you know that the bones are there?—A. I counted all the graves.

Q. But they take them up?—A. When they take them up they take the headstones away with them.

Q. They will take them up by and by?—A. These are undisturbed graves.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In these different tables which you have submitted (see Appendix S) I find statements purporting to have been made by different persons. Those statements were made by them to you and not under oath?—A. O, no, not under oath.

Q. And you incorporated those statements as explaining the tables?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You went to each of these parties yourself?—A. Yes, sir; to each of them.

CHARLES D. DOUGLAS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Question. (Exhibiting a letter.) Is that your signature to this paper?—Answer. It is.

Q. What was your position at the time?—A. What is written on there, secretary of that club.

Q. What club is it?—A. The Eleventh Ward Central Anti-Chinese Club.

Senator SARGENT. Read the letter, and let it go in as evidence.

Mr. BROOKS. Read it, please.

Senator SARGENT. You read it.

Mr. BROOKS. I will read it.

The WITNESS. Wait one minute, please. (Producing a letter.)

Mr. BROOKS. This letter is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, *May* 13, 1876.

SIR: I am instructed by a resolution of the Central Anti-Cooly Club of the Eleventh Ward to notify you that unless you discharge all the Chinese now in your employ in one week from date hereof, your name will be placed on the black-list of this club and published in the daily press of this city.

All members of anti-cooly clubs in this city are prohibited from purchasing from or in any manner whatever patronize any firm, company, factory, or persons employing Chinese labor.

C. D. DOUGLAS,
Corresponding Secretary Central Anti-Cooly Club, Eleventh Ward.

Please answer.

The WITNESS. That is correct.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What paper is that you have there?—A. It is an original. It is just the paper that you read.

Q. Was the paper I have just read sent?—A. I do not know how

many; in all probability fifty or sixty, perhaps more. Such papers have been sent to different parties.

Q. By whose direction did you send them?—A. It states by what direction; by resolution of the club, ordering me as the corresponding secretary to do this.

Q. How many of these clubs are there?—A. There are probably eight or nine clubs in the city altogether.

Q. What is the membership of your club?—A. I could not state as to that. I did not keep the books of the club or the list of the members. I had nothing to do with anything but simply the correspondence.

Q. Do you know about how many members there are?—A. I presume at one time the membership of the club was in the neighborhood of 200 or more.

Q. Is it more or less now?—A. I presume we have still the same membership that we had then; perhaps more.

Q. Can you approximate to the number of members in all the clubs?—A. Not very accurately. I presume the members of the anti-cooly clubs in the city are all fully up to five or six thousand. I imagine that it comes very near that.

Q. [Presenting the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union.] Is the constitution of all the clubs similar to this?—A. They are not similar. This is the constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union.

Q. What relation does that bear to all the clubs?—A. It is the head of all the constitutions of the various clubs in the State.

Q. They must all conform to this?—A. Exactly. [See Appendix F.]

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you look upon that note as intimidating?—A. No, sir; I think not.

Q. It was not intended to intimidate?—A. Not as a threat in any manner.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The note was to affect the interests of these people?—A. It was so considered at the time.

Q. State from what stand-point that note comes. What is the class of people who belong to an anti-cooly club?—A. They are, as a general thing, all workingmen.

Q. They depend upon their daily labor for their daily bread?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. And for the bread of their families, their wives and children. That is the character of the men who form that club?—A. It is.

Q. They are laborers, toiling for their daily bread?—A. They are.

Q. Do they, or do they not, sincerely believe that the introduction of Chinese labor here by employers is taking that daily labor from them?—A. Certainly they do.

Q. And taking from their families their daily bread?—A. Decidedly.

Q. And do they all not look upon the present welfare of their families as dependent upon their ability to obtain employment and labor?—A. Certainly.

Q. And in that belief they have communicated their views to these people who employ Chinese, and say to them if they do not discontinue Chinese they will not trade with them. That is what it amounts to?—A. That is what it amounts to exactly.

Q. That is the length, depth, breadth, and thickness of the intimidation?—A. That is all.

Q. And in that you claim that you are exercising your right as citizens?—A. Certainly.

Q. You have a right to trade or withhold your trade from anybody who affects your labor or interests?—A. That is clearly our right.

Q. Is that the object and the scope of the argument which you intend when you attempt, by the association of labor, to oppose the association of wealth?—A. It is.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. This resolution, and this notice, and the black-list will affect five or six thousand people, I understand?—A. No, sir; you do not understand me in any such manner. I said that I probably sent between fifty and sixty of those notices.

Q. I understand from the resolution there that no persons belonging to anti-cooly clubs were allowed to trade or have anything to do with the person whose name is published in the black-list?—A. That is right.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do your clubs demand the expulsion of the Chinese?—A. No, sir; they do not. The constitution there shows precisely what they want to accomplish.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are the sessions of your clubs open?—A. They are.

Q. Can any person attend who chooses?—A. Anybody. The proceedings of all the clubs in the city have been reported in the papers just the same as a political meeting, exactly.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is it the opinion of your clubs—the crystallization of your opinion—that the Chinese should be prohibited from coming here in numbers?—A. It is.

Q. That it would be for the best interest of labor for white people to exclude them?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. I will ask you if your clubs are composed of American citizens, as a rule? I do not speak of American native-born citizens, but American citizens.—A. I do not know of any one of my own club who belongs to it at all who is not a citizen and a man of a family.

Q. Has there been any other counsel or suggestion than peaceful in any of the anti-cooly clubs, so far as you know?—A. Never.

Q. Has there not been an express resolution that they would not resort to violence to solve this problem?—A. The constitution of the central club, which is the head of all other clubs, makes it the duty of every member of the anti-cooly clubs of San Francisco to protect the Chinese from assaults in the streets or anywhere else.

Q. You are conservators of the law in that respect?—A. Yes.

Q. And you do not encourage or assist this system of persecution of the Chinese?—A. On the contrary, we oppose all such work as that.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. What does your antagonism arise from; is it race?—A. No, sir.

Q. What does it arise from?—A. I can only speak in that respect of my own feelings. My prejudice, if it can be called a prejudice, against the Chinamen arises from the injury that their immigration does to the rising generation, more particularly to our boys and girls in San Francisco.

Q. It is not the labor question?—A. It is the labor question consid-

erably. It prevents boys and girls from obtaining employment, throws them out in the streets, and leads to evils and mischief. The other objection is that I have considered Chinese labor from my observation here of ten years in San Francisco, seeing the Chinese daily coming in and going out, as a species of slavery. That is one of my objections.

Q. Why is not the Chinaman as much entitled to labor as the white man?—A. I presume he is entitled to labor.

Q. Your antagonism would not be against any white men coming here to labor?—A. No; because a white man's labor would not injure me as the Chinaman's does.

Q. How does a Chinaman injure you? Is he any more in demand?—A. So much as whites, because he can live differently, and can live on less than white men.

Q. Then it is because of race and their mode of living?—A. I presume it is.

Q. The white man is a better man in every way?—A. Yes; I think so.

Q. And the same antagonism would arise against any other race, inferior, would it not?—A. Yes, certainly, if the labor would come in competition with ours in the same manner.

Q. Would not the giving him of the ballot remedy all that and make him equal?—A. I think not.

Q. Did it not have that effect with another race, and the inferior race, in the Southern States?—A. Yes, it had with that race; but that race is different from the Chinese. I do not consider the negroes as inferior to the Chinese, by any means. For generations the negroes were raised up among our own people.

Q. Suppose you raised up the Chinese in that way?—A. I do not think any number of generations of them would ever make them the equal of the negro.

Q. Why not?—A. They have their own traditions and language; they claim that they have stuck to their own traditions for the last four thousand years without any change, either one way or the other.

Q. Then it is because of his nationality or race that he cannot amalgamate?—A. I do not think it would be possible for him to amalgamate with the white race.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. He would not if he could, and he could not if he would?—A. No.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Why?—A. Why, I do not know.

Q. It must be race or nationality. Is there any other reason that you know of?—A. Certainly; any reason arising out of habits or different modes of thought; his habits and his religion.

Q. That is because of his nationality?—A. Their habits and traditions are different from ours.

Q. And their nationality is also different, and civilization, every way?—A. Every way.

Q. And it is because of his nationality and that civilization that you antagonize him?—A. Yes, partly.

Q. That would be race, would it not? He is a distinct race?—A. Yes; a distinct race.

Q. That gives him that nationality and those characteristics?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Was there not at the commencement of the formation of these clubs a military organization among them?—A. No, sir; never, to my knowledge.

Q. It was so stated in the newspapers. What did those notices allude to? Did you not see some notices in the papers?—A. I saw something of it, but we have never been able to find out anything at all about it. I think that was really done by the enemies of the anti-cooly clubs, in order to get them in bad repute in the community. I do not think those notices ever came from anti-cooly clubs or anybody who favored them in any way.

Q. It was a public notice in the newspapers, calling meetings for that purpose, to organize military companies?—A. I never saw any such notice.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say that the other anti-Chinese labor leagues are subservient to this constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union. I want to read you section first:

Its objects are to protect the people of the United States from the degrading influences of Chinese labor in any form; to discourage and stop any further Chinese immigration; to compel the Chinese living in the United States to withdraw from the country; and to unite, centralize, and direct the anti-Chinese strength of our country, to the end that good order and harmony may prevail, that no law may be violated, and the great objects herein enumerated may be fully accomplished by the use of lawful means.

That seems to declare emphatically in favor of sending all out of the country who are here?—A. Not by force. It is not the intention to use any force.

Q. I did not ask you about force.—A. To persuade them to go; that is the way that is understood.

Q. You want them all to go?—A. I should be very glad to see them go.

Q. May I ask you what ticket you voted at this election?—A. I do not think that has anything to do with it.

Senator SARGENT. It has been asked of a great many witnesses, and there is no objection to answering the question.

The WITNESS. I voted the republican ticket. I never voted anything else, and I do not think I shall, either.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What ticket did you vote?—A. I voted for Hayes and Wheeler.

GEORGE W. TUCKER sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are a resident of this city?—Answer. No, sir.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Ship-master.

Q. Commander of a ship?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What ship?—A. The North American.

Q. What State are you a native of?—A. Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Q. You have been long connected with the trade with the Chinese?—A. I have been in China and connected with the Chinese trade since 1851.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You have resided in China?—A. I have never resided there, but I have been there months at a time in different parts of it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have had a great deal of experience with the Chinese there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have heard some of the testimony here to-night?—A. I paid no attention to it.

Q. How have you found the Chinese there for cleanliness and honesty and sobriety?—A. The Chinese that I have been in contact with have been merchants generally.

Q. What kind of a class are they?—A. I think they are very superior men as merchants, honorable men.

Q. Have you ever been in the interior at all, among the farming classes?—A. In 1860 I was chartered by the French government to go to the north of China, near the Yellow Sea. I laid there some four months, about the latitude of forty north. I went ashore among the farming population and saw beautiful farms, nice school-houses, fields as well cultivated as in New England.

Q. A thrifty class of people?—A. A thrifty class of people.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What part of China is that?—A. In the north of China.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have been in the port of Hong-Kong?—A. Yes, sir; frequently.

Q. Have you ever known of any coolies being shipped from Hong-Kong?—A. Never in my life.

Q. Are you familiar with the cooly-trade as it was carried on with Peru and with Cuba?—A. I never was in the trade myself; I have carried Chinese passengers from the port of San Francisco to Hong-Kong, some thousand of them.

Q. What kind of a class of men were they as to their behavior, &c., on board ship?—A. The best-behaved class of immigrants I have ever carried, and I have carried all nations; they are the most cleanly.

Q. What is their reputation for honesty, as your experience has been?—A. Superior to any other class of trading people.

Q. As a whole, was the class superior in those respects that you have come in contact with?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What class of immigrants come to this country from China, as it has been sworn here—the thieves and lower order, &c., or is it another class?—A. I do not know what class comes here to San Francisco. I am not competent to say, but I have seen Chinamen in San Francisco that I thought were very respectable people.

Q. Did you hear Captain King's statement here to-night?—A. I am a little hard of hearing and I did not hear his statement particularly.

Q. The class of Chinese who come here as coolies he does not make any different from the cooly of Cuba and Peru. What is your idea on that subject? You know something about the cooly-trade as it has been carried on, although you have not been engaged in that trade.—A. I should say there was a great difference.

Q. Wherein is that difference?—A. I do not think that any mercantile Chinese go to Peru. I think there are some who come here.

Q. From what ports have they shipped coolies up to a year ago from China?—A. Swatow, Amoy, Macao, and Wampo.

Q. Has not that trade entirely ceased?—A. I was in Hong-Kong two years ago, and a number of Peruvian ships came for coolies and could not get them. I understood the trade was stop ped.

Q. Do you know Captain King?—A. I knew Captain King in China.

Q. What business was he engaged in?—A. Ship-master when I knew him.

Q. In what capacity? Where was his trade or what was he doing?—A. He was captain of a vessel.

Q. Trading there on the coast?—A. I suppose so. I was not intimately acquainted with him. He was merely introduced to me as Captain King.

Q. Did he stand high there as captain and as a gentleman?—A. He did at that time.

Q. What year was that?—A. I think it was about 1854, 1855, and 1856. I have not seen him since until this evening.

Q. Do you know the name of the ship that he had command of at that time?—A. No, sir.

Q. You know of the Wanderer on that coast?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What trade was she engaged in?—A. I think she was running up the coast.

Q. A coast-trader?—A. A coast-trader, if I am not mistaken. I saw her in Fuhchau.

Q. They call them lorchas?—A. This was not a lorcha. It was an American-built vessel. A lorcha is a Chinese vessel.

Q. What is that trade?—A. That trade then was not a legitimate trade, buying and selling merchandise in ports not open by treaty. I think that vessel was owned at that time by a highly respectable mercantile firm in China. If I am not mistaken it was owned by Augustine Hurd & Co.

Q. Then it is an entirely different class that they ship from those ports as coolies from what we have here?—A. I should think so.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Did any incident in 1857 occur with you in relation to the finding of a Dutch ship?—A. I picked up a Dutch ship at sea one day.

Q. How came it to be at sea and in a condition to be picked up?—A. I suppose she sailed from port bound from Macao to Havana.

Q. Loaded with coolies?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know that those coolies captured and killed the officers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the ship was drifting helplessly when you took her in?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You took her to Singapore?—A. I sent her there.

Q. And got your salvage?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There was not a very good class of emigrants on that ship going out?—A. I did not pay much attention to them.

Q. But you stated that the kind of emigrants you took on one occasion were the best of any European class.—A. Yes, sir; but I did not take those on the Dutch ship as emigrants. I took those as captured people.

Q. They were people, however, who were emigrating from China to Cuba?—A. There is something more in relation to that matter. At that particular time there was a war between Great Britain and China. This vessel was chartered to carry coolies from Macao to Havana. I understood that part of these people put on board were convicts condemned to suffer death for crime, but the Chinese government told them they would put them on board that ship, and if they would kill the foreigners on board of that ship and then run the ship ashore and land it, they should be free and their lives would be given them.

Q. Do you know whether that was the same kind of cargo of passengers as Captain Joy, of the steamship Crocus, brought to this port?—A. I do not know.

Q. Did they not come from the same part of China?—A. They came from China.

Q. They were Cantonese, from the same quarter?—A. I do not know where they came from.

Q. Do you know that the same locality that furnishes the pirates such as took this Dutch ship that you found, and are brought from Macao to Peru and Cuba and elsewhere as coolies, were from the same country and the same class of emigrants as are found here in San Francisco?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you state that it is so?—A. I did not state it. I do not know it.

Q. Do you know that the people who go from Macao to Peru are Cantonese, from the Kwang Tung province?—A. I do not know that they all come from there.

Q. The majority of them?—A. I do not know it.

Q. You are intelligent generally upon the class of people that emigrate and the provinces from which they come?—A. I told you some that were shipped from Amoy and some from Swatow are certainly from the Cantonese.

Q. Coolies for Peru?—A. Coolies for Peru.

Q. Going from Swatow?—A. They do.

Q. And also they go from Canton?—A. They used to come from Canton.

Q. Do not coolies come from the Canton province and from Swatow now to California?—A. I suppose they do.

Q. Then you state according to your general information that the emigrants known as coolies who were sent to Peru and to Cuba were from the same parts of China as those who come to California?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know and will you state whether they are not the same class of people?—A. I do not think they are.

Q. What is the difference?—A. Because some who come here are merchants. Some who come here are respectable people. Some who come here are educated people.

Q. That is a mere avoidance of the question.—A. I do not avoid it. We understand that merchants and respectable people come here, but the great bulk of Chinese immigration that comes here is of the class of people engaged in manufacturing occupations or the lowest occupations as laborers.

Q. Are they not from the same class of society?—A. Probably.

Q. And it is your opinion that they are?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the only difference is the difference of condition in which they come to California or go to Peru?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do they ship from any of those ports here? Have any ships cleared from this port to Swatow and Amoy?—A. I do not know. A great many of these Chinese come over in steamers.

Q. They come from Hong-Kong?—A. They come from Hong-Kong.

Q. The class of coolies, then, is a different class of people that go to Peru and Cuba, that is as you state, there have been criminals put on a Dutch ship.—A. That was some years ago; that was in war time.

PATRICK H. HUMPHREY sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. You are a resident of this city?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been a resident of California?—A. About eight years.

Q. Were you quarantine officer here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long?—A. A little over two years.

Q. What were the duties of that office?—A. To board vessels in the harbor.

Q. Coming to this port?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It has been testified by one witness (O'Donnell) that the Colorado brought the small-pox here.—A. I think not, and I think we have positive evidence to believe that it came from a different direction. At least we had eight or ten cases reported before the Colorado arrived.

Q. The small-pox had been already here?—A. Yes, sir; and the first cases were among white people. The first case reported was a white man.

Q. Do you recollect the ship Crocus?—A. Yes, sir; that arrived about a month before the Colorado.

Q. Was there any small-pox brought in that ship?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you examine the passengers?—A. Yes, I examined them before they were landed.

Q. What kind of class were they in comparison with those coming in the Pacific mail steamers?—A. The vessel was hardly in as good condition as the Colorado, and the captain reported that he had some trouble with the passengers. I believe it was on account of their complaint in regard to provision or something of that kind.

Q. You examined them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As a class of passengers did they compare with those in like circumstances arriving by other ships?—A. Hardly; they were not as cleanly as a general thing.

Q. In your experience, are English ships as cleanly as ours?—A. They are not as cleanly, in my experience.

Q. The reputation of English steamers and sailing-vessels is not equal to our own?—A. Those steamers that were in that employ were older than the ones used by the Pacific Mail, and probably on that account it was not possible to keep them clean.

Q. Was there any small-pox on the Crocus?—A. No, sir. No cases of small-pox came through the Golden Gate during the time I was in office. The Colorado reported a few cases that they had landed, but there had been no cases among the Chinese after leaving Yokohama.

Q. They landed their cases at Yokohama and fumigated the ship, I believe?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. She was quarantined here a few days?—A. She was a week in quarantine.

Q. Have you any statement to make in connection with this matter?—A. Nothing further than, so far as immigration is concerned, I would consider that some strict national law probably should be made, or rather that the immigration laws should be more strictly carried out, and probably in that way prevent not only an overplus of immigration from any source, but also prevent any one who is afflicted with any contagious or epidemic disease, or any one who might become a burden to the country, from landing. We have such a law as that, but the law under which the quarantine officer has to act here is merely a State law. His authority is merely derived from the State law.

Q. You think Congress ought to have control of this subject?—A. It seems to me it would be better to have a national law, and put it into the hands of Government officers to enforce. Undoubtedly, a great many immigrants land here not only from China, but from other sources, that our country would be better without.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you not think you could protect yourselves better than Congress could do it?—A. I only speak of giving more authority to the officers carrying out the law.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What other immigration do you refer to when you say there are others that the country would be better without?—A. We very often have had insane or maimed persons land here from the Sandwich Islands, and from other sources.

Q. I understood you to be speaking of nationalities?—A. I do not refer to any nationalities.

Q. I did not know but that it was another fling at the Irish.—A. Not at all. While I was in office here we had a few immigrants from the Islands that were objectionable.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. As nearly as I remember the testimony of the gentleman who, I believe, is occupying the place you formerly occupied, he said the first case of small-pox was of a white man who took some Chinese baggage from the steamer Crocus with his team up town, and that the small-pox developed in him. Have you any knowledge of that case?—A. Only from what Dr. Mearęs stated. He stated that it was one among eight cases that had been reported to him before the arrival of the Colorado. The first case I understood him to say was a man that was taken to the French hospital and had arrived here on an immigrant train a few days before from New Orleans. That was the first case. Probably the second case was this man Dr. O'Donnell speaks of as being a teamster.

CHARLES WOLCOTT BROOKS sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Question. Are you a resident of this city?—Answer. I am.

Q. What official position did you hold in China, if any?—A. Not any. I was agent of the Japanese government here about seventeen years, Japanese consul.

Q. You have been to China?—A. Yes, sir; a good many times.

Q. What is your opinion of the Chinese who come to this country, for honesty, integrity, &c.?

Mr. PIXLEY. Do you confine the witness to the commercial classes?

Mr. BEE. I refer to all classes. The witness can explain by headings.

The WITNESS. I imagine there are all classes among the Chinese, as there are among our people. It depends very much upon their position in society and their education, but I think the honor of the Chinese mercantile classes stands quite as high as the average of any race. I think that the mercantile losses by Chinamen are vastly less than by almost any other single nationality.

Q. It has been testified to here to-night that the Chinese are thieves. Is that your experience among them?—A. No, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to hear Mr. Brooks make his own statement before the commission. I think he is pretty familiar with the questions involved here.

Senator SARGENT. Certainly, testify freely.

The WITNESS. Give me a little idea of what topic you would like me to treat on.

Senator SARGENT. I understood Colonel Bee to ask you to describe the character of the Chinese who came here, dividing them in classes as you thought best.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. And the effect, as Mr. Pixley puts it—morally, physically, socially, commercially, and Webster's dictionary generally?—A. I think the Chinese come here for pecuniary benefit. The question to them is a money question. The question to us is both a money question and a question of political economy. I think the Chinese are a far superior race to the negro race physiologically and mentally. That may probably not be the case with some neat mulattoes who have white blood; that is different. I think that the Chinese have a great deal more brain power than the original negro. The negro, however, has never had any discipline; he never has had in Africa a regular religion as the Chinese have had. His mind is undisciplined, and it is not systematic as the Chinese mind. For that reason the negro is very easily taught; he assimilates more readily. The Chinese are non-assimilative because their form of civilization has crystallized, as it were. China has been hemmed in by certain natural limits, certain boundaries, and cut off from the rest of the world. The people have advanced as far as they could advance without contact with other nations. I think that from the year 1200 to the year 1400 or 1500 what scientists call differentiation ceased, and when differentiation ceases the advancement of the people in a great measure ceases. I think China has retrograded since that time.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What is the character of the lower class who come here, the labor class of Chinese?—A. I think a great many of them come from the mountain districts, from the provinces of Kwang Tung. A great many of them are farmers, in one way and another. I think some of what is called the boat population come here. It is very likely that this ship Crocus had some of this class on board. I do not know, but I think that the majority of the people who come here come for work and belong to the working classes. The word "cooly" is a Sanskrit word, which means simply "laborer;" it means a man who works for a day's wages. In Sanskrit "cooly" means a day-laborer; "wallah" means a merchant; "baboo" means a sort of banker; and "banyan" is an equivalent in Sanskrit to the word "comprador" as used in China.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. How is the word "cooly" used in China?—A. Any man who works for day's wages I should call a cooly.

Q. Is it not used with other words, classified as "house-cooly," &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Different classes of persons who labor are designated by this prefix?—A. It means simply a day-laborer. A trading cooly is a trade in labor, and cooly-trade is a trade in labor. It is merely by compounding it and making it "cooly-trade" that you make it offensive at all.

Q. Did you acquire sufficient knowledge of the Chinese language to converse with them?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you learn the language in which trade is carried on in China?—A. Pigeon English?

Q. Yes.—A. I know some of it. As I understand it, pigeon English

is simply a literal translation of the Chinese words. As, for example, in French, "*Comment vous portez-vous?*"—"How do you carry yourself?"—really means "How are you?" The Chinese pigeon English is a literal translation of the Chinese idiom, that is, word for word, as it would be if translated literally.

Q. What was the cooly-trade? How is it distinguished from immigration of Chinese to this country?—A. The cooly-trade is a trade, as I understand it, where parties were formerly taken or purchased from their relations and put in barracoons at Macao and other ports in China until they got a cargo, oftentimes more than a cargo, and from those barracoons were drawn supplies to load ships, which took cargoes to Havana, Peru, and other places.

Q. Was that done with the consent of the Chinese government?—A. It was very painful to the Chinese government. The Chinese government covers a very large area, and the central government is not strong, as I understand it, in the different provinces. There is a government over the whole of China, but each of the provinces have viceroys in their own districts. Many irregularities can be carried on, and have been carried on, in the different provinces, that were not fully sanctioned by the general government, and the general government was not strong enough to prevent it at all times. I know very well by conversation with leading Chinamen that this cooly-trade was the one sorrow of the Chinese government, as it were, the great sorrow of that government. They could not prevent it for a while.

Q. Does slavery exist in China by law?—A. I am not sufficiently familiar with the law to be able to say whether it does or not.

Q. Have you ever seen the Chinese code?—A. No, sir; and I do not think one has ever been published. I think that different sections of the country probably have different laws.

Q. Is there not a general code of laws that has existed for a great many centuries that is revised every five years, a published code?—A. Do you mean moral law or physical law?

Q. I mean the law just the same as our own code of laws, civil and criminal.—A. Yes, sir; I know they have the law, but I am not sufficiently familiar with it.

Q. I saw it stated by an English writer that their code is preferable to any European code. Do you know any such book as that, translated by an Englishman into the English language?—A. I have never seen it.

Q. You stated in your testimony before the State senate committee the population of the empire of China. At what figure did you put it?—A. I am speaking from memory now; but the statistics of the census I saw I think put it at 415,000,000. I furnished this evening to the committee a little article that I wrote in the Overland Monthly some six or eight years ago, which had an exact tabular statement of every province in China. (See Appendix U.)

Q. Has the population materially altered within the last ten or twenty years?—A. I think it has been diminished, if anything, in many parts of China.

Q. From what cause?—A. I think China has been retrograding for the last two or three hundred years.

Q. In population?—A. There are certain general laws of nature, laws of action and reaction. Whenever a country gets too thickly settled, famine or some disaster occurs and carries off a large number of people. I think the southern parts of China are very thickly settled. There are parts of China that are thinly settled.

Q. For how long a period has the population of China remained stationary or retrograded?—A. My impressions in regard to it I have gathered from conversation with intelligent Chinamen, and also from scholars in the East. They all think that at least for two hundred years it has been retrograding.

Q. What is the reason that one portion of China is so much more thickly populated than the other?—A. I have always supposed that water-lines are the easiest means of communication, and therefore that settlements are attracted around the water-lines of any country.

Q. Are not those portions of China which are not so thickly settled as capable of supporting a large population?—A. Yes, sir; many of the mountain districts are capable of large settlement, I have no doubt. Professor Pumpelly, a professor at Harvard College, who went through that country in the interior, says there is a great deal of very fine land in the interior of China. But the habits and tastes of the Chinese people lead them to eat a great deal of rice; the southern portions of China are principally devoted to the culture of rice, and it is natural that they should live where their food is. The history of the Chinese race, by their own traditions, is that they originated from the southern part of China. It is natural that where they originated there should be the largest population, if the conditions for life are good.

Q. You spoke of the population that emigrates to this country as being derived, in a great measure, from hilly-country farmers, from the mountains.—A. A good many men have come here from the mountains right in the province of Kwang Tung, not very far back from Canton.

Q. They do not cultivate rice there?—A. No, sir; not in the mountains.

Q. Why do they not crowd more into this fertile country which you say is so thinly settled?—A. There are many animosities between different portions of China. Whole districts of China speak different languages, and persons in one province cannot communicate with persons in another province by spoken language at all. Then, again, in the interior part of China there are what are called Miautz, the old aborigines, who bear the same relation to the Chinese Empire that the North American Indian bears to the present population of the United States.

Q. Are they a different race, a different root?—A. Yes, sir; entirely different.

Q. What branch of the human family do they belong to?—A. That is a good deal of a study now among ethnologists. I do not think it is a settled question at all. They belong to a very ancient aboriginal race.

Q. Do the Miautz belong to the same stock as the aboriginal race of Japan?—A. It is barely possible; but I think the Japanese belong more to what was the Turkish originally. They came along over the northern part of Asia, came down the peninsula of Corea, and peopled the northern part of Japan. Then there was a current which came from the Malays up by the south, and those two met in Japan. The Chinese are an absolutely different race from the Japanese. There is no friendship or similarity between them. They hate each other most cordially.

Q. Are they not from the same stock of the human family?—A. No, sir; the Japanese keep a history of all the Chinese who come into their country. I have the Japanese records, I think some 120 volumes, running back to the days of Zimno Tenno, 600 and odd years before Christ. It is an exact account of the Chinese who have come to their country every year. These records will say, this year thirty-eight Chinamen came to Japan, remained such a length of time, and so many returned. I have the history and I have tabulated a statement, not for

this purpose at all, but for my own amusement, to figure up the number of Chinamen who have come into Japan in the last two thousand years or more that the Japanese government has kept a record of. It is less than three thousand years.

Q. I understand you that the Miautz are not the same race as the aborigines of Japan?—A. They may be the same race as the Inos, the more ancient than the present race of Japan.

Q. I should like to know whether those Inos are not the same race as our Digger Indians? I ask the question because I observe such a strong resemblance.—A. I wish I had brought here a map that I have. The Japanese Kuro Shiwo or Gulf Stream strikes over on the coast of Alaska. There is a section of our coasts where the Japanese can make the Indians understand them. From what I have learned, and I have studied the subject pretty thoroughly for twenty years, the immigration from Japan to the northwest coast of America has been in detail and not *en masse*. It has been a casual immigration which has occurred from wrecks, ships disabled off the coast of Japan, which drifted around by the Japanese Gulf Stream and stranded all along from Kamtchatka, Atcha, Adach, Alaska, along the coast of Alaska, then down Vancouver's Island, clear down as far as Acapulco. I have an account of one hundred such wrecks.

Q. You are speaking of the present race of Japanese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I was asking you about the aborigines, the Inos.—A. The Inos are a very hairy race; their bodies are covered with hair. They are probably one of the most hairy races known, and a very mild, docile race.

Q. You think, then, they are not the same race with the Digger Indians?—A. No, sir; I think that whatever similarity exists is caused from the fact of sailors, males, wrecked upon ships and stranded in the way I have stated. There never was a woman found upon a wreck yet. In every wreck that has been found upon the Pacific Ocean the cloth has been Japanese, and no Chinese ship has ever been found that was wrecked. These wrecks have been cast around the northwest shore and these men landed and naturally went among the coast tribes. The similarity does not extend beyond a thin veneering around the coast.

Q. Do you think they intermarried with the women of the country?—A. They intermarried with the women of the country, and the result has been that they impressed their type more or less upon the coast tribes; but only upon the coast tribes.

Q. What is your opinion of the moral condition of China as compared with other nations, excluding the United States?—A. As I understand the religion of China——

Q. I do not speak of the religion, but the moral condition.—A. That is the way of reaching it, I think; because if you wish to get at the moral condition of a nation you must look at their springs of action. When I first went to India and traveled through all those countries, I made up my mind that the only way to understand a people was to first learn their religion. When you learn the rules that govern their actions you can judge of them, and you can judge whether they are influenced according to their belief. That is all you can expect of any nation. The Chinese religion, as I understand it, is very much like what might be called pure spiritualism. It is very much like modern spiritualism, supposing it to be pure. I am not speaking of the Buddhists, but of the religion of the masses of China. Their religion is called Fung Shuy, to a great extent. Fung means wind and Shuy means water, and taken as a compound word, it means wind and water.

Q. Something between wind and water?—A. No, sir; it means the sweet influences which are cast upon a hill-side with a southern inclination in spring-time, between alternate sunshine and showers. In other words, it is the gentle influence that the departed spirits of their ancestors shed upon the present population, not to oblige them to do anything but merely to influence them. That is their spiritualism; and planchette is a common thing in China. You can go up in the temple on Pine street and see planchette every day, and see the priests go into convulsions, and write with mediums.

Q. Are there not certain moral principles acknowledged by all nations as good and evil which are distinct and separate from religion?—A. Yes, sir; but if you take the Chinese religion in its purity it is a very pure religion. It is not dogmatic theology, but it is very pure in its principles. You may say of them as we would say of a Christian, that a good Christian must be a good man; and a man who lives up to their religion must be a good man. They are both very pure religions, and, I think, on the average the Chinese live up to their religion pretty nearly as well as any other nation that I know of.

Q. Are you acquainted with the character of laborers who were employed on the Union Pacific Railroad?—A. Yes, sir; I went over the Union Pacific Railroad twenty times when it was building.

Q. Did those white laborers who built that road become settlers?—A. No, sir. I made a trip across on the overland stage when there was a gap of about forty or fifty miles between the two ends of the route. The men who were engaged in building the Union Pacific Railroad, I think, were an exceptionally rough set of men. They were called Union Pacific roughs.

Q. Do you think they would have been of any value as settlers to any country?—A. No, sir. The railroad company attempted to have them stay there, but they were without their families, and there were such disturbances that when the road was finished they were obliged to free the road of them entirely. Train after train took them down to Omaha, and they even carried them farther than Omaha to get rid of them and get them off the line, the disturbances and fighting and bloodshed and murders among them were so constant. I saw two or three men killed there in one day, and I saw three men hung.

Q. What was the character of the towns that grew up along that road as it progressed?—A. They were nothing but shanties and most of them have gone to destruction. A few places like Cheyenne and Laramie have grown up there.

Q. What was the character of the society of those towns that grew up along the road?—A. It was very rough, indeed.

Q. Was it not worse than anything that ever before existed in the United States anywhere?—A. I should hope it was. I should think it was, too, from what I observed.

Q. Do you think it would have been any advantage to this State to have had the Central Pacific Railroad built by that class of people?—A. I do not think it would be any advantage to have that class of people here.

Q. If the effect of building the Central Pacific Railroad by that class of people had been to bring them here, it would have been rather disastrous than otherwise?—A. I think that would have been the case with a great many of them.

Q. What is the difference, if anything, in the character of business that has been created by the building of these two roads?—A. The California end of the Pacific Railroad was built almost entirely by Chinese

labor with white foremen and white men to do all the directing. The Central Pacific Railroad now has a very large local business with more branch lines. I was looking at the returns lately, and I saw the statement made by the agency of the Central Pacific Railroad in New York that 77 per cent. of its earnings was local business. I have no means of knowing that that is true except that I have read it in their statement made in New York.

Q. What is the character of the business of the Union Pacific Railroad?—A. In conversation with Mr. Sickles, who is the engineer of that road, he told me that the business is gaining some, but that the heaviest part of their business is through business.

Q. Has the Union Pacific Railroad done anything to open the country through which it passes by building lateral branches?—A. I think they have toward Denver. There is no other lateral branch.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Yes; there is one up north from Fremont.—A. That is not the Union Pacific. That is the Sioux City Road.

Q. I do not know that they built it, but it is a branch.—A. I do not think that connects with the Union Pacific at all.

By Mr. COOPER:

Q. Does the Denver branch?—A. I said the Denver was the only branch.

Q. It does not connect either.—A. I think it connects at Cheyenne.

Q. But they are not connected; they are fighting each other.—A. O, yes; but by connecting I mean the Denver branch runs into the Union Pacific.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is the character of the laboring-class of the Chinese generally?—A. I think they are systematic, and generally faithful.

Q. In their own country?—A. All we can judge is at the open ports. At the open ports everything seems to be very systematic and well governed.

Q. What is the character of the population of the Kwang-Tung province?—A. I could not tell without my statistics.

Q. You do not know an agricultural laboring-class, whether they are peaceful or industrious?—A. I think that the Kwang-Tung district is the most enterprising district of all China. It is the only country in China where the people go abroad much. I have seen them down in Singapore; I have seen them in Penang; I have seen them in Siam, up the May-Kiang river; I have seen them in Calcutta and Ceylon, and I have see them all around that country.

Q. What is their character as you have seen them?—A. They are a very industrious, frugal, thrifty people. I have seen whole fleets of Chinese junks in Singapore.

Q. How long has emigration from China been carried on anywhere? Is it a new thing; in other words, has it been going on for ages?—A. We have a record of it as far back as the days of Vasco de Gama, about the year 1500.

Q. Do they establish colonies, or do they simply go with the intention of returning?—A. I think they go with the intention of returning home. I think they establish colonies, but very few ever remain permanently.

Q. There has been considerable testimony as to the number of Chinese inhabiting these Channel Islands. They are permanently settled there, are they not?—A. I never so understood it. I have always heard

them spoken of as going and returning to their own country, and by that means furnishing a great deal of occupation for the vessels in transporting them.

Q. What is the reason of this? Is there any peculiarity of their character that induces them to return?—A. The Chinese religion. They believe in the veneration of ancestors. I have understood that as long as they buried their ancestors in an unbroken line, the sweet influence of those ancestors are around their descendants; but when there is one that is not buried at home and lost abroad, they lose his sweet influence, as it were. Therefore, it is an advantage for every man to have all his ancestors buried at home, if he can. Some years ago there was a Chinese emperor whose ship was lost at sea, and a day was appointed, a sort of all-saints day, when they make offerings for him and all those persons who die abroad. The intention of everybody is to be buried on their native soil.

Q. I would like to have your views on the interests of this country as affected by Chinese immigration?—A. I think it is only the province of Canton that is particularly interested, and I do not think that all the other provinces would care at all whether there was any foreign trade or not.

Q. Is our trade increasing?—A. Yes, sir; it is.

Q. Do you know what is the amount of trade in domestic cotton goods with China?—A. It was very heavy formerly with the United States; but at the time of the war we were unable to compete with England, and England got the trade away from us to a great extent. The result is now that almost all the teas from China go to England, while almost all the teas from Japan come to the United States.

Q. Consequently, then, England supplies them with their cotton goods?—A. Yes, sir; and opium.

Q. What is the total amount of the trade to that country in cotton goods?—A. I was not aware until this evening that I was to be called to the stand. If I had known it I would have prepared myself.

Q. Does it amount to many millions?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. If we could raise cotton here, and manufacture it at this port, could we not control that trade?—A. We could do so, if we could undersell England. I think the whole secret of the Chinese coming to this country is that it is profitable. When it is profitable for them to come they will come, and when it is not profitable for them to come they will not come. That is the whole thing in a nut-shell.

Q. What is the prospect in the future of the bullion trade with China, or the export of our silver?—A. The usage of the precious metals is very large in China, from the fact that they believe they can send messages into the upper world. They write their prayers on paper and burn them, and that carries them up into the upper world. They beat out gold and silver and paste it on paper, and call them joss-papers, which they burn, and then it is supposed to go up, sending repose to their friends in the other world. By that means, the usage of the precious metals is larger than in any other country in the world.

Q. Can we not send bullion from here at such a rate as to control that trade?—A. I think we do supply China pretty much with silver now, and we settle our exchanges through London.

Q. Can we not pay the English debt in that way? There is always an English debt, a balance of trade, to China?—A. Yes, sir; there always has been; but I think that balance is getting to be less and less now.

Q. Can we pay that balance from here and thus control that exchange?—A. Yes, sir; we do it.

Q. Entirely?—A. The American trade-dollar is a very favorite coin in China, because it runs fine. The American trade-dollar is four hundred and twenty grains, I think. The Mexican dollar runs from four hundred and eighteen to four hundred and twenty-eight grains; it varies. The American trade-dollar is always exact. They have confidence in it now. Were we to continue sending trade-dollars, I think we could eventually furnish currency for the whole of China. I think it would furnish a market which we very much need.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know the nature of the country between Laramie, toward Salt Lake, at Bridger's Pass, and all along through the Green River country, &c.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that country very favorable for settlement?—A. No, sir; it is more of a grazing-country.

Q. And only portions of it are fit for grazing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It is not well adapted to making a settlement upon?—A. I think we could mine the country by and by, when it opens up; it is a gold-mining country.

Q. The gold-mines were discovered, I believe, some time after the railroad was built?—A. They were opened about a year after, but they were discovered simultaneously with the building of the road.

Q. Between Cheyenne and the border of Nebraska, how is the country?—A. There are the Laramie Plains.

Q. I know. That is between Laramie and Cheyenne, and this side of Laramie a short distance.—A. The country improves toward Omaha.

Q. After the road crosses the Nebraska border, the country begins to improve?—A. Yes; but I do not think the country is any worse there than along the Central Pacific, all through the alkali desert, and out through Humboldt Valley.

Q. But along the alkali desert and through the Humboldt Valley, except some mountain meadows, you do not find settlements, you find towns are very rare?—A. But there is a good deal of business done there.

Q. On account of silver mines off toward Antioch and other places which have been developed and opened?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Between Cheyenne and the border of Nebraska there is the same kind of bleak, sage-brush country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When you cross the Nebraska line you find Sidney and all those towns, a handsome, thriving community built up there?—A. Yes, sir; it is a developing community.

Q. I see school-houses and churches when I pass through, and evidences of thrift?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In speaking of the laborers on the Union Pacific, would it not be rather harsh to say that the whole of them were of this bad character, or do you mean there was a bad class among them?—A. There was a very bad class employed. They found considerable difficulty in getting men. I think they got the very worst class of men that I ever saw in my life.

Q. Were there not also good men among them?—A. I think there were, but the bad men largely predominated. I believe they used the railroad company very badly also.

Q. There was an *emeute* there at one time when their wages were not paid to them, I believe?—A. O yes, sir; and a great many bad things.

Q. Is not that very apt to be the case where a few bad men are in a community? For instance, let me give you an illustration: The testimony here has been given of a certain outrage which happened at Los Angeles, which was very reprehensible. Does not that give a painful impression of Los Angeles to the mind of the person who hears of it?—A. Yes, sir; that is true.

Q. Would it not be unjust to blame the great mass of the people of Los Angeles, although there were men who committed reprehensible acts among them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. May not that be true in a certain measure of the men—who were certainly industrious and energetic—who built that long line in such a short time? May it not be that the bad element among them was comparatively small, but it seemed to cover the whole mass?—A. That may be true to a certain extent.

Q. I only want common justice for them.—A. The persons who were overseers and who were subofficers in one way and another were all excellent men as far as I observed, but the class of men I am speaking about, as a rule, were the men who were picked up to do the manual labor.

Q. Must there not have been an immense amount of that manual labor done to have built that road so fast? There was a good deal of industry there.—A. Yes, sir; but the trouble was that they needed so many men in a short time, that they got all sorts of people, and the thrifty men there were the terror of everybody. They went by the name of the "U. P. Roughs."

Q. I know; but was not that the designation of a class of gamblers and others who followed along in the train of the construction of the road?—A. Yes, sir; there was a train of followers.

Q. And as distinct from the workmen as the muddy stream that plunges into the clear one?—A. I think they were in a certain sense distinct from them, but they amalgamated with them.

Q. Do you know what the queue on a Chinaman's head signifies?—A. I understand that at the time of the Tartar conquest it was originally worn as a badge of servitude, but that when the government changed again it became a badge of honor.

Q. Has that any religious signification?—A. None that I am aware of. Whenever a man committed a crime in China it has been the custom to cut off his queue. Therefore, when you see a man with his queue cut off the inference is that he has been convicted of some crime.

Q. A very educated and intelligent Chinaman stated to me the other day, in the presence of some gentlemen who are here, that the queue always has this signification: In the other world, if the person had his queue cut off, it would be evidence that he had done something wrong in this life, and probably it would affect his status in that world.—A. I think that is right. The inference is that the man who wears no queue has been convicted of some crime.

Q. And that that inference has been carried into another world?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the nature of the superstition connected with that queue, it affects a man's future, and is a part of his religion?—A. Yes, sir; I should so call it.

Q. If it is true as a rule that those who are converted to Christianity, or assume to be, in this country, in our missions here, still insist upon wearing the queue, may it not be inferred that it is on account of their unwillingness to relinquish the superstition as well as on account of its

being a badge of honor?—A. Yes, sir; I think that our superstitions oftentimes are stronger than our faith, you may say.

Q. Do you think that the Christian faith in that case does not overcome the religious superstition of the Chinese?—A. I think it very seldom does.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 10, 1876.

JOHN F. SWIFT sworn and examined.

Mr. PIXLEY. Mr. Swift is an intelligent citizen and a representative man of our community. I want him to state to the commission his views generally on the Chinese question, as he is advised of the scope of the investigation, particularly upon the economical and political branches of the subject.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of San Francisco?—Answer. Yes, sir; I have lived here for a quarter of a century.

Q. You have been in active business and political life during the agitation of this whole question, from the time of its inception to the present day?—A. I have.

Q. State to the commission, if you please, whether, in your opinion, the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese is desirable or whether Congress should by some legal and proper measures restrain the further and continued immigration of Chinese. That about includes all, and enables you to give your full views upon the question.—A. I consider it, and have for some years past, exceedingly pernicious and undesirable. I have not always been strictly of that opinion. For a number of years I think the most intelligent part of the community was in doubt about it. I think for the first fifteen years of my residence upon the coast I was in doubt, but gradually, and for the last ten years, I have grown in the opinion and it has strengthened in my mind. I think I have come to understand the question better, as I think the intelligent men of the coast have generally. I think the settled opinion of this people is correct, that it is exceedingly undesirable. I think that those who oppose Chinese immigration do not always do it upon the most intelligent grounds. I think we often hear very foolish reasons given.

Q. State in your opinion whether the general opposition to continued immigration is the sentiment of the better, larger, and more intellectual class of the citizens of the State.—A. I think it has been so for the last ten years, and it is now increased; and opinion now may be considered as permanently settled that way.

Q. If there is a class that is opposed to any restrictive legislation, what class is that?—A. I do not know of any considerable class to amount to a class at this time.

Q. Take individuals. How about the Central Pacific Railroad and the various industries?—A. I think those who oppose it now are of the intelligent—I will not say the intelligent, but the more fortunate—classes, the wealthier classes. I think those who oppose it now do it because, in the first place, a labor element like this of course is a convenience to the more fortunate class of people; it makes life easier. In a new community like ours the question of domestic servants is one that is apt to bear heavily upon those who are able to keep them—that is, wealthy people—and forms the disagreeable part of housekeeping. Again, an

industrious element like this tends undoubtedly to some extent—that is, irrespective now of its disadvantages—to the material wealth of the community. Any hundred thousand men who work hard, of course make the community wealthy. Of course this is irrespective of disadvantages that altogether overbear the particular fact that there is so much muscle and force at work. It would take a book for a man to tell all the objections and disadvantages of the Chinese immigration. A great many of the reasons that are put forward against it are absurd; I will not say absurd, but, at all events, not sound. The presence of a perpetual alien element in a community is a great disadvantage. By "a perpetual alien element" I mean an element of a community that will always be alien, not bringing women with them; and therefore the prejudices are great against them. They cannot assimilate, so that the next generation and the one after and all the generations will be equally alien and ignorant, without speaking of the present men, the individuals who happen to make up this Chinese community now. So that practically if we could see one hundred or five hundred years from now, we should find the same uneducated class of Chinamen, not speaking our language, here temporarily. The number is kept up, not by births, but by their importations, those here dying or going back in old age; so that they are always the same degraded, ignorant class of people, constantly striking against the sentiment of our people, always hostile to it, always growing and increasing, and more ugly and angry, having no interest in the country, utterly valueless for defensive purposes, surely, when the nation is fighting, as it must be at some time, for no country can be exempt from war. But the strong prejudice that has grown in this State against them is evidenced by the facts which have been proven, which are undoubtedly true. I heard part of the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Loomis, who has just testified. What he said is true as to the strong prejudice of this community; it is a fact. It may be disagreeable; you may think it is a pity; but it is human nature and it is our nature. This prejudice has grown. It is ten times as strong as it was ten years ago. In 1852 the Chinamen were allowed to turn out and celebrate the Fourth of July, and it was considered a happy thing. In 1862 they would have been mobbed. In 1872 they would have been burned at the stake. That element to the statesman is surely a very important element to deal with. We cannot overcome it; it grows, and it must be treated as a fact.

Q. That has crystallized into class legislation against them?—A. Into class legislation of the severest quality; and I do not know of any measure that would not be passed against them.

Q. Is that confined to any one party?—A. I do not think so, but both parties, all parties. Then it degrades our labor; it makes work discreditable. I do not think this doctrine so much heard of, that it takes the bread out of the mouths of workingmen, is as great as they think themselves. It does that to those who first come, and therefore prevents their coming; but in time the white men settle down. The tendency is for them to settle down into the condition of a superior class, making money out of Chinese labor. The conditions of life become too easy instead of too hard. Therefore a boy of 17 or 18 can beg and borrow, sponge, bum, a better living, get more bread and butter, and easier, than it is in any country to get it by work. In fact young men can get along here without labor. I think that is the result of the work being done by this element; it makes labor disreputable. White men will not work any more. White men do not want work any more. White boys do not work, and besides there is not a very good

chance for them to work. These Chinese come in and the whites will not work with them, their prejudice is so great; and this prejudice is growing; it is increasing. The mere material question has two aspects.

Q. In the absence of Chinese immigration who would do our work?—A. We would have to do it ourselves, I hope.

Q. It would be done, you think?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would manufactures go on, perhaps more slowly?—A. For a time. They would undoubtedly be set back, because we base our community here upon Chinese labor, and the transition from that back to a sound basis of homogeneous labor and a homogeneous society of course would be difficult. It would not surprise me, if we should send Chinamen away, that in two or three years we should have quite a clamor to have them back. I think we would. We are very selfish. We look to our own interests, or what we think they are; and very few people are willing to make the sacrifice to build up the State where they think they can gain a little ease and comfort.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What would be the ultimate result?—A. The ultimate result would be undoubtedly beneficial. We would have a community here of what I think is the superior race.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Our race?—A. Our race. We would do our own work. A man would work in the lower classes and positions of life, and if he had brains and intelligence he could get into the upper; and it would be a constant incentive to rise. As it is now a young man must either be a lawyer or doctor or merchant, or he is a swindler, a bummer, or a thief. He will not go out and work with his hands, because Chinamen do it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You are speaking of the tendency of things rather than the universal rule?—A. I think that is the tendency here. I think I have observed it. I think there is less tendency on the part of our growing-up young men to work now than there was a few years ago. I think it is getting worse all the time.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Has this influx of the Chinese here had approximately the same effect upon the respectability and dignity of labor that slavery had in the South?—A. I think it is, if possible, worse. I think there is a stronger feeling here against the Chinese than there is in the South against negroes. Negroes were born in the country.

Q. Then you think it is more injurious to the vast mass of people who necessarily must work for a living than negro slavery?—A. It is worse. I would rather have negro slavery to-day, for negroes are born in the country and at least take an interest in it; but these people are utterly aliens and are going to remain so. They bring no women and are not likely to do so, and there is no possibility of their being born on the soil.

Q. You have traveled a great deal in Asiatic countries?—A. I have.

Q. Do you think Asiatics have a comprehension of a representative government?—A. I have not traveled much, but some. I think from what I have seen there they have not the slightest idea of it. I do not think they have any comprehension of it whatever.

Q. They have no comprehension of a free representative government?—A. I do not think they have any idea of any government except despotism; I doubt if they have any word for it. I doubt if they can describe it by any circumlocution in their language and understand it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You have traveled as extensively in this State as perhaps any other man?—A. I think I have.

Q. You are familiar with the opinions of all classes of people on this question in the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have stopped in various towns and talked with the people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Aside from the aspect of political parties upon this question, what do you think is the sentiment of this State?—A. It is as near universal as any sentiment I have ever known.

Q. You have watched the growth of it?—A. Prominent men who ten years ago, some seven, some six years ago, thought they were in favor of Chinese immigration have dropped away, not under pressure, but under conviction.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Is this not a fact that those in favor of this influx of Chinese are men of very large capital and large land-holders?—A. The few whom I know are, but I do not know many. I could reckon upon my fingers all that I know; they happen to be and are men who have large capital, and very large owners of land, as a rule.

Q. The small land-holders, owning only sixty, a hundred, or five hundred acres, are opposed to them, so far as you know?—A. I believe they are; of course a great many employ Chinamen in this State. I do not think that is any test. I believe men are obliged to employ them because there is no other way; in other words, we base our community entirely upon that element.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. What would be the effect, in your opinion, of a change of our naturalization laws, so as to allow the Chinese to become citizens? Would that change the sentiment against them?—A. I think the first one that got naturalized would be hanged to a lamp-post when he left the court-room; perhaps I am going too far when I say that; but he would not be allowed to vote I am sure.

Q. Independent of that consideration, would it be injurious or otherwise; would it tend to stop this feeling against them?—A. No, sir; I cannot conceive that it would.

Q. Or would it increase the antagonism?—A. It would increase the antagonism undoubtedly; the feeling then would be intensified. I do not think the Californians are different from the people of the other States. I think if you had this number of Chinamen in any of the Atlantic States, while you might at first think it was well, in ten or fifteen years you would discover just what we have discovered, that it is ruinous.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What would be the effect of the admission of 30,000 Chinamen to the suffrage in this city? Thirty thousand adult Chinamen probably is the number or an average here during the year. What would be the effect of giving them access to the polls?—A. It would be simply to make 30,000 votes for sale I should think. I cannot think of anything

else. I cannot conceive of any possible good that would come of it; they surely have no idea of voting; they would not know how to vote or who to vote for. I do not think you can make voters of them, not the class that we mean by the voting population—men of intelligent thought, men believing in a certain idea or principles and voting that way to carry it out.

Q. It has been testified here by Mr. Loomis, I think, that the Chinese are beginning to buy large tracts of land in the interior, valuable land, and that they make their settlements there. What effect will it have upon the future of the State if the Chinamen were to buy up the agricultural lands of the State generally and make settlements; what effect would it have on the prosperity of the State?—A. If Chinamen are to remain in this State, they will change our institutions undoubtedly; our society is going to be changed by them; changes are now going on; the existence of Chinese in this State is utterly incompatible with anything like a government by the people.

Q. Mr. Loomis expressed an opinion that eight Chinamen to one American on this coast would be a benefit. Suppose there are a million Americans with 8,000,000 Chinamen here, could the Chinamen be handled and enlightened by our civilization and transmuted into American citizens; what do you think of that opinion?—A. Mr. Loomis is a conscientious gentleman who undoubtedly believes that the spread of the Christian religion and the salvation of souls among this people is of sufficient importance to change our form of government to carry it out. If that is his view I find no fault with it. I think quite the contrary: that the purposes of government are something else.

Q. Have you an idea if there were eight million Chinese on this coast to one million Americans that the Chinese would be christianized by the Americans?—A. O, no; they cannot be christianized unless they are born here. No Chinaman imported from China under their present system to stay here until they die or return without reproducing here, can be christianized. I do not believe in the sincerity of any Chinese converts at all unless they are born and bred to our religion.

Q. It was testified that after twenty-five years of Christian effort in this city, there being at the present time a large number of Chinese, something less than two hundred have been converted.—A. I should not believe in the sincerity of two hundred conversions.

Q. At that ratio, how long would it take to convert the eight million Chinamen by one million Americans?—A. I doubt if two hundred have been really converted.

Q. Suppose there are two hundred converts now, the time would be indefinite, I suppose?—A. Indefinite. That system simply means to create a superior aristocratic non-laboring upper class, based upon a degraded labor with the stamp of alienism upon them in their color and race. It means a new society and a new form of government, different from anything we have, and it means the destruction of our form of government.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you lived here?—A. Since 1852.

Q. You are a lawyer by profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I understood you to express the opinion a while ago that the presence of the Chinese here and of Chinese labor exerted a worse influence than that of slavery?—A. If possible. I think it has many of the disadvantages of slavery and does not have all the advantages of it. Slavery had some advantages. I do not know what they were. I will not undertake to enumerate them.

Q. I will ask you if the Chinese labor here is not free labor?—A. I doubt if it is, but admitting that to be so, still it would not alter my views.

Q. Do you think slavery would be preferable?—A. I think it would; but I do not wish to be understood as regarding slavery as anything but a curse.

Q. I understood you to say a while ago that you did not think Chinese labor had the effect to take bread from the whites.—A. It has that immediate effect. That is the first impression upon the laboring element when they first arrive, because they cannot compete. Those who cannot compete with the Chinamen either come here and rise above them and set them to work and make money out of them, or else they stay away. That is what I mean. They cannot compete with them, but if many of them come, it necessarily will follow that the whites will rise above them and make money out of their labor, or if they have not the intellect to do that they will stay away.

Q. Is there a plethora of labor on the coast, or have there been more laborers here than there was work to do?—A. I do not think so.

Q. You said a while ago that you believed if the Chinese were excluded in two or three years there would be a clamor for them?—A. I would not wonder if that should be the case, because we have so long had them, and they are so convenient to the wealthy classes of people, that the turning away of one hundred thousand laboring men in a small community like ours of only seven hundred or eight hundred thousand people would be temporarily a very considerable injury tothe material prosperity of the State for the time. Men, as a rule, are very selfish, and they think more of a dollar than they do of any principle.

Q. If there is not too much labor on the coast, not too many hands to do the work that is to be done, if there is work for all, how do the two classes of labor interfere with each other?—A. This lower class of labor works at these pursuits cheaper, because they can live cheaper.

Q. Still, if there is work for all, how do they interfere with each other; why does one crowd the other out?—A. An unskilled laborer who comes from the Atlantic States to this State has a difficulty in bridging over the first three or four or five years before he will have learned sufficiently the ways of the country to get a living by the advantages of Chinese labor. Nobody can compete with Chinamen in the things that they do. No white labor can compete with them, because it cannot live so low. I will admit that if you could bridge over the little time that an immigrant would have to be here until he could get into the ways of the country, and get to knowing something by directing or furnishing the brain-power for the Chinamen, then he becomes a prosperous man and he gets along very nicely; but if he either has not the intellect to avail himself of the Chinese, or the money or means of getting on until he learns how to do that, then, this is a very bad quarter for him, and he goes back home, or stays away, if he can.

Q. If there is labor here for all, labor for the white man as well as labor for the Chinaman, how does the presence of the one interfere with the other?—A. Men do not work for amusement; they work for profit.

Q. I admit that; but if there is work for all and room for all, why does the presence of the Chinamen injure the white man?—A. In that way; they underwork him, and he either does not come here or cannot get the work he would naturally turn his hand to when he first comes. It does not interfere with the lawyer or merchant.

Q. I still understand you that there is room for all white men as well

as Chinamen here. Then how does the presence of the Chinamen interfere with the white man and his wages?—A. Possibly I may be wrong in saying that. I think the logic is that there is room for all. It is evident, on reflection, that there is not.

Q. You think there is too much labor on the coast for the amount of work to be done?—A. The new men cannot come here and compete with Chinamen at the prices they work for; therefore they will not come, and the amount of labor assimilates itself to just what we have. If we had more Chinamen, no doubt they could get work. No doubt you could put down a million Chinamen here and they could all get work and do well, and I have no doubt corner-lots in San Francisco would double in value by it; but your community would be destroyed; your white men would be pushed out of the community; they could not come here.

Q. They would be pushed out on the ground that the Chinamen were doing the work and white men could not get work to do?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then there would be more hands than work?—A. White men cannot compete with Chinamen.

Q. Then you modify your statement by saying that you think there are more hands than there is work?—A. No. I do not think either of those views is perhaps strictly correct. With an increased community there would be increased work. We have got a State here susceptible of holding a population of from seventeen to twenty millions of people. As people come in there will be more work to do. If only one million, there will be work for one million; if seventeen million, there will be some kind of work for seventeen million. We can never say, in a State with a population of seven hundred thousand, which is capable of holding seventeen millions, that there is too much labor. There cannot be too much labor until we get the seventeen million here; but you cannot get white men to come here and compete with these Chinese laborers.

Q. If there is work for all the whites who are here, as well as for all the Chinamen, where does the competition come in?—A. With the Chinamen here there is not work for all at the prices. In other words, there is no inducement for white men to come here and work at wages that the Chinese work for.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. It is a question of wages rather than a question of the amount of work?—A. It is a question of wages, because this whole State has got to be cultivated at some time, and it must be done by labor. As our society is now formed with this kind of labor and the wages which they work for, there is no room for any more labor except Chinese labor. I do not believe you could get so many Chinese here that we would not find work for, and if they were gone I do not believe you could get too many white men here.

Q. You think we would not have so many white men here if we had more Chinamen?—A. The less Chinamen we would have the more white men would come. We cannot get white men to come except in the position of superior and intelligent labor based upon a degrading and ignorant Chinese labor. Therefore the white man will not come here and work; he stays on your side, and when you have got enough he stays in England, Ireland, or Germany; he will not come here; he cannot do it.

Q. You spoke about the Chinamen not assimilating. Do you regard the mental condition of the Chinese as different from that of other

races?—A. In the commencement I pointed out to you this prejudice against them.

Q. I am not speaking of prejudice, but the fact. Do you regard the mental and moral constitution of Chinamen as different by nature from that of other races?—A. I do not know. I would not undertake to answer that question. I know, as they come here with their education, they are a very inferior people. What could be made of them under different conditions I do not know. We have not those conditions here.

Q. That is hardly an answer to my question. I will first put this question: Do you regard their mental and moral nature as different from that of other races?—A. I should think it would be to some extent different, but how different I cannot say.

Q. Do you regard them as susceptible of the same influences that affect other races?—A. I should hardly think they were. I do not believe they are the equal of the Caucasian race. That may be prejudice; I do not know. I think ours is a superior race; but that is a question I should hardly undertake to give testimony upon. I simply give the the way it strikes me.

Q. Would Chinese children growing up here be subject to the same influences with other children growing up?—A. I suppose they would.

Q. Would they make American citizens, then, in the same way that the children of other foreigners growing up here make American citizens?—A. If they would grow up under the same condition as the children of other foreigners, they might, but they do not. But then I shall not undertake to say they would, neither will I undertake to say that they would not. I would not undertake to swear that a Chinese child born and brought up in an American family, away from this condition of things—for example, in New York, Washington, or New England—might not make as good an American citizen as the children of other foreigners.

Q. You think the first Chinaman naturalized here would, perhaps, be hung to a lamp-post?—A. I wish to modify that statement. I put that rather forcibly; but the feeling would be intense against them; and it would be intensified by the number of them. I do not believe they would be allowed to vote, as a class. I do not think it would be safe for them to attempt to vote at our polls.

Q. Do you regard this prejudice as a just argument or a false one?—A. A just one. I think it is one to be taken into consideration as an element in this problem, because it is growing, and growing in as intelligent a community as you will find in the United States.

Q. You think it would be right to exclude from our country any race of men against whom we have a prejudice?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think that would be right?—A. I think a man has no more right to come to this country than he has to get on a plank in a shipwreck. I think a Chinaman has a right to come if he can get here. We have a right to stop him if we can. We look upon ourselves as the trustees of posterity to the extent that we are to hold this country, and not build up a slave empire or an aristocracy.

Q. It would be proper to exclude any race against whom we may have a prejudice?—A. Undoubtedly, if that is a prejudice calculated to go on and increase and injure our institutions.

Q. Suppose that prejudice was in part the result of our own laws, do you think it a good reason why the law should be continued?—A. I do not know of any such condition of facts existing as you refer to; and I

have not thought of such a question. I do not think any prejudice here is the result of any laws at all, except natural laws.

Q. But the laws are the result of prejudice?—A. I have not thought of the question.

Q. Are you in favor of slavery?—A. No, sir.

Q. Your opinion is very strong against it?—A. Very strong. I regard it as an unmixed evil.

Q. Speaking of this question of sufficient labor, is it not a question of competition of wages and comforts of home, rather than of work enough to do for all?—A. Undoubtedly it is the question of wages. These people live in discomfort and upon rice.

Q. Let me suppose a case. The price of wheat here is governed somewhat by the price in the Liverpool market?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. A man who produces wheat the cheapest can soonest sell it to the middleman or whoever buys?—A. Yes.

Q. Suppose a man is cultivating a large ranch with Chinese labor and cheap labor, and another man near him attempts to cultivate his ranch with white labor, which of the two, all conditions considered, would be able to sell cheapest?—A. The man with the Chinese labor.

Q. If the man who employed white labor could not get a sufficient price for his wheat he would have to resort to Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There would be just as much employment for labor where both ranches were cultivated, whether the whites were employed or not?—A. Exactly.

Q. Then it is a question of competition between the employers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If a man in a certain line of business produces cheaper by using Chinese labor it compels his neighbor to use the same element in order to get into the market?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, although there may be work enough for all, the competition of employers compels the employment of cheaper labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. If Chinamen were not here the employers would then have to resort to white labor entirely?—A. Entirely.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long have you been a resident of this State?—A. Since 1852.

Q. In what business have you been engaged since 1852?—A. I have been in various kinds of business.

Q. Have you been in any business which would develop the vital interests of this State, farming, manufacturing, or mining?—A. I cannot say that I have.

Q. Are you a good judge of the best interests of this State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are they?—A. They are in building up and laying the foundation of sound, republican, homogeneous, Anglo-Saxon people, capable of self-government.

Q. You did not answer my question directly. I want to know what those interests are that conduce most to the advantages of this State.—A. The institutions of the State.

Q. The institutions generally follow developed?—A. The honesty, integrity, and intelligence of the people. I do not think that the making of money or the increase of wealth has anything to do with it at all.

Q. Would you first develop the society and civilization of a State?—A. I would first get sound and intelligent men and women into the State.

Q. To settle the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then what would you do?—A. Then everything else would follow. The State would take care of itself.

Q. What would you think the best interest first to be developed in a State, under your state of society?—A. To get food for these men.

Q. To raise wheat?—A. Not particularly.

Q. To manufacture?—A. To do whatever they find is to their advantage.

Q. What is to their advantage?—A. It is to their advantage for all to be industrious.

Q. What does industry produce?—A. Allow me to answer your question. It is their best interest to be industrious, to have the boys go to school from 6 until they are 15 or 16, and then go to work, in trades or agricultural employment, or at the mines; and it is their best interest to have those who work at the harder manual labor to be as respectable and as well thought of as is possible.

Q. Up to the present time of our development, what state of affairs exists now, in your opinion, according to your ideas?—A. Quite the reverse of what I have been thinking the ideal republic. We have grown up to be an avaricious, grasping, unprincipled community. Men think it is more important to get a few thousand dollars than it is to build up the State, and yet we claim to be the founders of a great country.

Q. Then you think avariciousness predominates in this State.—A. Much too much.

Q. Were you ever engaged in manufacturing?—A. No, sir.

Q. In farming?—A. No, sir; when I was a boy, before I came to this country, I was on a farm. My father was a farmer.

Q. You state that the best sentiment of the people of this State is against Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What comprises the best sentiment of the State?—A. The most intelligent and unselfish.

Q. You say you have traveled over this State extensively. Can you name some of the parties who are opposed to Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Prominent citizens?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Please give us a few names of the men.—A. A prominent citizen?

Q. A citizen.—A. I know a great many very good people who are not very well known; they are intelligent people.

Q. Your word for it is good that they are good people.—A. It would be much more easy for me to name those who are the other way, because they are much less numerous.

Mr. PIXLEY. We will put the directory in evidence and attach it as an exhibit to the testimony.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Swift has put the directory in evidence and I want to get some names out of it from him.

The WITNESS. I do not know of anybody who is not opposed to the Chinese hardly, except about a dozen.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. A dozen would be very desirable if they are within a hundred or two hundred miles of this city.—A. I know a very reputable gentleman, but I do not like to name a gentleman right here. This is all brought about, you know——

Senator SARGENT. I do not think that a proper question for Colonel Bee to ask.

The WITNESS. I can answer on reflection. A great many come to mind whom you do not know and never heard of. A great many again come to my mind who are very prominent.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Let us commence, then, with the leading gentlemen of the State?—A. I believe Governor Low is opposed to them. I think Governor Booth is opposed to them, and Governor Burnett. What other governors are living?

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Latham, Stanford, Haight, and Irwin.—A. Haight and Irwin. I believe Governor Stanford claims that he was not in favor of them.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Could you not give us some one outside of politics?—A. Mr. E. B. Mott, of Sacramento, one of the most excellent and intelligent gentlemen in the State.

Q. He is a merchant?—A. Yes, sir. Mr. H. J. Booth, a manufacturer, one of our leading and best men here.

Q. He is a founderyman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Can you give us the name of a farmer or two?—A. Mr. Meek, of Alameda. I do not know personally a great many farmers. Mr. McPike, of Napa, a farmer.

Q. You have canvassed the State recently?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You found all parties unanimous upon this question?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I would like to ask you whether it would be to the interest of this State and to the community, in your judgment, to exclude the Chinese immigration altogether. What is your opinion on that point?—A. I would allow those who are here to die and return home, as they will do in the course of time.

Q. And prevent any more from coming?—A. Yes, sir; I think it would take ten thousand a year to keep the immigration at its present number; in other words, to keep up our present numbers.

Q. Do you mean that you would admit enough to keep up the number as at present, or cut them off entirely?—A. I would cut them off entirely.

Q. I understood you to say that you thought it would be to the best interest of the nation to build up our nation with intelligent Anglo-Saxons?—A. I do not say Anglo-Saxon, because there are Frenchmen, Italians, and others. I did not mean Anglo-Saxon; I meant Western Europe.

Q. You mean, then, you would make it exceptionally white?—A. Yes, sir; of course the negroes that we have in the country, white men have dragged here and made Americans of, but I would not bring any more from Guinea. Against those who are here we have no complaint to make, because we brought them here against their will.

Q. You think therefore we had better exclude the Chinese from this time altogether?—A. Undoubtedly. It is a clear proposition; and I think if any of you gentlemen had lived here a few years, however much you desired and hoped in the interest of humanity the other way, that would go out of your minds, and you would come to the same conclusion.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you make that apply to all eastern nations?—A. Clearly; I think it would apply to any other nation of that kind.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Providing they were in danger of coming among us in such enormous numbers?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say a very intelligent class favor Chinese immigration because it makes life easier in housekeeping.—A. I said another class. There was a time when there was an intelligent class, a wealthier class; the people who employed labor did favor it.

Q. It has been given in evidence here that there are six or seven thousand Chinese employed as domestic servants in this city. What class of people are they who employ those Chinese?—A. It is the employing class.

Q. Is it not pretty general? Do not our first class, middle class, and laboring class employ them?—A. Most everybody employs them. I do not think it is confined to any particular part of the employing class.

Q. You stated that 10,000 busy laborers like these make certain capitalists richer. Does it not at the same time enrich the State?—A. It is possible. Any work enriches the State, whether done by horses or machines or anything. Work enriches the State, of course. I claim that the chief end of the State is not to get rich. If you assume that the chief end of the State is to get rich, then let us have some more Chinamen. I think we could have ten millions of them.

Q. How much of a population of the white race have we received in the last five years? What has been about the increase of our population in the last five years?—A. Really, my opinion upon that subject would be of no value whatever. I simply think it has been increased, but I could not reason the question intelligently.

Q. Has it not largely increased?—A. It has increased somewhat; not largely; nothing like as much as it ought to have increased; nothing like as much as it would have increased had it not been for the Chinese. I think that, had it not been for the Chinese, we ought, in the last five years, to have doubled our population. An immense population came here last year, but it stopped dead, simply because of the impossibility of the immigrants competing with the Chinamen, in my opinion.

Q. What do we infer, then, from the arrival of from 150 to 250 immigrants by express trains?—A. I am told that they are going back as fast as they came. Last year they did not; this year I understand they do.

Q. Emigrant-trains are running exclusively for emigrants?—A. Yes; but they run both ways.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Has there not been, in the last two years, in consequence of the times, a large diminution of emigrants from Europe to the Eastern States?—A. Yes, sir; in consequence of hard times in the East.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have we been complaining of hard times here recently?—A. No, sir; but not for that reason. I think we have not had hard times here, because we did not have an inflated currency; and, again, there is the enormous yield of our mines. I think the enormous yield of our mines

has been more important than the other consideration; but the currency question has had some effect upon us.

Q. Do you think the currency question affects only the capitalists?—A. I think it affects everybody.

Q. Do you think it affects the farmer, who sells his grain and sends it to Europe?—A. I think, on him, it perhaps has some effect. I think the yield of our mines has contributed largely to our good times. I do not think we would be much better off but for that exceptional yield.

Q. You think, then, if we had national banks established here, where the farmers could borrow money at 6 per cent. per annum, it would be a detriment to us?—A. It would not have been a detriment. I do not know that that has been a detriment; but it brought about that collapse in the East undoubtedly.

Q. In what manner?—A. In consequence of an inflated currency, or an inflation of values.

Q. Would not that inflation of values raise the price of wheat per bushel in proportion?—A. It does not affect it. The price of a bushel of wheat is fixed in Liverpool in gold.

Q. It affects the price we pay for goods in the East, in Boston?—A. We made a very large sum of money out of the Atlantic States during the war by the very fact of our keeping gold.

Q. Then you think it was an advantage to us, really?—A. I started out with that proposition.

Q. Then you think it would not have been an advantage to us to have had cheap money here?—A. I do not know what you mean by "cheap money."

Q. I mean the rates of national banks East, seven per cent., the legal rates?—A. I do not know that I can answer the question.

Q. That is my question.—A. I pretend to understand this Chinese question, but not financial questions as well.

Q. You have no prejudices on this Chinese question?—A. I do not know that anybody can say that in this world. I have as little as most men.

Q. You say the Chinese have not become educated. What opportunities do we give their children growing up here to become educated?—A. I stated in the commencement that this people was a permanent alien population, and that they have substantially no children. There may be a few hundred children among them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do our laws permit the men to become citizens?—A. My impression is that they do not, but I would not undertake to say.

Q. If we by our laws prohibit them from becoming citizens, can we complain that they remain aliens?—A. It is not the alien question that I object to. That is not the point I make. I used the word "alien" for want of a better word.

Q. You did use the word?—A. I did, but I used it simply for want of a better word.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What did you mean by it?—A. I meant by it that these people come from China here with the civilization or want of civilization that is in China. It is like picking up 150,000 men from the slums of Canton, or wherever they come from, and setting them down and allowing them to stay a certain time. They are adults when they come. They go back in a few years and others come in their place. I said "alien," because I could not think of any other word; but it is a perma-

nent Chinese population set down here, they having come here when too old to learn, and going away before they do learn, their places being supplied in the same way, but not by propagation.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What inducement have the Chinese to come here with their families and become permanent residents while our laws forbid them to become citizens?—A. I do not know. I do not think they know anything about it.

Q. Suppose they did know. They are perhaps not so ignorant as we take them to be?—A. I do not believe that it would make any material difference with our immigration if we had no naturalization laws at all. I do not believe people come to this country because they can be made citizens.

Q. Do you think that as many Europeans would come to our coasts if they were not permitted to become citizens and become a part of our country?—A. I am inclined to think it would have made no material difference.

Q. You think the Germans, English, and the Irish would remain here the same if they were compelled to remain the inferior race?—A. I do not think they would have been inferior.

Q. Inferior in legal rights?—A. They are not citizens now for five years, but they have the privilege of becoming citizens. If the limit was twenty-five years, I do not think it would affect their numbers materially.

Q. What effect would it have on the foreign element, suppose they could not become naturalized, could not become citizens, but were compelled to remain a permanently inferior race in legal rights?—A. I do not say that we should take it from them now, but if we had never had naturalization laws at all they would have come to this country with their wives and families. Recollect, their children would have been citizens. I doubt if it would have made any material difference in immigration.

Q. You think they would come to us from Europe just the same.—A. I do not think citizenship any part of the inducement. I think they come here to better their condition.

Q. Without regard to being made citizens?—A. I do not say that it would have made no difference, but we would have had substantially the same immigration that we do now. I do not think the Chinaman here thinks of it at all. He is not a citizen at home in the sense that we have citizens here.

Q. You think the prospect of becoming a citizen forms no part of the inducement to Europeans to come here?—A. I doubt if it is a very material part of it. I think the man in Germany who says, "I will go to America," thinks of a home and a chance to settle himself and raise his family and have a home and prosperity, and a chance to work and get on in the world, more than he thinks of the mere fact of voting. I think, of course, now if we should change our laws it would be a very serious thing, and give a great check. Of course we could not do it; but I am supposing that we never had provided for the naturalization of foreigners. I do not think Chinamen ever think of citizenship either there or here, or that they know what it is, or know anything about it; although what I have said about the European immigration I am not so confident upon as I am upon the other point. I do not think Chinamen ever think of it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. When you used the word "alien" you did not use it in contradistinction to the word "citizen," but you meant alien in feeling and ideas?—A. I did when I said alien population. I meant a population that has no sort of knowledge of our institutions. I did not mean it in the simple sense of non-citizenship, as we ordinarily use it.

Q. Suppose the Chinese could become citizens, would that make their presence more desirable?—A. Not at all. On the contrary, I think possibly less so.

Q. Then you think it would be a misfortune if an additional inducement arose from becoming citizens, if it would bring a large number of them?—A. I think a larger number of Chinamen, and even the number we have here, are subversive of all our ideas and of the system that we are endeavoring to establish in this country.

Q. Suppose it is true that European immigrants are attracted here by the fact that they can become citizens. If we gave the same attraction to Chinamen, and brought here great numbers, would that be a greater misfortune?—A. Still worse. That is all.

Q. Do you think the condition of the Chinaman is affected here by the consideration whether he is or is not a citizen?—A. Not at all.

Q. That is, are they more or less degraded because they are or are not admitted to the polls?—A. Not at all. I do not think they care anything about it, or think about it, or know anything about it. They do not intend to stay here long; they go back in great numbers. If we have ten thousand Chinese who come here in a year, we have six or seven thousand going back; at least we have a large continuous return. I had Chinamen employed as domestic servants in my house at one time, and I have had opportunities of knowing that the cook, or the waiter, or in whatever various capacities they served in my house, go back, and return again and resume their employment as much as three times in five years. They get a little money and go off home, and it is spent.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Has there been any increase of this immigration in the last twenty years?—A. I hardly know.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are there more Chinese here than there were twenty years ago?—A. Undoubtedly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say that they have no interest here, and are a worthless, unreliable class?—A. I did not say worthless. I said pernicious, bad.

Q. Do you say as a class that is their character?—A. I refer to their presence here. I am not attacking Chinamen. I believe that they have a very low grade of morals; I have no doubt of that; but that is not my objection to them. I do not base my objection to them upon that ground.

Q. Do you know, as to their honesty and integrity in their dealings with our race, what their reputation is?—A. I think they are inferior to our people in that respect.

Q. You think their honesty is inferior to that of our people?—A. For example, take them in the capacity of servants. I can trust European servants with more confidence than I can trust Chinese In other words, you do not feel as safe with Chinamen as you do with others. I come down here any time to an intelligence office and employ an Irish woman or a German woman that I have never heard of, without

any character, as you may say, at all, and I put her in my house and go away at once with perfect satisfaction, and you may not have one time in a thousand, I never had in my life, any betrayal of that confidence. You cannot do that with Chinamen at all.

Q. How long did you employ Chinese?—A. About three years.

Q. Did they rob from you or steal from you in your three years' experience?—A. I cannot positively say that they did.

Q. You say that Chinese once marched in Fourth of July processions, and if they would do it now they would be hung or burned.—A. I modified that statement.

Q. No, sir; you modified another statement.—A. I simply say they would not be allowed to do it now.

Q. Who would be the parties who would punish them? What class of people?—A. The laboring class of people, white people.

Q. What do you mean by the "laboring class?"—A. The class of people who work for a living with their hands.

Q. In manufactories?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Or on our streets under labor contracts?—A. People who work with their hands generally.

Q. You stated that our white boys will not work; do you mean that statement to be sweeping?—A. It is very general.

Q. Do you know of any Chinese who are attending our schools?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you know why?—A. I do not.

Q. You say that our white people cannot compete with these Chinese laborers. What is the wages of a Chinaman per month in our manufactories?—A. I cannot answer that question.

Q. What is the wages of Chinamen?—A. I cannot answer. When I formed my opinion upon that subject it was from examining the figures. I have known it at one time, but at this moment I cannot give it.

Q. Are the prices for making boots and shoes cheaper here with Chinese labor than they are in Boston?—A. I do not know whether the prices are cheaper there than they are here in San Francisco with white labor.

Q. Is the manufacture of cigars cheaper here than it is in Chicago, or Indiana, or Connecticut?—A. I cannot answer as to that.

Q. Where did we get all the goods that we manufacture now before the Chinese went into the business?—A. We imported them from the East largely.

Q. Do you know the amount we sent East ten years ago to buy the things we now manufacture here?—A. It was very large.

Q. Was it $40,000,000 a year?—A. I cannot answer; but it was large.

Q. Is it $20,000,000 now?—A. I presume it is less now.

Q. That money is saved to the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you not know that 20 per cent. more white men are employed in the different manufactories in this city to-day than there were employed at the time the Chinese commenced to work in factories?—A. Very likely. At that time we were simply a mining community and had no manufactories. I will state that I have no doubt whatever that very many manufactories were established in this city through Chinese labor that would not have been established at present; or they would not have been started quite as quick as if we had not had the Chinese labor.

Q. What is the pecuniary condition of our working classes here from your observations?—A. I do not think it is very bad. I think it is fair.

Q. Do not the most of them own their little homes here and in Oakland?—A. I think very many of them.

Q. And they have been living here probably twenty years, and we have had the Chinese here for twenty-five?—A. You ask me about the material result of these things. I told you at the start that I did not regard the material prosperity of the State as directly injured in that way. So far as making money is concerned, I am inclined to think the State is richer, in dollars and cents, although, perhaps, if we had not brought them at all, I do not know what immigration would have come. Assuming that the white immigration would have been no greater than it is, just that number of whites and no more, and then taking these additional Chinamen, of course a hundred thousand workingmen add to the material wealth; but if these Chinamen have prevented an equal number of white men from coming by taking their places themselves, I say it would have been better if we had not had the Chinamen, and had had white men, which would have been the result without the Chinamen.

Q. You assume, then, that the Chinese here have prevented the immigration of white men?—A. That is exactly the point I make.

Q. You stated that real estate would double in value according to the increase of this Chinese laboring-class?—A. I say if we had several millions of working-people like the Chinese, and change your society so as to enable the white men to live without work, dependent upon this Chinese labor, no doubt the material prosperity would be increased by this large accession, so far as the ease of life to white men is concerned; no doubt their property would have enhanced in value; but it would have been very much more advanced in value if, instead of those Chinamen, we had five million white men.

Q. In traveling through the State, do you not find the Chinese generally employed on farms and in hotels?—A. Very generally.

Q. Do you think their places may be supplied with white labor?—A. I think their places would have been supplied if we had not had Chinamen.

Q. How much do you think the material interests of this State have been advanced in the last ten years by the hundred thousand Chinese laborers?—A. I think the material interests of the State have not been advanced at all except in the way I have named. If we had not had Chinamen, we would have had white men who would have been as industrious, and they would have done the work; but if we could have had only a fixed number of white men, then, of course, a hundred thousand Chinamen doing the work produces capital more rapidly than if we did not have them. Anybody who works adds to wealth.

Q. You say if we had a large addition of Chinamen it would pull down our civilization and level it by coming in contact with these Chinamen?—A. I think so.

Q. Then our civilization, by the influx of a hundred thousand Chinamen, is not as high as it was?—A. It is not.

Q. In what particular?—A. In the particular I have named. The laboring-classes are ignorant. The Chinamen, remember, are the laboring class, and I do not think they are as highly civilized as white men.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you somewhat acquainted in the cities in the Eastern States?—A. Somewhat; but of course allowing for the fact that I have not been there for a long time.

Q. How does the condition of the laboring white people of California compare with the laboring whites in the Eastern States and cities?—A. I think they get quite as much to eat and drink as they do in the East; perhaps with as little work.

Q. Are they as prosperous?—A. Materially, I presume they are. The difficulty I complain of is that children will not grow up to industrious habits. They will not learn their trades, and in a little while the white population, as laborers, will cease to exist; we will not have any white laborers. Of course the white laborer comes here and works. He finds something that the Chinamen have not got into, and life is very easy here. It is a mild climate, food is plenty and cheap, and a man can get a living here very easily with very little exertion.

Q. You regard it, then, as one of the evils of the state of society here on this coast that white children are growing up with contempt of labor?—A. Yes, sir; that is one of the most serious evils of all; the most serious of all, in fact.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you notice the attendance at our public schools?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What class of boys and girls do you meet in the morning going to their schools?—A. We have got a large population here of very nice people.

Q. A very nice class of boys and girls?—A. O, yes; those who go to school.

Q. We compare very favorably with any State of the Union on that point?—A. O, yes.

Q. These children come in contact with Chinese?—A. Yes. I do not know that Chinese will hurt them except in the way I have named—that these boys grow up, and they will not go out to service, if poor; they will not learn trades, if poor.

Q. Do they not have every opportunity here that they have east in the way of learning trades?—A. I do not think they do.

Q. You state that you are opposed to the naturalization of Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You state that if thirty thousand Chinamen were naturalized, they would vote as a unit?—A. I do not know how they would vote. They would not vote with any sort of intelligence based upon love of country and love of republican institutions. I cannot tell how they would vote.

Q. They would form a clan, and vote together?—A. I should think so.

Q. When they did that, do you think they would, when strong enough, demand a division of municipal contracts and demand a revision of the school-law, as a class, and take advantage of all such things, when in a majority? Do you think it would come to that?—A. I do not know what they would do.

Q. You do not think the country could stand under such evils as that?—A. I do not know of anything they would do.

Q. I want to get at what the results of this enfranchisement of the Chinese would be.—A. I think it would be bad. That is about as far as I can go. It would not be intelligent; it would not be patriotic, and it could not be, because they are incapable of it.

Q. You said that you had not taken any pains to learn as to the christianizing of the Chinese; do you know that there are institutions here for the purpose of christianizing them?—A. I have heard so.

Q. In view of all the evils which you have stated here in connection with this immigration, would you be willing now to abrogate all treaty relations between the United States and China in order to stop this immigration?—A. It cannot be stopped in any other way.

Q. You would do that?—A. Yes, sir.

HENRY H. BIGELOW sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in our community?—Answer. Off and on, since 1850.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Insurance business.

Q. You are the manager of the Home Mutual Insurance Company.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are called as a witness to state first, as an expert in the insurance business, what is the result of your observation of the effect of Chinese quarters and Chinese residents upon the cost of insuring adjacent and contiguous property?—A. It poisons any portion of the city where they go. There is no question about that. It increases the rates of insurance nearly double.

Q. Would or would not the presence of a gang of Chinese laborers, we will say in workshops, as at the corner of Brannon street, increase the value of insurance of the entire neighborhood?—A. Very largely.

Q. Would or would not the establishment of a wash-house in any one of the suburban blocks about the town increase the insurance of the contiguous property?—A. About from one to three and a half per cent. on the hundred dollars, whether the buildings exposed were stores or dwellings.

Q. What is your opinion, as an observer of public opinion, as to whether the intelligent business classes of the community of California and San Francisco are or are not in favor of the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese? What is the intelligent public opinion upon that subject?—A. That has been a very vexed question indeed, but I believe there is only one opinion with all business men, and that is that it is detrimental to our State.

Q. What is your own opinion upon that subject?—A. I am in favor of Chinese immigration, decidedly so, on the ground that it produces wealth here. We can subdue our land, and we can build our railroads with Chinese labor. I was very much in favor of slavery, and on the same ground that I was a strong advocate for slavery I am an advocate for Chinese immigration.

Q. Then you are in favor of unrestricted immigration?—A. I am, if you take it in that light; but you drive away the white population by it, and you will make California as is Peru to-day. I am in favor of producing all the money I can out of the land, without regard to the civilization of the State, and on the same ground that I was in favor of slavery.

Q. Did you hear Mr. Swift's testimony?—A. Nearly all of it.

Q. Assuming that you were in favor of slavery and of immigration for the purpose of making money, how do you estimate his statement?—A. I would subscribe to every word he said on the ground, you may say, of our white race—Americans and those who are to become Americans. There is no question but every word he said is the feeling and the belief of the better portion of California.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do the Chinese themselves largely insure their property?—A. They do. There are about five or six thousand Chinese in the State who control almost all the lower orders; they do the business. They do insure largely; that is to some extent. In about three years they paid my company some $40,000. Out of that we had very few losses; but they are confined to some five or six thousand. That class are as good

business men as you would expect among the same class of Americans or Englishmen, and they are a help to us; but the rank and file of course do not insure at all. They have no property. They live just by their labor; they are producers merely, and have no insurance. There are some five or six thousand Chinese in the State who own property and insure very largely, but they insure everything, both by sea and against fire.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Some five or six thousand?—A. Some five or six thousand out of a hundred thousand belong to the mercantile class, and I would do business with them as quickly as with any Americans; but the others are peons; they are slaves; that is the amount of it, only our laws do not so term them. We cannot enforce the contracts as we could in Peru, but the same system undoubtedly is here that is in Peru, with which I am very familiar.

Q. You say that you are in favor of unrestricted Chinese immigration?—A. I should be in that view of the case.

Q. That their labor adds to the wealth of the country?—A. That their labor adds to the wealth of the country. I am an old Californian, however, and I do not believe in immigration.

Q. Has Chinese labor, in your judgment, added to the wealth of California?—A. O, vastly. There is no question about it; that is as regards our money, our wheat, and our mineral resources, and, in fact, every branch of production.

Q. You speak of some five or six thousand of the Chinese population who insure freely?—A. They are the merchant class. Of course I cannot mention the exact number.

Q. What is their character as business men?—A. As good as the same class of Americans or other foreigners.

Q. How are they in their contracts?—A. I would take their word as quickly as I would take any merchant's word in this city.

Q. Do you find them correct in their dealings?—A. Entirely so. Mind you, I restrict myself entirely to this class, the upper class of merchants, but the lower class of course are like any slaves or peons.

Q. You spoke in regard to the rates of insurance in their neighborhood. Do you insure in Chinatown?—A. I do not at all, on account of the incendiary hazard.

Q. Are there many fires in Chinatown?—A. There have been since the excitement increased.

Q. Are those fires brought about by the Chinese or the whites?—A. Of course I could not say; in some cases by the whites, in some cases by the Chinese.

Q. You speak of it as being the result of opposition against them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is their property fired by themselves, or is it fired by white people?—A. In most cases I suppose it is fired by the white people. I do not think it is done by themselves. I do not think, in my experience, that I have ever known any swindling loss from Chinamen.

Q. You say that aside from these five or six thousand, the rest of them are virtually slaves?—A. They are; they are peons.

Q. How do you mean that they are peons or slaves?—A. They come here under contract. There is no question about it. It is the same contract system that exists in Peru, only it is not recognized by our laws.

Q. They are free to hire or not to hire?—A. They are free in one

sense, and I suppose they are not free in another sense. Of course I cannot go into that question, because I merely know what I have been told and through my acquaintance with the Peruvian system, and the same parties were engaged in shipping Chinese here who hired their peons for Peru.

Q. I will ask you if in this city the Chinese are not as free in their labor to hire or not to hire, to work or not to work, as Americans, white people?—A. I do not think they are. Of course I could not say of my own knowledge, but from information and belief I do not think they are.

Q. Then are they better workers than white people? Do they work more, the same number?—A. No; three Chinamen are about equal to two white men.

Q. If they are not free to hire or not to hire, are they more industrious?—do they do more work?—A. They stick to their contracts very well.

Q. Are they generally industrious?—A. Very industrious indeed. That is the reason I would put three Chinamen into two white men, and then I would prefer them to white men to do my work.

Q. Are they as industrious as the white men?—A. Yes. They do slower work, but they do it more faithfully; that is, you can count on their work better in that proportion.

Q. They cannot do as much work?—A. No, sir.

Q. But you say they are more faithful?—A. That is, you can count on them better.

Q. Do they keep their contracts better or as well?—A. They do when you contract with the powers that be. If you take a single Chinaman and contract with him himself, you cannot count on him, but if you go and hire of their head-men you can count on their performing their job; only you have got to hire of the proper parties, and then they will enforce the contract. That is what they fear.

Q. Have they any means of enforcing the contract except the voluntary assent of the parties themselves?—A. I know that they do enforce their contracts; but I cannot tell you anything about that from my own knowledge, only from report.

Q. Do you know of any means to enforce the contract except the voluntary assent of the laborer himself?—A. Not of my own knowledge.

Q. Have you been here since 1850?—A. I have, with the exception of four or five years. I was four years in the East. I have been backward and forward.

Q. You have quite an extensive acquaintance with them?—A. I have quite an extensive acquaintance with the Pacific coast, from Magellan to the Pacific, and also East.

Q. What would be the effect of their exclusion from this coast?—A. It would damage us very materially for a time. I want to explain this matter in one way. Their effect on the boys and the agricultural population here I think is very disastrous indeed; but looking at the interests of the State, I do not know whether we should look at that consideration. That is the reason that everybody is in doubt about it.

Q. That is a very important point. In what way is it disastrous upon the rising boys and girls?—A. Because it takes the labor which the boys would be paid to do out of their hands, because they can labor more cheaply than boys; and this makes labor disgraceful in a measure. We have a class of hoodlums growing up here that I think is almost entirely the result of the great number of our Chinese population here.

Q. Do you think that the Chinese take the work that these boys other-

wise would get to do and would do?—A. Yes, sir; which they would do and would be made to do.

Q. Is this the result of the fact that there is more labor here than there is employment?—A. There is hardly any end to the employment that we can give laborers here.

Q. Is there labor, then, for the whites as well as for the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; but it would be a cheap labor.

Q. There is labor for all?—A. Labor for all, and we could extend it to any amount, but it would be a cheap labor and it would be a servile labor like the Chinese labor, instead of being free labor as it is in Illinois and the Western States. It will be a servile labor here. We shall be as we were in Louisiana, and Mississippi, and Arkansas, entirely.

Q. I understand you to say that there is labor enough for all; that what the Chinese do does not deprive white men or white boys of labor?—A. It deprives the boys of labor, of course, because we employ Chinese, when we can get them, at 75 cents and $1 a day; and then our boys will not work with the Chinese any more than a white man would work in the South with the negro.

Q. That is the reason, then, that the white boys will not work with the Chinese?—A. They will not work with them. You degrade the labor.

Q. But there is labor enough for all?—A. O, we can support a population of 15,000,000 in this State easily. There is no question about that.

Q. You do not say that the Chinese take from the whites the only labor they can get?—A. There is labor for them if they would work; but they will not work alongside of the Chinamen.

Q. It is the result of this prejudice against the Chinamen?—A. It is the result of the feeling in a man's head that he does not want to work with servile laborers.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. That pertains to all servile labor?—A. To any servile labor.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are the Chinese careless with fire?—A. They are very careful. You would think they are very careless; but they are the most careful people with fire. They think it is the devil, and they keep him in due bounds.

Q. Are you aware of conflagrations in the interior towns coming from Chinese quarters?—A. Any quantity.

Q. Do you not know that those fires originated in the Chinese quarter?—A. Most of the fires originated in the Chinese quarter where towns have been burned up.

Q. And that has been the case from years ago?—A. Years ago.

Q. Down to the present time?—A. Down to the present time.

Q. Before there was any prejudice against the Chinese?—A. There has always been a prejudice against the Chinese, but it has been increasing lately.

Q. Those fires occurring in the Chinese quarters, do you imply that they were from the Chinamen themselves or caused by white people?—A. You know their houses are of a very fragile nature and of very combustible material. Any one going through their quarters must wonder why they have not burned up long ago. It is the very nature of the race, that while they are careful of fire they are dirty. They will have fire in a coal-oil can right on the floor; but they are afraid of it and will be very careful. Yet they live like dogs. They do not live as well

as dogs; they live like pigs. The nature of their buildings is such that it is very hazardous on account of fire.

Q. So that, although they are very careful, the liability of fire is very great?—A. Wherever a wash-house is inserted in a block we always steer clear of the block.

Q. Up to a year ago, and for the past ten years, were fires occurring in the Chinese quarter?—A. Not so many. The Chinese quarter had been very free for ten years, until within the last year and a half. We have had a great many since then, so many that we have declined to insure for them.

Q. When you speak of fires caused by whites, do you speak of the result of investigations, or infer it simply from their great frequency?—A. It is my impression. That is the result of investigation.

Q. What fires have you found set by the whites, as the result of your investigation, during the last year?—A. There is Truckee.

Q. I am speaking of the Chinese quarter of this town?—A. I cannot tell exactly; but it is my belief that there have been half a dozen fires in Chinatown in the last year, that I am confident was the work of incendiaries. Of course this fire in Brannen street down here was set by hoodlums. There is no question about that. I know it as clearly as I know anything about my business.

Q. Was that set in a Chinese house?—A. No, sir; in a manufactory where Chinese were employed. I insure largely in manufactories; and whenever they receive these warning letters they always send them up to us. I suppose twenty or thirty warning letters have been sent to our office in that way.

Q. Then the presence of the Chinese, from the effect it has upon the minds of a bad class of whites, makes our cities very liable to conflagration?—A. Yes, sir; so much so that a great many companies refuse Chinese insurance altogether.

Q. That is an element then in the problem, the danger to an American city?—A. Yes, sir; the danger of their presence among us.

Q. We are more liable to have our cities destroyed because there is an unreasonable prejudice which breaks out in that way among the lower classes?—A. I think the Chinese create the hoodlums, and then the hoodlums react in the way of hazard from fire.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Why do you charge 3 per cent. where there is a Chinese wash-house on the corner of a street? Is it your fear of the incendiary's torch, or is it owing to the carelessness of the Chinamen?—A. Well, it is my fear of the incendiary's torch.

Q. What have your Chinese losses been for the past, compared with losses by the insurance of the property of white people?—A. Almost nominal.

Q. The chief of the city police telegraphed here that there had been less fires in Chinatown than in any other portion of the city for years until recently.—A. Until recently. My own business has been about $50,000, I suppose, in fire, and out of that I paid in Chinese losses in the course of seven or eight years about $7,500, and those losses were where there could be no doubt they were perfectly straight and fair.

Q. In settling with the Chinese do you have an unusual amount of trouble in the settlement of these claims?—A. O, no. They are keen, of course, to get the last cent, but they are not unduly so.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. They are close dealers?—A. They work right up; they are very sharp people.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you any insurance on Mr. Bird's hop-drying house in San José?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you recollect its being destroyed by incendiaries after threatening letters were sent?—A. I heard of it.

Q. Do you know of the burning of General Nagle's wine-house?—A. I do.

Q. Do you know of the woolen-mill also that was burned after threatening letters were sent?—A. I do.

Q. And numerous instances occurring constantly throughout the State?—A. I could refer to twenty or thirty of them by referring to my books.

Q. You do not think our boys generally are degraded by coming in contact with the Chinese?—A. Not in coming in contact with them, but by their presence here, and the Chinese taking the work which the boys would do. It has raised an idle class among us.

Q. Have you been in New York and Boston?—A. I have.

Q. Have not those cities an idle and vicious class of boys?—A. To be sure, but I do not think it is to any extent like our own.

Q. You think there is a greater extent of it here?—A. Yes, sir; according to our population.

Q. Do you think the same influences make those hoodlums in Boston and New York?—A. Yes, sir; that is not the Chinese influence, but the lack of work for them. That is an old country and we are a new country, and every boy here ought to be at work.

Q. Are you from New England?—A. I was born in Massachusetts.

Q. You were in Boston in 1835 or 1837?—A. I was there in 1838.

Q. Do you recollect the great excitement against the Irish?—A. I was in Saint Louis then.

Q. Was not that as great as this feeling against the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; and it is about the same thing in New Orleans also.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the hoodlums. Is that a class of vagabonds or loafers peculiar to San Francisco?—A. I do not know that it is. There always will be idle boys around a town.

Q. I will ask you if in other cities they have not the same class of idlers and vagabonds, but that they go by the name of roughs?—A. Yes, sir; but these are boys under twenty years old.

Q. You think, then, there is a larger class here than in other cities of the same size?—A. Very much larger in proportion. There is no question about it. It is an evil that we ought to cure.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Our population is a cosmopolitan population?—A. Yes, sir.

JOHN KIRKPATRICK sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. How long have you lived in California?—Answer. Since 1852.

Q. Have you at any time been the sheriff of an interior county?—A. I have.

Q. What county?—A. Sierra.

Q. How long?—A. From 1861 to 1866; two terms; four years and five months.

Q. During that time was the foreign-miners license law in opera-

ation?—A. Yes, sir; I do not know whether it was during the whole time or not, but during the first portion of the time it was.

Q. On what classes did you enforce the collection of that tax?—A. On all who were not citizens, or who had not taken out their first papers.

Q. Was that law impartially executed against all, whites and Chinese?—A. It was, as far as my observation went; so far as that county was concerned.

Q. Was that a county where mining was carried on quite largely?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. One of the principal industries?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The law was impartially administered?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To all who were not citizens of the United States?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Or who had not declared their intention to become citizens?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Were there many Chinese in the mines at that time?—A. A great many, working the river-beds and creeks.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were there other foreigners there?—A. Yes, sir; people from almost all nations.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you collect this tax yourself?—A. I did, directly and by deputy.

Q. How much was the income of that tax a year?—A. I cannot tell you; I could if I should see the books.

Q. How many Chinese miners did you collect of?—A. That I cannot tell you.

Q. How many foreign miners?—A. I got them all.

Q. Were there a thousand foreign miners there?—A. I do not think there were.

Q. Were there 250?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were there three thousand Chinese?—A. Hardly.

Q. Twenty-five hundred?—A. Perhaps.

Q. What did you collect a month a head?—A. Four dollars.

Q. About what was the income a month from this source in round numbers?—A. That I cannot tell; we collected by townships.

Q. You had an aggregate of collections?—A. I suppose so,

Q. Did that all go to the county or to the State?—A. I think a portion of it went to the county and a portion went to the State; I am not sure.

Q. What was the first year that you collected the tax?—A. I think it was 1861.

Q. Did you not collect almost exclusively during last four years of the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; because the foreigners went away or got out their first papers.

Q. You did not find any foreign miners there for two or three years that you could collect of?—A. Oh, yes; a few.

Q. It finally came about that there were not any foreign miners there?—A. I do not think they enforced the law against the foreigners after I went out of office; it was mostly against the Chinese.

Q. The last two years did you collect any tax from foreign miners, other than Chinese?—A. I did.

Q. Can you state the number?—A. I cannot.

Q. Was it a hundred?—A. It might have been. Let me see. I had a white township myself; I do not think there were a hundred the last year.

Q. Were there twenty-five hundred Chinese that year?—A. I do not think there were.

Q. Two thousand?—A. Something near that number in the county.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The law, I believe, provided that where persons were citizens, or had taken out their first paper—declared their intention—that they were excused from the tax?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And, of course, when a person did that you could not collect the tax?—A. No, sir.

Q. But where they had not done that you impartially collected the tax?—A. I attempted to enforce it in a company of fifteen or twenty—I think they were Italians—and they immediately went and declared their intention, and I let them off.

Q. You enforced it until the terms of the law were complied with?—A. Yes, sir.

STEPHEN H. PHILLIPS sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are a native of Massachusetts?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Formerly attorney-general of that State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Subsequently an emigrant to the Sandwich Islands?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And attorney-general of that kingdom?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now a resident of San Francisco, and practicing your profession, I believe, at our bar?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you aware of the subject-matter of the investigation before this commission of the Senate and House of Representatives touching the Chinese question?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From your residence and observation of the Chinese question in the Sandwich Islands and here, and your general knowledge of the subject, state your conclusions, and the facts upon which you base those conclusions in reference to the desirability of Chinese immigration to this coast in increasing or continuing numbers?—A. The question opens a pretty broad field of inquiry. I have only had a very short notice that you desired my attendance here. I got notice yesterday. There is a great deal to be said upon the subject, and I am not sure but that my views may be a little peculiar in regard to it. I have given the subject very careful consideration, and I have some pretty strong convictions. In those Islands there were about fifty-six thousand people at the last census.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In all the Sandwich Islands?—A. Yes, sir; about fifty-six thousand; and two thousand of them were Chinese. I do not know how many more may have come in since. Those Chinese have come there upon contracts of labor, which are indefinite and assignable. I think I ought to say that I never could bring my mind to believe that those were legal contracts under the constitution of that kingdom, and certainly they are not legal under the Constitution of this country. They are contracts which are indefinite as to everything but time. They are indefinite as to the place of performance. They are indefinite as to the party with whom they are to be performed. They are indefinite as to

the kind of work which is to be performed; and, generally speaking, there are only one or two limitations, such as that they shall have a certain number of days at the China New Year's, &c. With that exception they are bought and sold out body and soul to the person who employs them. In the scarcity of labor and of cheap labor in that country there is a great and pressing demand on the part of the planters to obtain this kind of service. The fact is that without it you could not live at all. I think that the plantations in the Islands are supported by Chinese labor in the main. They have certain contracts with native laborers, and those contracts are a little peculiar; but they bind them pretty closely. In the main, without the Chinese labor those plantations could not exist; and, with the wasting population of those Islands, they fall back entirely upon the Chinese labor for subsistence. There is undoubtedly a present advantage to the planters in obtaining this kind of labor. There is a present necessity for it; but that that will be ultimately beneficial, I never have thought, and never can think. The laborers are bound for a term of years; we will say five, and I think it is ordinarily five. Those terms are continued sometimes and sometimes they are not; but a large proportion of them upon the expiration of their terms seek for other means of employment, and seek for cheap means of subsistence. They seek cheap and humble employment, but at the same time it is employment which they get in preference to the poor natives; and they are driving the natives to the wall very fast. I cannot think, never have thought, that this importation of cheap labor in the mass, by the recipients of large sums of money, is ultimately beneficial to a community or to any of its citizens. I think it tends ultimately to degrade the whole character of labor.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are now speaking of it in its influence upon California?—A. Of California I know very much less than I know of the Sandwich Islands, except by general reputation and an experience of about three years here. Here in California you owe a great deal to the fact that most of your vigorous population came here twenty-five or thirty years ago at the time of the first settlement of the State. Every man had to pay for his passage, and he had to scrub around pretty hard to get something to pay it with; and you only got the ablest and smartest men to come here. You obtained here in California, no doubt, the most vigorous population that could be found anywhere on the surface of the globe. If the Chinamen came here under the same conditions that I remember here, you would merely get the able and efficient ones of them; but I cannot make up my mind, never have been able to do so, that this artificial process of importing labor is ultimately beneficial. It supplies a present want, but I do not think it is ultimately beneficial. I resided in New England for a good many years. There the character of our manufacturing labor twenty years ago and upwards was very high. We used to hear a great deal said about the Lowell operatives, but it has been going down lower and lower. During the year prior to the war, there was great necessity for introducing labor at the manufacturing establishments. Laborers were imported from Europe, from Canada, and from other places; and I know we found before I left there, and I think since I have been back I have noticed the same thing, that the tendency has been rather to degrade labor, to bring it down, to take away its manly character and dignity. I do not know that I could express myself more fully without going very much into detail.

Q. Do you think the effect of the Chinese importation, of the class

now coming, as within your observation of three years, is likely to have the same result upon our population here?—A. It is pretty hard for me to answer that question precisely, with the limited time I have had for considering it, and perhaps I am not correctly informed as to the state of things. I do not know how fully these Chinamen are brought here under contracts. They are contracts which I presume never could be enforced in our courts. I do not think the question would be open for a moment to enforce any such contract as this in a court. If I understand the law correctly, an indefinite contract of labor is merely a contract of servitude, though it be for a limited period, and it would be ignored by almost any court. I suppose that is the law. I do not know how far the Chinese are imported under these understandings. The trouble is they speak only a foreign language, and they are not influenced by our laws or by our public sentiment; we cannot reach them; I suppose it is just the same here as anywhere else. If you are going to bring honest labor here to compete with other labor which is brought here by money being advanced to them, the latter will have an advantage over white laborers who are not brought here without the expenditure of money.

Q. Then practically the introduction of Chinese labor and its cheapness interferes seriously and prejudicially with the interest of white labor that would naturally belong to this coast in the absence of Chinese; is that your opinion?—A. I suppose all labor is to be judged of by itself. A good many of these Chinamen are very enterprising men, who find their way here; but I should put it exactly upon the ground that the importation of labor which is too poor to bring itself here is labor which would interfere prejudicially and not beneficially to labor which must pay its own expenses to come.

Q. What is your opinion of the presence here of a large and increasing population of aliens, Chinamen who do not speak the language and have no knowledge of our institutions, who under our law cannot become citizens, and who think their civilization superior to ours, and have no inclination to become permanently residents of our country?—A. I do not know that I can answer that really any better than any other gentleman could. It is a very queer state of things, and I saw it illustrated in the Islands very strongly. When we have a large and numerous body of people among us who are not particularly responsible to anybody, they really do nothing for society except just to perform their work. They do not do any military duty; they do not sit on your juries; they are not available for any of the purposes for which citizens as a general thing are available. It is notorious that Chinamen by their habits and associations keep themselves entirely distinct from other people. We had a few Japanese out there, and I was very much struck with the difference between the Chinese and the Japanese. The Japanese conform themselves very soon to the habits of the country in dress, language, and everything. They mix right in and become citizens like the rest of us, but these Chinese keep themselves entirely distinct. As to its effect upon the great mass of the community, of course it depends upon the numbers in which they are brought. If all China could be thrown over here they would deluge this country in no time, and really I suppose they could spare people enough without missing them from China to outvote all the Pacific States, and, for aught I know, all the Atlantic States too. With their immense population, in mere numerical voting they might acquire the control of foreign interests. That is mainly a question of numbers, as to how far they would outnumber us. If it was merely the employment of a few it would not be felt. The view

I have always taken of it is that labor which is merely imported, which does not import itself, which is brought here by other agencies, puts other labor at a disadvantage.

Q. It degrades it?—A. I suppose so.

Q. In the estimation of the white worker who has to compete with it?—A. Yes, sir. I do not know how far these Chinamen feel bound by any contracts they make here. I do not suppose one of them could be enforced. They tried the experiment of introducing several at a manufacturing establishment in the western part of Massachusetts a short time ago. I believe they have given them all up. They gave great trouble, and I suppose they would have been released at any time if they had asked for their release.

Q. That was at North Adams?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long did you reside in the islands?—A. About ten years.

Q. You think there were then about two thousand Chinamen there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Out of some fifty-six thousand inhabitants?—A. Yes, sir; fifty-six thousand was the total population. I think the island population was about forty-six thousand, and of all other nationalities about ten thousand. I was familiar with the figures at one time.

Q. I understand you to say that the importation of labor into New England some years ago was injurious to the character of labor?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. What class of people were those who were brought in there?—A. They were of all classes.

Q. Europeans?—A. A great many were brought from Canada. I know a great many were brought to Lawrence, Lowell, and Fall River. They came from everywhere, almost.

Q. They were Europeans?—A. Europeans and French Canadians. A great many French Canadians were introduced then. There was a great dearth of labor at that time. Now there is no employment for a good many, I suppose.

Q. You think that imported labor anywhere from any country would be injurious to the dignity of labor?—A. I think if labor is brought under contracts, and more especially is that true in regard to those islands, and they live out a contract of servitude there, for that is very nearly what it amounts to, it is rather degrading; it is like opening the door to any species of slavery.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. There was no family relation among them there?—A. No, sir; I think there was none at all. There were a few Chinese women, but very few. The Chinese married native women very much. A great number of Chinese have married native women.

Q. Native Hawaiians?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The Chinese in these islands remain there and make homes?—A. No, sir; not entirely. A good many of them expect to go back, and some few come from there here; but a great many of them remain there, and they start up little shops. Every bit of petty trading all through the island is given into the hands of the Chinamen. You will find a little shop here and there out in the country, and a whole street of them in Honolulu is entirely in the hands of the Chinese. The larger merchants are foreigners. There are one or two Chinese houses of the very highest respectability.

Q. How many Americans are there in the Sandwich Islands?—A. About fifteen or sixteen hundred—I think not a great many more—and about as many Englishmen, and a great many Portuguese who used to come out in whalers and land there.

Q. Do Americans and Englishmen in the Sandwich Islands go there to live, or do they go to make money and come home again? What is the general purpose?—A. The old missionaries are pretty well established there, and a good many of these planters I think are settled down very firmly and strongly. They have got large landed interests, and very many of them have been working very hard there.

Q. Do they expect to live and die there, or only to remain for a time?—A. I think there is a little bit of the absentee system about it. I think the tendency is necessarily to work as all absentees work, and return at some time; but still they have lived there pretty closely.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long did you reside in the Sandwich Islands?—A. About ten years.

Q. How much sugar did they produce in the Sandwich Islands annually at the time you lived there?—A. Ten millions, I think. I can furnish you with the exact statistics.

Q. Ten million pounds or dollars?—A. Pounds. I think that was the quantity. I forget the exact statistics, but I could get them.

Q. Is that production of sugar increasing?—A. Yes, sir. It will increase under this treaty tremendously.

Q. Have you ever seen contracts such as you speak of being made to furnish these laborers to parties in the Sandwich Islands?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. What language were they written in?—A. They were written in both languages.

Q. First explain to the commission what that contract said, what it read, what the provisions of the contract were.—A. It is pretty hard to give a parol explanation of contracts, but I can tell you about what it is. It would be that Sam Wang agreed to serve some one else out in China, and to work for him for the space of five years or thereabouts—I think they were generally five-year contracts—and to serve him well, and that he was to have so many dollars a month, and so many days at the Chinese new-year's, and I think some of the latter contracts had some provisions about sickness and medical care, but there was hardly anything else. It was an assignable contract—to him or his assigns.

Q. Do you know what became of the money for this contract, the earnings of this Chinaman? That is, to whom were the wages paid under this contract for the labor of this Chinaman?—A. Paid to the Chinaman.

Q. Paid to the Chinaman himself?—A. Yes.

Q. What became of it then?—A. He bought food to eat.

Q. You do not know that it was sent back to the bondsman who sent him out?—A. No; I do not know that it was. I do not know anything about it. I merely know the fact. If you wish my views about the contract I can give them to you, because I have studied it very carefully. General Pixley asked me to bring a book here, a decision. I studied it very carefully, because I was satisfied, and I studied in my seat in the legislature, and in the court, and every place——

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. That is, the legislature of Hawaii?—A. Yes, sir; and I was satisfied that it was an illegal and unconstitutional violation of fundamental principles.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Was there any effort to annul this contract by the Hawaiian authorities?—A. There was some effort.

Q. Any successful effort?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did the planters demand legislation, so that this labor could be brought there?—A. The legislation which they demanded was specific legislation, to enforce the contract. Those contracts grew up very queerly in the islands. For a long time the islands were rather missionary establishments, and the contracts were drawn there as a sort of friendship contract. Then they were likened a little to the contract for the shipment of seamen; and the universal expression everywhere there used is, if a person goes to labor on a plantation, "he ships;" and if a Hawaiian contracts with a native, "he ships." The legislature has been abridging the rights of these contracts somewhat lately, and they provided that they should be executed with more formality, &c. We did have a case there—that of Dolores Ugarte. He came there and he had a lot of these men on board. They put them on shore, and left them there for a little while to recuperate. The ship never dared to come within the limits, but they left these men, hoping they would take them off. One of them asked me what these men's rights were. I told him they had a right to stay where they pleased. I did not know that there was anything to send them home, or keep them, or anything else. They were in a wretched state, very diseased, and seemed to suffer very much indeed. They were bound to Peru. The ship went to Peru, and came back, and started again with another load, and was burned at sea. You may remember the account of it. It was a pretty horrid sort of thing.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Burned by the coolies?—A. Yes, sir; they would have liked to have made those islands a sort of rendezvous for that trade. Not long afterward another ship came in, and the question was raised immediately, and they sent out some writs of *habeas corpus* and those men were discharged.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. That was a cooly-ship going to Peru?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We do not know anything about that. Has not the government of Hawaii encouraged the importation of Chinese?—A. Somewhat.

Q. Extensively?—A. They have spent a good deal of money to get them.

Q. Is the native of that country, the Kanaka, an industrious, laboring man, and willing to labor?—A. Not systematically. One of them will do one day's work in three, and then three days' work in one. Sometimes he will work terribly hard, and then he will not work at all.

Q. They have no reputation as laborers?—A. They can do very hard work. A great many of them are pretty useful and valuable men, but they are not thrifty at all.

Q. Who are these planters? Are they not mostly Americans—New England men?—A. I should think a majority of them are. They are foreigners; men of all nationalities.

Q. Does not the American element largely predominate there as planters?—A. I should think a majority of the planters are Americans. I do not think I could put it any stronger.

Q. One of the largest planters there is Captain McKee?—A. Yes, one of the very largest.

Q. Does he employ Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do these Chinese behave when brought there? Do they fill the prisons of the Hawaiian territory?—A. A good deal. I tried eight of them for murder; convicted five and hanged three.

Q. For murdering one of their own countrymen?—A. One of them murdered the French consul. He went into his bed and chopped his head open with an ax.

Q. One of those laborers?—A. Yes, sir; the other went into a house in the island of Maui and murdered some poor old natives and stole their money.

Q. Why was it that the Sandwich Islands wanted this reciprocity treaty with the United States?—A. I suppose to make the sugar-plantations profitable.

Q. Was not the employment of Chinese cheap labor sufficient to compete with South Carolina and the sugar-growing States of the United States?—A. Not with the heavy duties here.

Q. They could not compete with the duties?—A. No, sir; I do not know that it was so much competition with South Carolina as competition with other sugars which come into market.

Q. The employment of Chinese now upon these sugar-plantations brings the sugar-growing States of our own country into competition with Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you think, in addition to that, we ought to have made this treaty?—A. I never have advocated the treaty in any manner, shape, or form.

Q. You say there are frequent marriages between Hawaiian women and the Chinese. Do the laws of that country legalize those marriages?—A. O, yes, sir.

Q. How do they look upon it there?—A. They passed a law that if a Chinaman has a former wife in China it shall not be lawful for him to marry a Hawaiian woman. That law is upon their statute-book.

Q. You say the importation of cheap labor into New England some years ago lowered the character of the population?—A. Yes; I think any one will tell you that who has ever been in a manufacturing district there.

Q. Was that class of labor from Europe?—A. Mostly.

Q. What effect would it have now to bring them in there?—A. We would rather employ our own people if we could get enough of them. There was great scarcity of labor during the time of the war, and also just after the war. It was utterly impossible to get labor in any manufacturing establishments.

Q. How did New York and those States build their canals? Did they import labor from Europe?—A. I suppose so. I do not know that they imported it directly by contract. I doubt whether they did; I think they took it as it came.

Q. Do you know that the Chinese shoemakers engaged in Massachusetts—those employed in North Adams—became a failure and were discharged?—A. I have understood very generally that they are trying to get rid of them.

Q. What does it cost to get one of these Chinese laborers from China here?—A. I do not know.

Q. What does it cost to get from Chicago here? You stated that the cost of getting here is one reason why the Chinese flow in here so freely.—A. I merely know how much it costs to come from Chicago here by knowing the general rates upon the railroads.

Q. How much upon an emigrant-train?—A. It does not cost a great deal.

Q. Is it not $60 in greenbacks?—A. I do not know. It may be some thing of that sort.

Q. Are not the prices from China here in steamships from $40 to $60 in gold?—A. That may be; but that was not my point. I say that they are imported here, and have money furnished them in consideration of some work which they are to perform hereafter. That is strictly an importation of labor. Take the old case, immediately after the Revolution, of the famous German redemptionists who filled up Pennsylvania. They came here under exactly the same understanding, that they were to work out a contract for a term of years, and were to hold themselves bound to it in consideration of having money advanced to get here; and they agreed to serve indefinitely whoever held them. Now, I may be peculiar in my view of that, but I think that is a contract of slavery. I have given the subject careful study.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were there not many laborers imported from Europe into Virginia and the New England States, in the early settlement of those States, in the same way?—A. Yes, sir; there were.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What do you base your opinion upon that these people make servile contracts to come here? You seem to be very emphatic on that point. Have you ever seen one of them?—A. No; I never have.

Q. What information have you, then, to give to this commission that these people are bonded to come here and work under servile contracts?—A. I can give this information. I know they could never get them to the islands unless they came under such contracts, and they come here in large numbers. I have no other information than the general report that it is done.

Q. Do you not know that in the case even of those taken to the Sandwich Islands, the Chinese in their ignorance, not knowing where they are to be taken, if any contract is made it is made by the mandarin or Chinese capitalist, who insures them their wages only; and that the only contract under which the Chinaman comes arises from the fact that he wants some one to be responsible for his money? Is not that the uniform way of those contracts?—A. No, sir; those were not the contracts under which the Chinese came to the islands.

Q. Are they not made in the same way? Is not that the first basis upon which these contracts are made? Do you not know that to be the case?—A. I know that they would come there from China, and that a contract was understood to be made with somebody who transferred that contract to somebody else, and there was the greatest pulling and hauling and anxiety lest they should escape from the ship, and everything of that kind, after they had arrived at the islands, before they were carried off to these planters.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did you ever see anything of that kind here?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say they have no inclination to become citizens of this country. How do you know that?—A. I do not know that I said that of this country. I think I said that from what I observed generally there, and from a limited experience here, I distinguished between them and the Japanese, that the Japanese conformed themselves much quicker to our institutions, adopted our style of dress, and it is notorious that the

Chinaman does not do that in any particular. The Japanese become familiar with our language to a certain extent, and these Chinamen do certainly keep themselves by themselves. Whether it is because we compel them to do so or whether it is a matter of their own seeking, I do not know. I know generally it is the case here, and out there I found it was in many respects the case; and yet I say they are marrying all the Hawaiian women. There were not thirty Chinese women in the whole kingdom when I was there.

Q. Have you ever met an educated Chinaman whom you considered capable of being made a naturalized citizen of the United States?—A. Certainly I have, and I said that those very men that I met in Honolulu—some of the Chinese merchants there—are men of the highest respectability; men I should be glad to see in any position of trust or honor or anything else; and I have no doubt there are a good many such here, although I have not any acquaintance among them.

Q. They built up that reputation there by honest dealing and good citizenship?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever met any of that class here?—A. No; I have never been very much with the Chinese here. I do not mean to say there are not a good many of that class here. I have no doubt there are.

Q. Can a Japanese become a citizen of the United States?—A. I suppose not, under our present naturalization law.

Q. Would he make a good citizen?—A. Some of them would.

Q. Do the people who come to this country from foreign countries make good citizens?—A. Perhaps you can answer that question as well as I. I think there is a good deal of difference in them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are the natives good citizens?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you think the same ratio of Chinese coming here as people who come from other foreign nations would make good citizens?—A. I hardly think they would, with their utter inability to cope with our language; they are so distinct. I do not see that they are of much use to us. They do no military duty, they do not serve on our juries, they bear none of the burdens of society; but still these are a great many very good Chinese.

Q. Suppose they had all the privileges that other foreigners have extended to them to become citizens, attend our schools, and that we did away with class legislation, and treated them decently, and gave them a chance of education for their children growing up, what would be the effect then?—A. If we would do that, and they would come right into our general system of government, I think they would be as good as any other people; but if they keep themselves entirely under the influence of their own system of government and social regulations, I do not think they would be a good element here.

Q. Is it not the blame of our own authorities and our own laws? Do you not know that as a lawyer?—A. I think there are some laws here which are very unjust.

Q. They have that tendency?—A. Yes; I think some of these discriminations against Chinese are unjust. If you want to know my views as a lawyer, I will say that I do not think any such legislation will bear inspection as enacting that if they do not have a horse and a laundry-wagon they shall pay an extra tax, while a man with two horses shall pay a smaller tax. I would hardly suppose anybody would think that was right.

Q. What would be the effect of the introduction of 100,000 Japanese into this State?—A. It would rather deluge it.

Q. How would it affect our civilization and society?—A. I think the Japanese more readily adapt themselves to our ways. I think that is a characteristic of the Japanese.

Q. Do you think they would do more under the same circumstances that the Chinese are placed here?—A. I think they would. I have noticed them side by side, and have observed that they are rather more ready to assimilate than the Chinese.

Q. Upon what hypothesis do you base your statement that the importation of labor here debases labor and puts it at a discount?—A. Upon a very simple basis. It is upon the general theory that those who are brought here and start fair and clear are men who can afford to come here and work cheaper than those can who have to pay a large sum to get here. It is not a question of how much it costs to come here from China or how much it costs to come here from Chicago; it is a question whether the party has to pay it himself or whether his employer pays it for him. My idea is that if every one came here and paid their own expenses in getting here, we would get merely the better class of Chinamen, and there would be very little complaint against them.

Q. Do you know that when Chinese come here and have the money furnished to them, as you say it is, it is simply done by the capitalist in China, the Chinaman agreeing to refund it as fast as he earns it here? Do you not know that there is no other contract in existence?—A. I am not sure but that that is the contract. The contract that they had in the islands was not like that in form. The contract system is broken up in China, the business was so bad. The Chinaman makes an agreement with the mandarin or individual in China to advance the money to him, and then he signs a contract to somebody in Honolulu, or Maui, or on some of the plantations, and that person gets the benefit of the contract instead of the other party. The contract is given for the sake of getting the Chinaman's labor.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I would ask you whether the contract generally made with immigrants to this country is not one to repay money advanced with a certain rate of interest; not a contract of service, but a contract to repay the money advanced—sometimes, perhaps, with an exorbitant rate of interest?—A. As I said, I do not want to say anything about contracts here, but I have an idea that they agree not so much to repay the money as to repay with labor; that is what they did out there.

Q. What would be the result in the Sandwich Islands provided they could not get this labor?—A. I think if they could not get the labor a class of influential Americans, laboring-men, would go there and take the land.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Why did they not go there before the importation of these coolies?—A. There was very little land in market until recently. It was nearly all crown land.

Q. They got those crown lands of late years?—A. Unless something has been done recently, land could not be let for a longer term than thirty years, and there was no such thing as title to property before the reign of Camehameha. Everything was held by a sort of feudal tenure from one end of the island to the other until the time of Camehameha. Then he gradually allowed rights to foreigners.

Q. You admit that these plantations could not be carried on without Chinese labor?—A. No, sir; I do not admit that. I said I thought the Chinese labor was of great present value to them. I think they have started up business very much with Chinese labor, but I do not think it is going to be an ultimate benefit to the people of that country.

Q. What do the planters pay for this labor?—A. In my time it was $4 and $5 a month, and then, of course, they found them in everything but clothing. They paid the parties in China whatever they had to pay, but how much I never exactly knew.

Q. Do you know Mr. Williams, the secretary of legation in Peking?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you know him by reputation?—A. No, sir; I do not think I do.

JOHN R. CORYELL sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Do you reside in San Francisco?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you resided here?—A. About a year and a half.

Q. Before that residence where were you?—A. In China.

Q. In what position in China?—A. I was for three years consular clerk in Shanghai, and for one year I was in charge of the consulate in Canton.

Q. Was that since what is known as the passage of the Page law, which passed, I believe, in March, 1875?—A. It was before that time.

Q. Were you there at any time after that?—A. No. I have not been there for nearly two years. I have been east.

Q. State the character of the women who were passed through that consulate during your observation.—A. Most of them—I think it safe to say there are no exceptions—belong to a class in Canton who live entirely upon the water. They live in their boats, and they are considered the very lowest class in China. No Chinaman who considers himself at all respectable will ever marry into one of these water families.

Q. Do you know anything of the character of the women who have been imported here to San Francisco within the last year?—A. From my observation of those who have left China that I have seen they are prostitutes, as nearly as I can judge. I think there is very little doubt but that my opinion is correct, for the reason that the prostitutes are such a peculiar class.

Q. You refer to those who have come within the year that you have resided in San Francisco?—A. Those I have not seen. I refer to those that left China while I was there.

Q. Do you know anything about those that have been imported within that time, and the estimation in which they have been held by the Chinese here?—A. I cannot say anything about the estimation in which they are held by the Chinese here; but I know that those I have seen coming from the Pacific Mail boats—I have been there several times—are all of that class There may be one or two exceptions.

Q. Then it is your judgment, from your knowledge of that class of people, that those who are coming here are still prostitutes, and come here for the purposes of prostitution?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. How is it you determine those are prostitutes who come here now under the Page bill, when the consul certifies that they are wives?—A. From their looks. Any person who has lived in China never hesitates a moment about deciding whether a woman is a prostitute or not.

Q. The class is so entirely distinct?—A. As distinct as white and black.

Q. The general character of the women in China is that they are chaste, is it not?—A. The character of the wives is that they are chaste; I think they are remarkably so. That has been my experience.

Q. This class of prostitutes is a very distinct class?—A. Yes, sir; a very distinct class.

Q. In what estimation are they held in China?—A. They are considered very, very low. There is another class of prostitutes who are kept for Chinese only, and who have nothing to do with foreigners. These women are considered so low that foreigners only are allowed to have anything to do with them. They are so low as that.

Q. Do I understand you that you were at the consulate at Hong-Kong?—A. At Canton.

Q. You were never at the consulate at Hong-Kong?—A. Never.

Q. How do you know that these women pass that consulate?—A. Because, when I was at the consulate of Shanghai, I asked a number if they were Canton prostitutes. They said they were not.

Q. I understand you to say that any person residing in China can distinguish these two classes easily?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That there is no difficulty in distinguishing between the class that comes here and respectable Chinese wives?—A. Not a bit.

Q. And therefore our consul must be very remiss in his duties in certifying that he believes these to be honest wives?—A. What the consul in Hong-Kong does I do not think I have anything to say about. I can only give evidence, and you may pass your judgment. I cannot pass judgment on the consul there.

Q. I understand you to say that any person residing in China can easily distinguish these two classes?—A. Just as easily as you can tell a negro when you see him.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Under the operation of the Page law, will any consul have difficulty in preventing the shipping of prostitutes?—A. He will have difficulty, for this reason: a Chinaman prefers a lie to the truth, and there is no way that I have ever found, or that other persons who have lived in China for thirty or forty years have found, whom I have consulted for the purpose, of finding any way to get at the truth.

Q. I want to know if I understood you correctly. I understood you to say that you could tell by sight at once whether these women were prostitutes or not?—A. You mean to say, what difficulty will any consul have in settling that question. Nothing, except that is his own opinion only. How it may be now I do not know, under the Page law, but I know when I was there any expense that was gone into was at the consul's own. He had to foot all the bills that would arise from investiating any such matter as that. I know if I were there now, and allowed to say that my opinion was that a woman was a prostitute, I would not allow one of these women to come here. I remonstrated at the time when they were passing through, and I appealed to the consul-general to find out if there was no way of preventing it.

Q. If the law authorizes the consul to act upon his own knowledge or his own opinion, he will have no difficulty in keeping these women back?—A. In my opinion he will have no difficulty whatever.

MATTHEW BLAIR sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. Hay and grain dealer.

Q. How long have you resided here?—A. A little over fifteen years.

Q. State the result of your observation upon Chinese importation in reference to labor, as you have observed it, and the information you have gathered.—A. My place of business has been located very close to three shoe-manufactories and a manufactory of underwear, probably as large as any in the city. I have two places of business; one is located near the Mission Woolen-Mills, where there were some ten or fifteen branches of manufacture conducted by that class of men. When I first came here I had seen some of the effects of associated slave-labor on the morals and industry of the country, and it struck me very sensibly at once what might be the result of associated labor here as workers, and the effect upon the young and growing generation. At that time there were very few children according to population to what there is now. Labor was scarce. It was really necessary to have more labor and cheaper labor to carry on manufacturing here, and at the time it seemed as though it might be an advantage, and probably would in a sickly country, such as most countries are that have this kind of slave-labor and associated labor, where the dominant race probably does not increase as our people here have increased. Carrying on the business that I have and my place being open, I have had a great many call on me for labor. Even when the factories first started near me there were some hundreds from Lynn, Mass., Cincinnati, and other eastern places, who came out here, and the factories were started mostly with them. Then from my place I could see boarding-places, having some three hundred in each place, and I could see the people at supper and going to their meals. I have had the advantage of observing that and their mode of living, and scarcely a day has passed, probably, for some years, without persons calling on me to know if I could not find them work, because a person who is engaged in any place of that kind is able to be more free, and I have a great deal of time to converse. I have been observing that most of these eastern people have returned, and their places are mostly filled by this class of labor.

Q. They returned because they could not obtain employment?—A. Because they could not obtain labor. I have had my feelings very much wrought up by the calls I have had for labor. A young man would offer to work for me in rolling, loading, or stacking hay, and I have sometimes from eight to ten young men at once who would be willing to go out and work with my men with the teams, hoisting hay into lofts in some places for four bits and two bits. Some of them have gone to sea, to Cuba and other places. I have seen them around my hay-cars while loading hay. Probably from ten to twenty of those people would come there with sacks gathering hay. I would ask them why they did not work, and they would say they could not get it. There is a manufacturing establishment conducted within nearly three blocks of me, that is the Mission Woolen-Mills, where there are said to be five hundred and fifty employed. I do not expect to say anything of the numbers, but the industry that is carried on is by Chinamen, more or less, and mostly by Chinamen. Opposite that is a candle-factory. Adjoining the candle-factory is a spring-mattress factory, where no white man does anything, not even making the springs for the spring-beds. Adjoining that is a chemical-works, a soap-establishment, where they make bleaching-soap. Then there are three or four tanneries that employ Chinese, where boys and a less class of men could do the work, as driving horses, breaking the bark, and such work in the tanneries. Then adjoining that is an oakum-factory, the only oakum-factory, I think, in the city, which is altogether run by Chinese, for I can see them in the shop from where my place is, and also see them in the yard spreading the oakum.

Q. The labor in all these trades you have named is done by Chinese?—A. Yes, sir. Then there is a trunk and box factory that I think at one time employed seventy Chinese.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. What do they employ now?—A. They employ a great many people. Every day as I pass I can see them on the lumber-pile piling lumber, from seven to eight and ten, on the outside of the lumber-pile mostly, and as I passed by the windows I have seen them inside on the machinery sharpening their tools. Just adjoining that, very close by, is a broom-factory, employing, I understood, at one time from forty to fifty Chinamen. Then there are the chemical-works, not a great way off, which employ a large force; then there are two breweries, that bottle ales very extensively—the Swann brewery and another one. They have, I think, never employed any whites in that business. Then there is another broom-factory that I have never seen any white persons doing work in.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. If these Chinamen were not employed there, is it your opinion that their position might be filled by white labor from New England and elsewhere?—A. I do think so. To state my experience, I am in a business that would lead every one to notice those things perhaps, and I, some how or other, have had great feeling for the young people of this city. They have a bad name, but I think we have some very promising children in San Francisco, if we would give them a chance. I have had a great many people coming here. I have had letters from Santa Cruz, from a doctor there, who failed in business, to see if I could not get a job of work for his son. I had to tell him, as I had to tell all Eastern men, that there is no show in this country for our people to earn a living by labor.

Q. Then it is your opinion that the presence of Chinese labor is degrading to our laborers, and takes the place of our laborers?—A. I think it does, and that it will in time entirely exclude our people from labor and destroy our system of civilization and government, for the reason that their system is entirely and diametrically opposite to ours. Theirs is to give labor to the masses, and he that makes labor for three persons when one could do it is a public benefactor. Our system is labor-saving, through labor-saving machinery. Our system is kept up, as I look at it, by giving the masses labor, and any nation that cannot furnish labor for its people goes into barbarism. That is the reason that our boys are becoming barbarians. It is lack of employment. Beyond that, further, there is a brick-yard that employs Chinese *in toto* nearly. No longer ago than day before yesterday there were three men there who said they had not been able to find work for ten weeks. They had formerly been on railroads. One was a very fine, stout German man, who said he had tried for six weeks to get a day's work. He did get a day's work or two to handle hay for the city railroads that we sold them; and he said it even had got so now that the railroads were inquiring for and employing men who did not have families; that their circumstances were getting so that people with families really, under the pressure of the reduced price of labor, they could not afford to employ, and they were looking for people without families. If you have the time, and wish to hear some few experiences, I will state an experience I had with Eastern men not more than four months ago. I have men nearly every day. I could report an experience night before last, and some in this room once

knew the party. It is not an uncommon occurrence to have something of the same kind occur. A very fine-looking young man from Massachusetts, I should suppose about twenty-five years of age, came into my place about 12 o'clock, and quite abruptly asked, and that is very often done, "Can you give me any work?" I said I could not; we employ a certain number of men; we had our teamsters and our stablemen, men to do the work. "Well," says he, "I must have work; I will clean your barn or your stable, or anything, or roll hay, if I can get work to earn my bread." Said he, "I was induced, like thousands of others, to come to this coast to find labor. I have been here months and months in the country, and have been unsuccessful. I have been here and at Stewart street." He said, "There are some sixteen or twenty of us who have been at Stewart street trying to get labor from the lumbermen piling lumber;" and, he said, "we got enough barely to keep us along, but we had to sleep in the lumber-piles when it was warm, and at night walk the streets, and have no means to get back East again." I told him it was impossible for him to get employment in anything unless it was in some place where some persons dropped out in some business; but as for labor it was almost utterly impossible, as far as I know, and I told him there was quite a movement making, that a great many people are interested in this question at this time. He was a man of very good address. He made the remark to me, "I have been well raised, and have a good education, and I will not steal, and do not wish to beg," and he said, "I want to earn something." I told him there was a movement made here, and he appeared like a sober man, and a disheartened young man from the East; that if a party of men like him would go to the mayor and explain their position, it would have a tendency to bring up this all-important subject here, and perhaps we all might be benefited by it; but if not, I told him, as I have told a great many men, it is no use to try. In ten years, to count back, I do not know how many, but a great many, have gone to those factories to try to get work. I have spoken to a great many of those men who employ Chinese, and said, "Why not give the white people employment?" They say, "We cannot work the two together." That I consider is one of the great difficulties. To show the sincerity of this man, he said that he had been around down in the country. He had found none that took any interest in him, and he was called a tramp. He said, "There are young men coming from the East, as good young men as there are in the East, and well educated; they get out here, and when they get here they are called tramps and hoodlums, and have no standing;" and he said, "You are the first man that ever gave me courage," and I put four bits in his hand, and he wet the sidewalk with tears; a fine-looking young man of twenty-five years of age. Such experiences I have had. Last night a lady of my acquaintance from Vermont, a woman who has written for the papers from here, who has a son 24 years of age, knowing I had taken some interest in finding labor for people, came to my house and staid until ten o'clock at night, to know if I could do anything for her son, who had been in Sacramento, and had walked the streets four nights, and could find no place to sleep; and she shed tears for an hour. It seems to me that the effect of Chinese is this: it decreases the demand for all products; it decreases the consumption and increases production. There are many things that bear upon this question not generally taken up. Those Chinese in those shoe-factories wear no American shoes, or American clothing. In the factory from three to five hundred persons pass in for years without having an inch of American labor or American goods upon their backs. They do wear Amer-

ican hats. There are fifteen hundred near me who are producing boots and shoes for our people. They live in six houses. The houses cost about $1,500 apiece; those houses can be repaired and kept up for all time. They cook their victuals at six fires for that amount of people, which shows the effect of the decrease in business and its results. In the first place, I have seen one place where we received all the benefits from the lumber; but in the lumber-mills of this coast the estimate that I saw in the papers is that there are seven Chinamen working in all the mills on this coast for seventeen white persons. There is a certain amount of their labor in those houses. They cook their victuals at six fires, and they have bought, as I understand, a large wood ranch back of San José where they are bringing in their own wood, and cars of wood come in nearly every day to do their cooking with. That certainly has a great depressing effect on industry and shortening the industry for our people. Those are all able-bodied laborers. They consume nothing of our production further than Sam Lee, who I am acquainted with, a very fine Chinaman and I suppose wealthy, an affable Chinaman, boards those men and feeds them on Chinese rice and vegetables raised in China; so that, as far as our people having any benefit from the productions they use, it amounts to nothing.

Q. Do you know what it costs them to live a day?—A. I suppose about 10 cents. Then there will be 300 in one small building. The effect on our circulating medium is striking. I have done business in different parts of the United States, and I was never in a place where the retail dealers and people in the shopping trade complained so much of the scarcity of money as we do in San Francisco. In no other place that I ever saw was credit so extensive, and so hard to get money; and many of us think the time is coming when we will have to exchange commodities instead of using money as a circulating medium. To illustrate: Your circulating medium is absorbed. Fifteen hundred of those people receive $12,500 of money every Saturday night. That money comes from the circulating medium of our country, and it matters not how much money is in the banks on California street, all the money that we do business with is that which is called out for labor and necessities to run the business of the city. That money is absorbed—probably $11,000 or $11,500 of our circulating medium—that never comes into our circulation, because it is China trading with China in this country. The money once in their hands, it is retained by them. The Chinese, I think, say it is for buying goods. They have produced the result of the labor of 1,500 able-bodied persons. According to the polling population—500 population to 100 voters—they have absorbed the consumption of 7,500 people in those two industries. If it was our civilization and our people, it would require 2,000 people more to furnish the necessaries for those 7,500 people; so that it is increasing production and decreasing consumption. I have viewed it in that light all through, and also to see how this money affects the circulation where this $11,000 are paid every Saturday night to this small body of men of 1,500. They say that they absorb $30,000,000; some papers say it is $27,000,000 a year; that that absorption is not $30,000,000. But, were these $11,000 paid on every Saturday night to our civilization, it would pay four or five hundred bills by the next Saturday night, instead of the hoarding-up, every Saturday night, of so many thousands of our circulating medium.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Silver is scarce in this market?—A. It is scarce to pay bills among the retail trade, butchers, grocers, and all such men.

Q. What makes it at a discount now?—A. Because it is not a legal tender.

Q. Is it not a legal tender?—A. No, sir; every day we pay discount on silver. We handle twenty-five thousand dollars of silver a month.

Q. You say a large number of these white people are going back to the East?—A. Yes, sir; a great many.

Q. Would you believe it if the official statement was shown you that, in 1875, 44,937 people came to this country by rail more than went East?—A. There is a class of people I am speaking particularly of, mechanics, and people who come here to earn their bread by labor in those factories. Bring it down to the absorption of their work. I have no prejudice, but I wish to show how the Chinese absorb the labor of the people, and how quick they come in to take it up. There was, a few years ago, not a great while ago, I suppose, a large party of them who were taken into a furniture-manufacturing establishment here to glue furniture and put it up, and they learned them the cane-seating of chairs. A great many people in this city and all cities are not able to do heavy manual labor, and the women do this cane-seating and reseating of chairs. I think that started them at that business. The first I observed was that they were into it, and very heavy, about six months ago. I have seen as high as forty-five of those chairs go by my place on the shoulders of the Chinamen at once. They had gathered them to repair them. I knew several women who had earned a living by cane-seating chairs for a long time, and received a dollar apiece for a cane-seat. I had a woman do some work for me myself. The Chinese commenced at six bits, and got the chairs and carried them off. Then they have come down to less. I have had them to cane-seat two in my place for four bits, although I have through principle not employed them. I can say that this lady and all others, as I have understood, on Dupont street and Fourth street, and those second-hand places, have lost their business. That industry is very small in itself, but it shows that they absorb all branches they undertake.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You observed that that industry has been absorbed?—A. It has been absorbed. This lady has had to give it up. I think there are no persons on the face of the earth under our civilization that can compete with a civilization of that kind; it is impossible—we must go to the wall. I have looked at it, and perhaps, for a man in business, I have given it more thought than most people. Men I have talked with have said I have given it as much thought probably as any other person.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is your business?—A. Wholesale and retail hay and grain business.

Q. What in your judgment is the effect of labor-saving machinery upon the city?—A. I think it is beneficial, but it is run to such an extent that it depreciates labor, so that we will have to make laws to make eight hours a day's work in order to let labor go around. If that eight hours is given to the Chinese and our people are excluded, I do not think there is anything left for our people to do. That is the ground.

Q. I ask what in your judgment is the effect of labor-saving machinery, machinery which does the work heretofore done by hand?—A. I think just as long as the manufacturing of those things gives labor it is beneficial, and will be until the population becomes like other thickly-populated countries. If all countries on the face of the earth were as thickly populated as China, and under the Egyptian system, when they

built the pyramids probably, for labor, we would have to go back on the labor system and give our people labor, unless we introduce this cheap servile labor that excludes our people from doing what labor there is left.

Q. If labor is performed by machinery which has been or can be performed by hand, I ask if the effect of that is to deprive people of employment?—A. I do not think it is, because I think in building the factories and the machinery to prepare it and the great consumption of machinery, there is a great deal of labor given; but it can come down so low that the people become so poor that they cannot purchase. Now we are prosperous. We have a great country. If by using sewing-machines we should not be able to pay $20 for making wives' and children's dresses, it would have that effect. The labor-saving machines, of course, produce an immense amount of lighter labor just as long as we can consume the products, but I think to-day one trouble with the world, why business is stagnant, is that we can overproduce.

Q. I want to understand what is the difference in effect, say upon white labor, whether a certain amount of labor is performed by a machine, thus taking the work from white labor, or whether it is performed by Chinamen? What is the difference in effect?—A. The difference in effect is, the Chinamen do work that machines cannot do. Machinery never can do all the work. There has always got to be a certain amount of work done by hand.

Q. That does not precisely meet the question. Take a certain kind of labor that heretofore has been performed by hand. Some machine is introduced that performs it and takes it, so that 25 white laborers are turned out of employment. What is the difference in effect of that whether that labor is performed by a machine or performed by Chinamen?—A. I do not know. There is this about it: the expense of running that machinery for wood or coal may be as great as the feeding of the Chinamen, but I think that manual labor has to go with machinery.

Q. Still, unless it does save labor, it is not a labor-saving machine. If it makes labor necessary it is not a labor-saving machine?—A. Labor-saving machines create labor, but the question is whether they can create enough to allow the people of this country all to get the labor that is required for subsistence.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Take another view. Does labor-saving machinery degrade labor, in your opinion?—A. Not at all.

Q. Did you ever know anybody to refuse to work beside or upon a labor-saving machine?—A. Not at all.

Q. Does labor-saving machinery send the earnings of the product out of the country?—A. It is here.

Q. Labor-saving machinery increases production and reduces the price and cost of it to the people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Leaving the rest of the labor to be performed by people who consume?—A. Yes, sir; but labor-saving might be carried to too great an extent. Some of our vegetables, it is said, do not pay the expense of raising. If we can get a barrel of flour for a dollar and cannot earn the dollar, it is not so well as if we could earn ten dollars and could get the flour for five dollars.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you know that in some countries of Europe labor-saving machinery is excluded precisely upon the objections you urge to the Chinese

labor?—A. I do not say that I object to labor-saving machinery, further than if this labor-saving machinery is run by Chinese it takes away any opportunity for our people to earn a living. Take those shoe-men. A good portion of that work is done by machinery, and if they employ Chinese to run that machinery, I say it takes away any opportunity for our people to make a living.

Q. Suppose that six men can run a labor-saving machine and do the work that formerly required a hundred men, that machine has in effect turned ninety-four men out of employment?—A. It has in that respect.

Q. What is the difference in effect upon these ninety-four men whether their labor is performed by the machine or performed by Chinamen? They have equally lost their employment.—A. It might require ninety-four men to make this machinery, and build the buildings, and furnish all that was necessarily created by it. But still that labor would not be done by Chinamen; that would be done by our people, and the profits, or the wages, would be left here; it would be left in circulation. The Chinese in absorbing the wages of labor do not circulate it with us. Look at the effect upon the vegetable-men, the Italian class. I think they are a good class. Most of them who used to trade with me had to go to the wall on account of the opposition in the vegetable business.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If we have labor-saving machines you object to another machine in the shape of a Chinaman, so that our population has no chance at all if excluded entirely both by the machine and the Chinaman?—A. That is what I wish to get at. I do not wish to have it understood that I am opposed to labor-saving machines at all, but I claim that our people must have labor out of these industries.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I simply inquired what was the difference in effect. I am not making any argument at all.—A. One effect, I think the worst of all, is that the Chinese are so industrious, so quiet, and so easily trained, that our people cannot train our own children; because if we take an apprentice, or anything of that kind, they are so much more troublesome that it creates a feeling against our people and we discriminate against our own people. I have often heard it said, I have heard it a thousand times, that our children are not so good as Chinamen, because they require more attention to make them learn. Here I can take a Chinese boy and teach him the whole day. He has no associates to call him into the street; he does not go to school. Our children cannot be so attentive as that boy, and of course we form an attachment to him on account of his obedience, and we discriminate against our people and call them hoodlums, and have no respect for them.

Q. That grows out of the fact that the Chinese learn so readily?—A. That is the danger, I think. We go against our people on account of the Chinese being so convenient; because if we could find horses and oxen already broken, we never would break one of them in the world. This class is coming in to work against our people, and I think our boys, like horses, want a little more breaking. If the Chinamen were not so industrious and did not learn so readily we would not want them.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You would give a chance to our boys?—A. Yes. As this is a kind of a free discussion, I would make the remark I heard from a man who ran a factory in this country. In speaking of running the factory he said they could not run it with our people, because they are not reliable, they

are troublesome. He said put forty Chinamen in a mill and they will work steadily and never stop, but continue until the day's work is done, but our people would throw bobbins at one another and thrash one another with skeins of yarn. That is why I say those Chinese are so obedient and so industrious that the effect is, among those who employ Chinese, to discriminate against our people, because our people are not so pleasant or agreeable, nor so good and quiet laborers.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. You do not think we can make a good laborer out of the free American citizen?—A. I say people talk that way. I am in favor of my own people.

Q. They do them injustice?—A. I think we ought to be able to manage our people.

ALEXANDER BADLAM recalled.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. You testified that you are assessor of this city and county?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. Rev. Dr. Loomis stated that it is the custom of yourself and your deputies to meet Chinamen at the Chinese steamers on their landing into this country and collect a poll-tax of them. Is that correct or otherwise?—A. It is incorrect.

Q. He stated that that was a common custom. Is it true?—A. No, sir; I never collect from them when they arrive here. They are not residents until they have been here six months.

Q. And you act upon that, and do not collect of them upon their arrival?—A. We do not collect of them upon their arrival.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Does the assessor collect the poll-tax?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. When do you assess for poll-tax?—A. From the 1st of March to the 1st of July it is $2; from the 1st of July to the 1st of January it is $3, and from the 1st of January to the 1st of March there is none collected.

Q. When is it assessed?—A. The 1st of March.

Q. Do you take any note of the Chinese arriving here upon the steamers for any purpose whatever?—A. None whatever. We pay no attention to them at all. We pay no attention to any one arriving here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Mr. Loomis stated in reference to some statistical information regarding the assessed value of property upon which Chinamen paid, that he did not know whether they paid the value in tax of $500,000 or upon a tax valuation of $500,000 of personal property. Which is it?—A. The assessed valuation is about $500,000, a little over.

Q. What would be the tax that would be on that?—A. It would be according to whatever is levied.

Q. Say this year's percentage?—A. Two dollars twelve and a half cents.

Q. Then they would pay about $11,000 into the treasury?—A. I think so.

Q. So that they do not pay $500,000?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In regard to the habits of the Chinese as to paying taxes, do they pay promptly?—A. I am not tax-collector, and do not know how it is.

Q. You say you collect a poll-tax?—A. We find a great deal of difficulty in collecting the poll-tax from them. They use every possible means to evade the payment of the tax, and trade receipts with each other. As I testified the other day, we are compelled to put distinctive marks describing the Chinamen carefully on the poll-tax receipt and changing it every year in order to distinguish the Chinaman who has it. There might be so many Ah Sins or Ah Yungs that we put some distinctive mark on their receipts which describes the man perfectly, his age, height, whether scars on head, one eye or lame, or anything of that character to designate him.

Q. Is the poll-tax devoted by law to any particular purpose in this State?—A. To school purposes only.

Q. Do you know the whole number of Chinese polls in this city?—A. No, sir; I do not. I testified the other day that there were not far from 30,000 Chinese inhabitants here.

Q. Could you find out by referring to the books in your office the number of Chinese who have paid a poll-tax, say last year, or the year before?—A. Yes, sir; I can find out by reference. It would take some time to segregate them from the others, but I could do it by placing a person in charge of that and working it out steadily.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. How many Chinese do you say pay poll-tax in a year?—A. I did not state the number.

Q. Can you ascertain how many?—A. I can by examining the books.

Q. Can you say how many white persons pay the poll-tax?—A. I can by examining the books.

Q. Can you say now whether the Chinese or white persons pay the most?—A. I cannot. I can give you the exact figures, if you desire them, for two years, before the commission adjourns.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is it not the fact that, since you became collector, the poll-tax paid by the white people has doubled?—A. No, sir; but it is a fact that my poll-tax collections are largely in excess of my predecessors.

Q. Very largely?—A. Yes, sir. I do not know what class it has affected, whether Chinese or white, without going to the books.

Q. I am speaking of whites.—A. I think it is on both classes.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How does the fidelity of the Chinese in paying the poll-tax compare with that of the whites?—A. The whites never change receipts and the Chinamen do. It is impossible for John Adams or John Smith to give his receipt to John Brown, but the Chinaman is Ah-Sin or Ah-Jim, and it will suit any of them, unless he has some distinctive mark; and the Chinamen who are going off that we collect from will send their receipts back the next Chinese post he arrives at. They will send their receipts to the companies they belong to, and they are distributed to the next Chinese going away; and so they use them a number of times unless they have some mark to catch them; and when we do catch them they acknowledge their guilt by their countenances, and immediately pay their tax.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Is it not the fact that you collect as large poll-tax from the Chinese as from the whites?—A. Would you not rather have the figures?

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you have the trouble with the merchants that you speak of having with this floating population of Chinese who are coming in and leaving the country all the time?—A. We collect readily from the merchants and all others engaged in business.

Q. It is the floating population?—A. Yes; you mean the Chinese merchants? We collect more readily from them than we do from those going, of course.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do the Chinamen ever pay the poll-tax voluntarily?—A. I know of instances where they have been badgered at their places for their poll-taxes, and they have come down to our office and paid it in preference to paying deputies on the street; but I do not know of any instance of a Chinaman coming voluntarily in and paying it.

Q. Do they pay this poll-tax more readily than other people?—A. No, sir. I think the white people pay more readily.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Upon whom is your poll-tax levied?—A. Upon all male persons over twenty-one years of age and under sixty; and active members of the militia only are excluded.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You collect from the Chinese as they are leaving the city, at the steamboat-wharf and railroads?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That has been the custom and practice?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has that ever been the practice in regard to white people?—A. I stated that it was not the custom with whites, in my testimony the other day, and I gave the reason for it the other day.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Repeat the reason.—A. The reason is that the white people have a habitation and a home, and you know them. The white man has a name; you know him, and you can find him; but you can never find a Chinaman; they are so much alike.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Your predecessor and some of his deputies are now at San Quentin, I believe? Can you answer about the number of fraudulent tax-receipts they palmed on the Chinese?—A. I have no idea.

Q. Was it $20,000 worth?—A. They were issued to white people the same. I think more white people got them than Chinamen. I have seen large bundles of those bogus receipts for white people, and I have seen very few for Chinamen.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. The question has been asked here, what was the politics of those officers who went to the State's prison?—A. I could not tell you. I think they were a little mixed. I do not think politics entered into it at all.

JOHN L. DURKEE sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. What position do you hold in the city?—Answer. Fire-marshal.

Q. Have you and your associates recently or within the year made a report upon fire matters in connection with Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you that report here?—A. I have a copy cut from a paper. I have not the original report which was sent to the board.

Q. You have examined it and see that it is the same report?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Read that report—it is short—and state when it was published.—A. This is cut from the Call of April 23, 1876, and it is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, *April* 20, 1876.

To the honorable Board of Supervisors:

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with resolution No. 8614, passed by your honorable board April 10, 1876, the undersigned fire-wardens have made an examination of that portion of the city occupied chiefly by Chinese. We visited the old Mansion House, old California Hotel, old Saint Francis Hotel, Portsmouth House, Callaghan's, Kane's, and other buildings, and find them all alike as to carelessness in the use of fire. In each of the buildings visited we found on each floor a rude open range, built on pieces of boards a few inches from the floors, where the cooking is done. Also, scattered throughout the building and placed on the bare floors, and sometimes on the window-sills, a number of old five-gallon oil-cans, with pieces of old iron hoops laid across the top, in which fires are made and cooking is done. In many places the floors had been burned from this cause. In one building we counted eleven of these cans on the floor in the space of thirteen feet. We also found upon the roofs of many buildings frame structures used for kitchens and poultry coops; also fences and bulkheads built across the openings in the chimney. Another very dangerous practice is the building of large platforms over the roofs of houses, some being used as wood-yards, and others for the purpose of hanging out clothes. The Chinese are in the habit of building awnings and balconies with a roof in the front and rear of their buildings, and in a short time they are inclosed and turned into kitchens or sleeping apartments. On one narrow alley (Saint Louis) we found from the upper stories of buildings on each side those inclosed balconies which came within two feet of meeting. It is next to impossible to detect the violators of these ordinances, for these people will not inform on each other, and the work is generally done at night and on Sundays. In Chinese wash-houses it is the universal habit to build a brick furnace on the floors, leaving the fronts open; they put in long sticks of wood, burning them off by degrees, one end being in the fire and the other lying on the floor.

We would respectfully recommend that some ordinance be passed prohibiting the erection of those platforms on the roofs of buildings all over the city, and also an ordinance compelling the owner or persons having control of any building in which fire is used to provide some safe way of building fires, both for heating and cooking, either by placing in such buildings fire-places, stoves, or secure ranges, of sufficient capacity to accommodate all the inmates.

Respectfully,

JOHN L. DURKEE,
GEORGE W. CORBELL,
JAMES RILEY,
Fire-Wardens.

Q. Is that report the result of personal examination?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By yourself?—A. By myself and two others.

Q. You know the facts therein stated to be true?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What are the habits of the Chinese generally, so far as fire is concerned?—A. They are very careless indeed.

Q. What is the liability of the city to conflagration from that cause?—A. I think it is greater than any other one cause we have, particularly out in the southern part of the city among those wash-houses. They are scattered in little buildings there and they are very careless about fire.

Q. How do you account for the fact that fires are not frequent in Chinatown, or are they frequent?—A. They are very frequent.

Q. Are those traceable to the act of white men who set places on fire in the cases you have examined, or from what cause?—A. I have known of but one cause, and that happened some three or four months ago, when some little boys ten or twelve years old set fire to a Chinese wash-house up in Leavenworth street in the afternoon.

Q. Do you investigate the cause of fires?—A. Yes, sir; that is one of my duties.

Q. In the cases which you have investigated, with that exception, do

you find that they have resulted from the carelessness of Chinese or otherwise?—A. Sometimes intentionally, or at any rate through carelessness.

Q. Do you know of cases of incendiary fires by the Chinese?—A. Several.

Q. Within the last year?—A. Within the last two or three years.

Q. What was the apparent motive for setting the buildings on fire?—A. To recover the insurance.

Q. How do you account for it that these fires are not more destructive when they break out?—A. In the Chinese quarter where the Chinese are mostly located it is very convenient to the engine-houses and they can easily get aid in putting out the fires.

Q. Are the engines frequently called out for fires in the Chinese quarter?—A. Yes, sir. As a general thing the firemen are almost afraid to go into Chinese buildings on account of the way they are constructed inside. Take a room, for instance, like this, and divide it off into two rooms and have a little passage through, and little crooked hall-ways, it is almost impossible to find the way out when you get into the smoke.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the frequency of fires in Chinatown. What is the effect; are they destructive?—A. Not as a general thing. The most of the buildings in the Chinese quarter are all brick, and the fire will be confined to one building.

Q. Have there been any serious fires in Chinatown? Were the houses burned down?—A. Some frame buildings, where the fire originated in frame buildings.

Q. Have they been frequent?—A. I think as to the proportion of the fires in the quarter bounded by Pacific and Sacramento and Stockton and Kearny streets, taking that quarter, there have been more fires there than in any other one quarter in the city.

Q. Have they been more destructive?—A. No, sir; we had one fire in August more destructive than any fire we have had here, out on Browning street.

Q. Is that property in Chinatown usually insured?—A. Mostly; all the merchants insure.

Q. What rates of insurance do they pay compared with other parts of the city?—A. That I do not know; I do not know what the rates of insurance are. I know wherever there is a Chinese establishment in the neighborhood the rates of insurance are increased on all the surrounding people.

Q. Do you understand that the Chinese pay a higher rate of insurance in Chinatown than is paid in other parts of the city?—A. That I could not tell you.

Q. Have you had any information on that subject?—A. No, sir; I never inquired into it at all. I know that some of the companies in the city have canceled all their Chinese policies and refused to issue any more.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Was that quite recent?—A. Since January last.

Q. How long have you been fire-warden?—A. Something over twelve years.

Q. Have you any tabular reports as to fires and where they arise?—A. Yes, sir; my books will show.

Q. Can you bring them here and show conclusively to the commission

that there are more fires in the Chinese quarter than in any other part of the city?—A. If you will go to the trouble of going over the books.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. How many buildings have been destroyed in that quarter since the Chinese have occupied it?—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Do you remember any?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many?—A. I never estimated the number.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How many fires have been in the city within the last two months?—A. I cannot tell without looking at my record.

Q. Have there been a dozen?—A. O, yes.

Q. How many have been in the places you mention?—A. I do not remember.

Q. Have any?—A. O, yes.

Q. In what part?—A. I will furnish you with that information in the morning.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Suppose that throughout this city the inhabitants employed these oil-cans that you have described to make fires in, on window-sills and floors, and had the half-consumed brands hanging out of the door and resting on the floor, what, in your judgment, would be the effect on increasing the fires generally?—A. I think it would increase the number considerably; it could not be otherwise.

Q. You have referred to these practices. Do you consider them as dangerous to the safety of the city?—A. I consider them very dangerous indeed. They set these cans right on the floor and build the fire in them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What insurance companies do the principal business here and the insuring in Chinatown?—A. I do not know. It is confined to two or three companies.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 18, 1876.

MORRIS M. ESTEE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of California?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. A practicing lawyer and the owner of a farming property in the county of Napa?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That about describes your occupation, does it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Since your residence in California you have had an opportunity to observe the Chinese immigration among us; state, if you please, to the commission what, in your opinion, is the effect of that immigration upon our State, and such other views as you may desire to present in connection therewith.—A. I suppose the question is whether it would be advisable for Chinese immigration to come here.

Q. The question is generally upon the propriety of legislative proscription.—A. My views are, first, that the Chinese population here, and those who will come here, are injurious to the best interests of the State

and the nation, for the following reasons, and many others: First, that they do not assimilate with our people; that in any line of labor that they follow they necessarily drive out intelligent white labor, and they do that for the reason that the Chinese as a class are industrious and economical. While their habits of life are not exactly barbarous, that is the nearest that we can come to it. They live on what no white man can live upon. On my own ranch, where I have employed Chinamen in times past, they live weeks and months on nothing but rice and tea. They have no families, no children to educate or to clothe, and their style of living is so different from that of white people that they come in direct competition with the white laboring element of the country. This is so much the case that in this city now, I suppose, there are not half a dozen persons who do washing, except Chinese, because they can underbid any white person in that line.

Q. How as to cigars?—A. The same is true as to making cigars, and all those pursuits. In other words, Chinese muscle is the cheapest muscle in the world to-day, and they have got more of it. It is not an intelligent labor. By that I do not mean that they are fools by any means, but I mean that it is not labor that we would characterize as free labor. In other words, I look upon the Chinese element here, so far as its effect upon the community is concerned, just as I would look upon the admission of a large slave element here. They have no interests in the community. Every Chinaman comes here with the Chinese wall around him, and they are insensible to all our modes of life. They take no interest in public affairs. They have fine regard, I think, for the rights of property, probably as much so as any other people of their intelligence; but they have no notion of the rights of liberty, and very little of life. I mean by that, that it is not unusual in this State—was not, I know, some years ago when I was district attorney in an adjoining county—when there is a difficulty between two Chinese companies, for one to put up posters that they would give so much to have a certain Chinaman killed. In those days it was not infrequent for it to happen, but now it is not so frequent. My notion of the thing is briefly, gentlemen, that if the Government is intended as a government for men, and not as a mere money-making institution, this is a very dangerous class among us. I have estimated that in the State of California there are probably near 200,000 white male adults, and not far from 100,000 Chinese adults. In the case of any great internal strife, or foreign war, from my knowledge of the Chinese, I believe they would not know on which side they were, and would be as apt to go against us as they would be to go for us. Certainly they would take no part for the Government, as they have no interest in the Government. They possess none of the material that makes good citizens, according to my notion, except that they are industrious and economical.

Q. They hasten the material development of the country, perhaps?—A. They hasten the material development of the country, and they help a few men to make money, beyond any question; but as I look upon it, the making of money is not the highest duty of a country; it is to have an improved society of good men, and moral, elevated classes of people.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have a farm, you say?—A. I have.

Q. Do you employ Chinese?—A. I have employed some in my business.

Q. Why do you employ them?—A. I employed them, when I did,

because they were really the only class of people at that time I could get to engage in that business.

Q. What time was that?—A. I have not employed any this year. I employed Chinese last year. I think I have had one Chinaman on the place this year for a time.

Q. Why do you not employ the same number this year? Had you not the same amount of land?—A. I had.

Q. You were a presidential elector and stumped this State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the price of washing, here, a dozen?—A. I do not know that I am an expert at washing.

Q. Do you know that it is $1.50?—A. I do not know what it is.

Q. Do you not know that it is $1.50 in the Chinese wash-houses?—No; I do not think that I do.

Q. Who does your washing?—A. Mr. Thomas Lidley has done my washing.

Q. What does he charge a dozen?—A. I do not know that. My wife usually settles the wash-bills.

Q. You say that these people take no interest in public affairs. What do you mean by that?—A. I meant it in its broadest sense; that I have never yet been able to see a Chinaman who took any interest in public affairs.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Political affairs?—A. Political affairs.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have you ever met a Chinaman who had an opportunity to take any interest in public affairs in this country?—A. I have met some Chinamen who are much more intelligent than others.

Q. You have heard the testimony here, and you have heard some of our prominent men testify?—A. No, sir; I was here about an hour yesterday. I read part of the testimony taken here.

Q. Would not any class of men make good citizens, and understand what is due to citizenship, when our best citizens come before this commission and swear, under oath, that they find them an honest and fair-dealing class of men in every particular in which they have transacted business with them? Would not such a class make good citizens?—A. No, sir; not if they were Chinamen, no more than slaves would make good citizens if they were honest.

Q. Why not Chinamen?—A. Because they have nothing but muscle to give us.

Q. Then this intelligence comes from muscle?—A. No; they have not any large intelligence. They have no literature.

Q. None?—A. Not to amount to anything.

Q. Have you read of the civilization of China as taught there?—A. I know something about it. I do not think, according to my theory, that they have any literature that amounts to anything. They have very little knowledge of the sciences, and some knowledge of the arts. They have no notion of music or poetry, or very few of the exalted ideas which distinguish between barbarians and civilized men, except their honesty.

Q. Did you see a letter from Professor Wilson, who was delegated by this Government to proceed to Pekin, in China, and take the transit of Venus, in which he said that the Chinese scientists succeeded admirably in doing it with their own instruments? Did you see that communica-

tion?—A. I did not. I do not say that there are not men among them who are scientific men. I speak of them in a broad sense. I speak of the Chinese as a nation. They have not a literature. That is what I said, and I meant it.

Q. They have not a literature?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever read the teachings of Confucius and Mencius?—A. I have read the works of Confucius.

Q. What do you call that?—A. I do not call that a literature.

Q. What do such teachings as are set forth there lead to?—A. Confucius teaches a new religion to the Chinese more than anything else.

Q. How new is that religion?—A. It is a good many thousand years old. It was new at the time it was written. I do not remember the date exactly when Confucius is said to have lived; about five hundred years, I think, before Christ; about the time that Greece was in its palmiest days, I believe.

Q. You state broadly here that there is no element among them to make good citizens; that they have no element of character which would make citizens?—A. I may have said that they had no element of character to make good citizens, and I say so now, excepting one quality, namely, they are industrious and they are economical. There is no question about that; but so were the slaves industrious and obedient.

Q. Our State legislature refused to make any appropriation by which this State could be represented at the Centennial. Do you recollect that?—A. I believe they did refuse.

Q. Do you recollect that the Chinese were the first to come forward and send a check of $500 to the chairman, Mr. O'Brien?—A. I do not recollect that, but I have no doubt there are public-spirited Chinese merchants here willing to do a thing of that kind, for two reasons: first, there are some very good Chinese merchants here, and they might do it for the effect it would have on the public mind.

Q. Through policy?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That shows a considerable ingenuity in a political sense?—A. In many matters they have very considerable ingenuity.

Q. There is some reason, something behind this. Why do you not hire white men to pick your fruit? Why have you not done so?—A. As a rule, I could not get white men to do it in my neighborhood.

Q. If these people had the rights and privileges that every other immigrant to this country has, if the laws were equally just toward them as other classes, and if they had the right to enter our schools freely and be treated as well as any other class of immigrants, from what you know of the leading class of Chinese, which you say you can only speak of, do you not think that they would make good citizens?—A. American citizens—no, sir; I do not think they would. I do not think they possess the first qualification for citizenship in a republican form of government except economy and industry.

Q. Do you think that a man must be a politician to be a citizen?—A. Not at all, but he must have some permanent interest in the country, either the interest of rearing a family, building up the country, exercising the elective franchise, or the owning of property. He ought to have all those.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In view of the fact that Chinese cannot become citizens, (which they understand, and thus have no inducement to study our institutions or to become attached to them,) I ask you if you consider that the experiment has been fairly tried as to whether they would make citizens

or not?—A. They have been here, I think, about twenty-four years, and I think they have had a fair trial. I think that the Chinese, as a class, are an industrious, frugal people, but they have no interest in the country and feel none.

Q. I understand you, but this is the point on which I want your opinion: In view of the fact that they cannot become citizens under the law and must forever remain aliens here, is it surprising that they do not become attached to our institutions or pay attention to them and study them?—A. Of course that will have a marked influence, there is no doubt about it; yet at the same time the slaves in the South became attached to the country in which they lived and were born.

Q. They of course never knew any other country?—A. That is very true; they did not know any other country.

Q. Do you consider that the Chinese have mental capacity enough to understand our institutions if they should turn their attention in that direction?—A. I do not think that they are a people who either know or care about anything, so far as our experiment in California is concerned, except to come here and make some money. I do not think that they have any interest in the Government.

Q. My question was as to your observation in reference to their mental capacity?—A. I think the great mass of them here have very little knowledge of any form of government. I wish to state here that the general idea that because they may make a few characters, they can read and write, is fallacious. They make a few characters, but they do not read and write according to our theory of reading and writing.

Q. They read and write in their way?—A. They do not have much of a way; they read very little and write very little. They have characters that represent figures, &c., and they can compute them; they can add and subtract and the like of that; but as to carrying on an extensive correspondence and engaging in reading for the purpose of improving the mind, as our boys and as our people do, they do not do it.

Q. Suppose that by our law we should prohibit any other nationality, say for instance the Germans, and should not permit them to become citizens of the United States, and they were forever to be aliens, would you not expect them, under such circumstances, to live to themselves and to take very little interest in our institutions except to make money?—A. They would certainly take less than they do now; but the Germans are a very different class of people.

Q. I understand that; but I ask you what the effect would be?—A. Undoubtedly it would have that tendency.

Q. Such a condition would tend to keep them together?—A. It would tend to keep them Germans still.

Q. In manners and in society?—A. Yes; and possibly in language.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. Do you say that the Chinese are inferior to the negroes as a race of people?—A. In some respects they are, and in some respects they are far superior. They have no idea of love of country, so far as this country is concerned, and I think the negroes here are eminently superior to them.

Q. Do you think the slave had any idea of country?—A. My knowledge of the slave question is not sufficient to state. I am not prepared to answer the question. It is a mere opinion that I have.

Q. Do you think intellectually they compare as a race of people now in the country?—A. In some things the Chinamen are far superior.

Q. Intellectually?—A. Yes, sir; for instance, in their knowledge of

mathematics, I mean in adding and subtracting and those things; they understand them better; and their capacity for making money is a great deal better. The negroes of course would have much finer taste for music and for literary attainments generally. That is my idea.

Q. How do you think the negro and Chinaman contrast morally as as a race of people?—A. There is no comparison. I do not hesitate to say that the negro is vastly more moral than the Chinamen here. I have never seen a Chinese woman here who is a moral woman. I have never heard of one. There may be some; I presume there are; I do not pretend to say there are not.

Q. I am speaking more of the race?—A. Taking them as a race, I think the negroes here are more moral.

Q. Does that grow out of their natural qualities as a race or from their mixing with the whites?—A. Possibly from mixing with the whites. I am not prepared to say as to that. I spoke of it simply as an opinion.

Q. As to their frugality, to which would you give the preference, the negro or the Chinese?—A. The Chinese have grown up in penury; they have no knowledge of anything but penury; and they live on what no other human being, not even an Indian, can live upon.

Q. What would you say, then, as to their industry?—A. The Chinese, I said, are industrious.

Q. As between the two races, comparing the races?—A. My idea is that they are quite as industrious as the negroes or as the whites even. They are an industrious people.

Q. They are quite as industrious as either the whites or the negroes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think that the elevation of the negro to the franchise has injured him or the republic either?—A. I do not know about that. If you ask for a political answer, I can give it. I think it was a necessity to give the negro the franchise.

Q. Would it not be equally a necessity to give the Chinese the franchise?—A. No, sir; I think not at all. The negroes were here by millions. The Chinese are not here, and the object, I understand, is to keep them from coming here.

Q. But would not the Chinaman protect himself in that way?—A. We do not want him here to protect himself. He has nothing but muscle to give us; he has no knowledge of our institutions.

Q. I understand that he is here and that he is legislated against?—A. Here?

Q. Yes. Is there not a prejudice against them?—A. There is not any doubt about it. It is the prejudice of free, intelligent labor against unintelligent labor.

Q. What remedy would you give the Chinaman? Is there any other remedy than the ballot in a free government?—A. No; I would give him the remedy that every inhabitant has. There are a great many people here who do not want to become citizens. I know many Frenchmen in this city who have lived here for years.

Q. If excluded as a race from the ballot, what remedy has a Chinaman against partial legislation and these various attacks that are made upon him?—A. He has none, except that the General Government may guarantee him security.

Q. Could you devise any remedy for his protection before the law better than the ballot?—A. I think he is protected now, except the misfortune that now and then in our criminal element these Chinese have been attacked; but the good citizens have never even consented to any

thing of that kind, and they do not favor any attacks upon the Chinaman.

Q. But he is attacked?—A. Once in a while; yes, sir.

Q. And the law is equal to his protection, and yet it is never enforced?—A. Almost always. I have never known our judges to fail in enforcing the laws.

Q. Have you ever known your officers to fail to bring the offenders before your judges for attacks upon the Chinese?—A. I have heard that, but I do not know whether it exists now or not. I presume there are instances of attacks upon the Chinese, as there are instances of attacks upon the white people, which go unpunished; but as a rule our judiciary are more than careful of the rights of the Chinese in this city. I can say that from my personal experience.

Q. All infringement of law as against them you think is punished or attempted to be punished?—A. No, sir; I do not say all infringement of law.

Q. Is there not such a prejudice in your community against Chinamen as to cause these outbreaks and to cause partial legislation against them?—A. I know there is a prejudice against the Chinese with a certain class of people here.

Q. And that feeling of antagonism against them occasions this partial legislation?—A. Will you call my attention to the legislation you refer to?

Q. Your cubic air law for example?—A. I do not think that is partial.

Q. I only give it according to what the gentleman who drew it testified. He testified that he drew it with express reference to the Chinese. That is the only reason why I say it is partial.—A. There is no white man living who can object to that law.

Q. I was only giving you what the draughtsman of the law intended. He certainly intended it to operate that way according to his testimony, if I remember it. One or two other acts of legislation or ordinances have been brought to our attention.—A. The basket ordinance?

Q. Yes, sir; and the queue ordinance, and several others. Those are occasioned by this antagonism of race?—A. Yes, sir; I presume that they are. There are two sides to that question. The basket ordinance was almost required. It was a big nuisance to have about a dozen Chinese going along with those baskets knocking ladies or children or grown men off the side-walk. I honestly believe we would not have permitted white people right here in San Francisco to have done that thing.

Q. How is it about the queue ordinance, as it is called? Would it have been passed except for the Chinese?—A. I understand that was passed for the purpose of the punishment of criminals only.

Q. Do you think it was intended for anybody else but the Chinese?—A. There was not anybody else but the Chinese wearing queues. I understand in the penitentiary they cut a man's hair very close and make him wear a peculiar kind of garment. I never believed in the queue ordinance. I do not believe in imposing indignity on anybody, whether he is a criminal or not.

Q. The question I am proposing to you is, with these antagonisms is there any remedy for the protection of the Chinese except the ballot?—A. I think so. I think the law is an ample remedy. I have never heard of the Chinese being interfered with in the slightest degree anywhere in this State, except, possibly, now and then in San Franciso.

Q. Do I understand you to think that any class of people can live in

a republican government as a class to themselves, an alien element, with safety to the republic?—A. I say they cannot. I do not believe they can.

Q. Why may they not live in a republican government?—A. Because, according to my theory of governments, a republican government is formed and maintained by the intelligence of the people who compose it; and each citizen is or ought to be a unit forming a grand whole, and they all ought to be equals before the law.

Q. If there is a considerable number of people who are not equals before the law, do you consider that dangerous to the republic?—A. I do.

Q. I understand you to say, in your opinion it would be dangerous to the republic to incorporate the Chinese as citizens.—A. I do; because I think they would not appreciate the franchises given them.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say you do not recollect of hearing of an outrage committed on the Chinese in the State except in this city. How about the outrage at San Diego a few years ago? How about the outrage at Truckee? How about the recent outrage at Antioch?

Mr. BROOKS. And was anybody punished for any of them?

The WITNESS. Which one do you want me to commence at?

Q. (By Mr. BEE.) San Diego.—A. San Diego I know nothing about.

Q. Los Angeles?—A. That was a fight between the Chinese companies, and they killed several of their number before the whites interfered, to my personal knowledge. At Truckee there were two or three Chinamen murdered. There is not any doubt about that; but I have never considered that that was any different from murders committed where white people are parties in this State. They failed to prove a conspiracy at the trial.

Q. Were there not twenty Chinese killed at the Los Angeles outrage, and was it not proved to have been done by Mexican greasers; and was there a man punished?—A. My recollection of that affair is that the two Chinese companies there got into a very serious contest about some money matters, and then they commenced killing each other; that several were killed; and then the local authorities bagged them; and then there were others killed; I do not know how many. I know that there were Chinese killed by the whites in that fight.

Q. Twenty-three?—A. I will not say twenty-three. I know that in the commencement the Chinese commenced killing each other. If my recollection serves me rightly, there were several Chinese killed by their own people.

Q. How about the outrage at Truckee?—A. The outrage at Truckee was a murder.

Q. Was any one punished?—A. Not yet, I think. I know nothing about it.

Q. Have they not been tried and acquitted?—A. One man was tried and acquitted. I think three were indicted.

Q. Do you not know that they have all been acquitted?—A. No; but I presume if you say it is so, that is true.

Q. How about the outrage at Antioch?—A. When was that?

Q. Last spring, about the time of the commencement of the organization of these anti-cooly leagues here.—A. That had escaped my recollection. I presume there were outrages there, but I do not recollect any of the circumstances connected with them.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I would ask you whether indignities and assaults upon Chinese are not frequent in this city?—A. Too frequent.

Q. I ask you whether they are not, in fact, almost of daily occurrence here?—A. That I am not able to say.

Q. Is there any adequate punishment administered for these things?—A. Whenever the offenders are caught. I know personally that these hoodlums and other people who assault Chinese are punished almost to the extent of the law.

Q. I do not doubt but that the judges do their duty; but I ask you if these things are generally punished?—A. Almost always, when the offenders are caught.

Q. Are they generally caught, or is an attempt made to catch them?—A. I will tell you that I think generally there is an effort to apprehend them.

Q. If they were punished generally would not these ruffians cease these acts of oppression?—A. That is the weak point. The criminal element have a class of people in our midst that they can attack, and by attacking them they of course are doing an act that with a certain class of our citizens is popular. Therefore there are more frequent attacks upon Chinese than upon any other foreign element in our midst.

Q. Is there not a considerable class of people who, in fact, sympathize with these attacks upon the Chinese?—A. I do not think there is a considerable class. I think the criminal element do. I do not think that the good people of San Francisco, whether they be working-people or foreigners, have ever indorsed brutality to the Chinese, because they are objects of pity more than anything else. So far as physical attacks are concerned the Chinese are perfectly harmless; they cannot defend themselves as a rule. I do not indorse the idea at all that our people are bummers. We have a bummer element here, but the great mass of laboring people are as intelligent and as industrious and as enterprising as any like number of people in the world.

Q. I have no doubt about that; but let me ask you whether there is not among good people and industrious working-people here a strong prejudice against Chinese?—A. There is a feeling that the Chinese take their bread from the mouths of their children. Good people, workingmen, entertain that feeling beyond any question, but that has never led to any riot thus far.

Q. These people who are opposed to the Chinese have the right of suffrage, they are influential, they can be felt at the polls?—A. Every American citizen can, I suppose, whether he is native-born or not, if he is naturalized.

Q. But the Chinaman cannot represent his citizenship if he has it at the polls?—A. No, sir.

Q. As Senator Cooper asked you, if the Chinese had the right of suffrage here, do you think it would be a protection to them?—A. I do not know how high people would bid for their votes.

Q. Do you not think that there are some who now prosecute the Chinaman and persecute him who would then seek his vote and become his friend?—A. That would depend entirely upon how high any party would bid for their vote. The public opinion of this State among thoughtful men, among the laboring element also, excepting a few people who necessarily use this Chinese labor, is overwhelming against the further immigration of Chinese. I think that the public sentiment is in favor of treating those who are here kindly.

Q. Are they in favor of a total exclusion, or of limiting the number

of Chinese who come here?—A. I can only give you my impression. My impression is that the mass of the people here are in favor of limiting this immigration.

Q. Is there an apprehension existing here that they are likely to overrun the country, that there is danger of a great influx hereafter, making them to preponderate in point of numbers?—A. So far as I have been able to observe, I think there is a general apprehension that their numbers will increase from year to year here, and that the increase is dangerous to the best interests of the republic; not alone of the State, but of the republic.

Q. Has that increase kept pace, taking the last fifteen years, proportionally with the increase of white people; is the number any greater now than it was fifteen years ago, or is it less?—A. According to my view it is much more, for this reason; the Chinese are represented by the male population here almost exclusively, and I think I have estimated that there is one Chinaman now where there are two white male adults in this State.

Q. How is that?—A. That there is one Chinese male adult here to two white male adults; in other words, there are probably in this State from 175,000 to 200,000 white male adults and very nearly 100,000 Chinese male adults. I think the number of Chinese is underestimated rather than overestimated.

Q. How does that ratio compare with what it was ten or fifteen years ago?—A. I have not examined that question, but I know that the steamers which have been coming here in the last two years have been bringing more Chinese than at any other time in the history of our State.

Q. How is it with regard to white passengers?—A. The white passengers overland?

Q. Every way?—A. Since 1854 or 1855 the white immigration has not been as large as it has been in the last two or three years. That is my idea.

Q. You mean it has been larger in the last two or three years?—A. Yes, sir; it has been larger in the last two or three years than at any time since about 1854. From 1850 to 1854 it was very large.

Q. Then there was a great influx on account of the gold fever?—A. Yes, sir; that was temporary.

Q. The motive for coming to California is for other purposes than it was then?—A. Entirely so.

Q. They come now to live here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To become farmers and mechanics?—A. Yes, sir; and to make this State their home.

Q. That was not the case in the early settlement of the State?—A. No, sir; not at all. We all intended to go back.

Q. You suppose that was the case generally?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your understanding now is that the white population is increasing more rapidly than at any former period?—A. The whole population, men, women, and children.

Q. That is, that there are more families coming here?—A. Yes, sir; but when a thousand Chinese come here, there are a thousand male adults. When a thousand white people come here, there are probably two hundred or one hundred and fifty male adults.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are not two-thirds of the Chinamen who come here under age?—A. I do not think so. When you go through the streets you see once

in a while a Chinese boy, but they are comparatively few. They are all big enough to work.

DELOS LAKE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You have been how long a resident of California?—A. Twenty-six years.

Q. Your profession is the law?—A. The law.

Q. You have filled judicial positions?—A. I have.

Q. Name them, please.—A. I was judge of the fourth district court, judge of the county court, judge of the municipal criminal court, and for six years United States attorney.

Q. You know the general scope of the investigation before this congressional committee?—A. I have noticed it in the press.

Q. State, please, the point whether or not it is desirable to have legislation that shall look to the restriction of a large immigration of Chinese to this State, and give your opinion, and the reasons therefor.—A. I am of the opinion that the immigration of the Chinese should be restricted. How it is to be accomplished I have never considered. I think the unlimited immigration of the Chinese is an evil to be deplored and guarded against, if it can be done. My main reason for that is based upon what I regard as experience and history, in connection with other importations of heterogeneous people. I think one of the greatest evils we are suffering under to-day is the negroes in the country. They were imported two hundred and fifty years ago, commencing more or less under the same plea of necessity for cheaper labor than the whites. It is hardly necessary for me to refer to what has been the consequence of that, believing them to be a heterogeneous people, who have caused civil war and the other evils following.

Q. In that connection, state your views in regard to the assimilation of the Chinese or the Asiatic with our people, their adaptability to our institutions, and whether they take an interest in our political affairs or not?—A. I think the Chinese as a race are quite as repugnant to the whites and heterodox to our people as the negroes. As a social question entirely, irrespective of this temporary labor question, I should say that it was just as great an evil to have an unlimited opening for this class of persons, who in time forget their patriotism, which now leads them to desire to return to their country, and it would after a time result in forming their matrimonial connections at home, and bringing their families and children here, and increasing as other people do increase in the ordinary course of nature. I believe them to be quite as objectionable as a population as the negroes, for the reason that they cannot properly assimilate and amalgamate with the whites, so that in a generation or two they would lose their characteristics as Chinese. I repeat, that I think it would be just as objectionable and repugnant as amalgamation between the negroes and whites. Upon the question of what has been the temporary effect of this labor I am not so well prepared to speak definitely, except my observation is that those who have use for Chinese and can use them profitably will generally be found, and always will be found, so far as people in material affairs are controlled by selfish and personal motives, to be in favor of getting them. On the other hand, you will find those whose interest lies in another direction—the laboring classes, for instance—to be opposed to the Chinese, because it is an injury to their material interest. You will find a very small class, who have no interest pecuniarily one way or the other, who would form their opinions, and they might differ, uninfluenced by those selfish considera-

tions. Those are so few in the community, that perhaps their opinion would not be very controlling.

Q. One of the interrogatories propounded is, "What is the intelligent disinterested opinion in California in reference to restrictive legislation and the desirableness of this labor, excluding from your mind all who are interested either way?"—A. There can be no doubt but that there is a strong and overwhelming opinion against Chinese immigration.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to say that a population which does not assimilate would not be a desirable population?—A. I do.

Q. You think that the Chinese would not assimilate?—A. I think they would not.

Q. In what respect do you use that word? Do you use it in respect to intermarriage, physical assimilation, or do you use it in respect to the adoption of our manners and customs and institutions?—A. I use it in reference to the former, their repugnance to intermarriage.

Q. Would that sort of assimilation, intermarriage, be necessary in order to make them good citizens?—A. That is another and entirely different question. My opinion is founded upon the desirability of having any nation composed of a homogeneous people, and I will illustrate it from the history of Europe. Although entirely divided from Africa by the mere strait of the Mediterranean for fifty thousand years or more—whatever the historic period may be—they have never permitted them to invade the country, and I think they found benefit in it. We brought the negroes to this country under the plea of cheap labor, and we got a people not desirable.

Q. Might a people assimilate so far as our institutions are concerned, adopting our manners and customs, and adhering to our institutions, without physical assimilation?—A. Possibly so, but I do not think it would be desirable, for the reason that I do not think there should be any inferior class, and there would necessarily be an inferior class. I think it is not desirable to have an inferior class in any country.

Q. Suppose that they were allowed by the law to become citizens of the United States, to enjoy all our political privileges and rights, and yet that the differences of race should keep them apart physically, that there would be no intermarriage—would you call them then an inferior race?—A. I would; they would necessarily become so.

Q. They would not be inferior in a legal point of view?—A. No, sir; but they would be inferior in a social point of view, unquestionably.

Q. They are now inferior in a legal point of view?—A. In respect of their civil rights, of their elective franchise, they are, if that is to be the test.

Q. They not being allowed to become a part of the body-politic, do you consider that the experiment has been tried as to whether they would assimilate so far as manners, customs, and institutions are concerned?—A. I do not know what would be called a fair and full experiment. I do not think there has been any attempt. Things have been allowed to drift along in that respect in their own way. They have not, so far as I know, adapted themselves to our customs, and our mode and manner of living, and sleeping, or of eating. In one respect they are said to be a little superior to the majority—that is, in bathing. I have heard it so stated. How the fact is I do not know. They are said to be a cleanly people. Upon the question of how they are treated, and what power there is in the law to protect them, I might differ slightly from Mr. Estee only in degree, not as a general thing. I do not think, from ob-

servation, that any law can be administered thoroughly and rigorously which does not meet with the approbation of the body of the people. It has got to be so now that any such law will be assailed by the press, and it will be defeated not only by the general voice, out spurred on by the newspapers. You will find not only in this State, but all over the United States, according to my observation, that on any subject that is decidedly unpopular the press will intervene to prevent justice being done. For instance, take the case of a homicide, committed under such circumstances that the voice of the community is that it was provoked, that there was considerable provocation, and you will find that a jury cannot be found to convict. The people will take it up, the press will take it up, and you will hardly find a case where the law is not defeated by popular opinion. It is not confined to the Chinese, but we have here an illustration of it merely. You find, therefore, that a person committing an assault upon a Chinaman, for instance, will not be punished. A wanton assault will be likely to be punished, because a policeman can haul up the criminal before the police court, and, being a minor offense, it will be pretty severely punished; but if it comes to a conspiracy or a riot, it would be utterly impossible to punish the offender, for the reason that the people would not permit it.

Q. A conspiracy against Chinamen here, do you mean?—A. I only use it as an illustration of what would happen in any other case.

Q. In the case of any other unpopular element?—A. In any other unpopular element. I believe the community have arrived at such a state that you cannot punish a man unless it is popular to do so.

Q. State whether, in your opinion, the Chinese receive the equal protection of the laws here.—A. I do not think they do in all cases. I think they do, as a general rule, for mere assaults, wantonly, on Chinamen; but where there is a combination, as in the case of Truckee, as I understand it, a combination among laborers to assassinate Chinamen, you never can punish them in the world. I do not understand that this is exceptional either. I find the same thing in Pennsylvania. Whenever they combine to work an outrage in England as well as in Pennsylvania, and in this State, where such combinations are made, I have never known adequate punishment to be administered. The overwhelming sentiment in this State is such that it would be impossible to punish a considerable number of conspirators who had conspired and carried out their conspiracy to the commission of an outrage on the Chinese. I state that as my belief.

Q. You speak of the overwhelming sentiment of the State. Do you mean to say that the sentiment of this State is overwhelmingly against Chinese immigration?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you take all classes of people?—A. I have already stated that where a person is engaged in that kind of business where Chinese labor is a pecuniary benefit without the man's knowing it, I would not charge him with baseness on that point, but you would naturally find, I think, and generally find, that to be the case. He is in favor of getting the Chinese here because they are useful.

Q. Would that apply to the majority of farmers in this State?—A. I am not advised. I should think not; but I cannot speak from personal observation on that subject. I am inclined to think, however, that the majority of farmers do not desire Chinese labor.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You refer to small farmers?—A. Small farmers do their own work, probably, as they do in the East.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are there many Chinese servants in this city?—A. Yes, I think so, but not so many as there were formerly. I have had them in my house. I do not remember exactly what the vote of my household on the subject is, but I think rather against them, because——

Q. I will ask you if there is any sort of proscription against persons who employ Chinese here?—A. I have no knowledge of any. I have seen such references in the papers, but paid very little attention to it. I should doubt whether it was very extensive, and yet it may be, without my knowing it.

Q. I will ask you whether there are not a number of clubs in this city called anti-cooly clubs?—A. I believe so, because I have seen it so stated, and I think I have seen their proceedings reported.

Q. Do they embody a good many members?—A. I do not know how extensive they are. I had supposed that was rather a temporary organization.

Q. Is it not a part of the constitution of these societies that they will not patronize in any way persons who employ Chinese labor?—A. I do not know; I cannot answer the question.

Q. You are not informed upon that subject?—A. I cannot answer the question. I do not recollect of ever having seen it so stated, but it is very likely. There are those who know that; I do not. I have paid very little attention to the matter.

Senator SARGENT. We have in evidence certified copies of their constitution and by-laws.

The CHAIRMAN. My point was to get at the moral effect of these clubs upon society.

The WITNESS. I have not paid very much attention to the immediate view that has been taken here in regard to labor as labor has been affected as yet. I really have not taken any part in that controversy, nor have I informed myself very much about it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You left an answer incomplete. You were stating the impression in your household in reference to Chinese servants. Complete the answer.—A. I think they were young boys mostly, seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, or twenty years old, and were used as a kind of assistant to the cook, &c. I think their labor was abandoned because their words were not very good. They make an engagement and leave very unceremoniously. It was for that reason, more than anything else, I think, that their labor was finally abandoned. So far as my observation goes, they are not a truthful people. You cannot rely upon their words at all.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say that outside of those pecuniarily benefited by Chinese the sentiment is overwhelmingly against them?—A. That is my opinion, I think. I do not think I gave it as strong as that.

Q. What occupations are the Chinese engaged in throughout the State where their employers would be pecuniarily interested?—A. I really do not know where they would be profitable. They are profitable, I assume. I should be inclined to think that Mr. Hollister has some use for Chinese.

Q. Do you not know that they are used for all occupations in the State, and that it is charged by these anti-cooly people that they crowd out white labor?—A. I have heard it so charged; certainly.

Q. Then about what number of our people are engaged in these various enterprises for which they hire Chinese?—A. I do not know in what particular enterprise the Chinese would be cheaper than white labor.

Q. They are used as house-servants?—A. Somewhat; not as extensively as formerly.

Q. It has been testified here that there are about seven thousand Chinese house-servants employed in this city now. They are used in manufactories?—A. I would suppose that they are employed somewhat in manufactories, making shoes, making cigars. I think they were, and perhaps now are, employed in the woolen-mills. How is that?

Q. Yes, sir; they are largely employed in the woolen-mills. They are employed in the manufacture of cigars, boots and shoes, candles, box-making, and it is charged here several other occupations in this city are taken up by them.—A. I should suppose that they are mostly employed by large manufacturers, who are not very numerous in the State; that is, they do not compose a very large portion of the population.

Q. They have been largely engaged in building railways and reclaiming tule-lands?—A. I have understood that the Chinese were sent for as laborers, and many thousands of them employed in constructing the continental road.

Q. Have you traveled through the State much?—A. Yes, I have traveled through the State somewhat.

Q. In the interior counties?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What class of servants do they use generally in hotels and in farmers' families?—A. I do not know about farmers' families. In hotels I have seen Chinese, and along the railroads at the stations I see a good many Chinese.

Q. What occupations are the Chinese not engaged in?—A. I cannot say.

Q. Do you know of any?—A. There are no lawyers among them, I believe; there are no editors.

Mr. PIPER. Preachers?

Mr. BEE. Plenty of them.

(To the witness.) These are the only classes you can think of. Then what portion of the State do you understand is overwhelmingly opposed to the Chinese? The classes you refer to as so overwhelmingly opposed to them are those who do not employ them, who are not benefited by them, and who do not make money out of them.

The WITNESS. I think so.

IRVING M. SCOTT sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you been a resident of this State?—Answer. Sixteen years.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. Founderyman and manufacturer.

Q. With what firm are you connected?—A. Preston, Scott & Co.

Q. You know the subject-matter of this investigation generally. State what your experience has been with the labor-interest here, as to the business in which you are engaged, with reference to white men as employés, and boys, together with such views as you may have upon the labor-league and questions in that direction.—A. We have been employing, for sixteen years, a large number of men in the manufacture of iron goods. It has been exclusively confined to white labor. We have also employed a very large proportion of boys. We have also, in our experience, had the only battle with the International Molders' Union or Labor League that has occurred on this coast. We found no difi-

culty in suppressing that league whenever we told them frankly and squarely what we would do and what we would not do. Their demands were generally small at the start, they did not amount to much; but the first concession was followed by another small demand, and the aggregate of their demands, in the end, seriously affected the business, so that it was necessary to take a position one way or the other. We took a position against them, and had no trouble, at the end of six weeks, in destroying the league. We have had no difficulty in obtaining labor to do our work, whether skilled or with unskilled laborers.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are you a founderyman?—A. Yes, sir; we carry on all the branches. We employ 520 men and boys. They have their proportion of labor divided into six distinct classes of work—blacksmiths, boiler-makers, molders, machinists, pattern-makers, and draughtsmen—all organized, making a complete institution. With the boys from the public schools, seventeen years of age, we have had a very gratifying experience. We have never less than sixty learning their trades. We think with those boys we can meet the question of cheap labor in any shape, form, or way that they may choose to make it, and meet it intelligently, and make a good citizen of the boy, teach him a trade, so as to be self-dependent, a producer, and carry on a large enterprise, possibly. When a boy comes there he comes for four years—from seventeen to twenty-one. We pay four dollars a week for the first year, six dollars for the second, eight dollars for the third, and ten dollars for the fourth. After that whatever he is worth is his wages. We have a written agreement which shows that we propose to take a boy for four years, and give him a trade and instruct him; and he agrees to stay with us the four years. We have never found it necessary to use any other means. We appeal to the common sense of the boy. If he is a bad boy, we do not want him. If he is a good boy, he wants to stay; and the proportion of boys that we have to let go is very small.

Q. Is that about the time required to become master of the trade?—A. Yes, sir. They take one of these branches, either blacksmith, boiler-maker, molder, machinist, pattern-maker, or draughtsman in four years. Our experience in sixteen years has been that the boys of seventeen from our ordinary public schools leave at the same position at the age of twenty-one as the boys that we have occasionally taken in on account of the necessity of their parents from twelve, thirteen, and fourteen years; that is, that the schooling prior to seventeen is of more advantage to them than the trade. We have never found any difficulty in adjusting the prices of labor to meet the conditions under which we had to manufacture, that is, competition from any section of the country, and we labor under three distinct disadvantages here. We do not produce a pound of pig-iron in our State; we do not mine a pound of coal, except for fuel purposes; we do not produce a pound of hard wood in this State; it is all imported.

Q. You produce no hard wood at all?—A. There is none in the market except some little scrub-oak or live-oak. Plank of considerable size is brought from the East.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Give the commission, if you please, an opinion as to whether other trades similarly circumstanced, had they adopted the same rule as you, might have developed the industries of this State without Chinese aid?—A. I am of the opinion that they could do so. I think that the trouble with white laborers, using them in large quantities, arises more from the

temperament of the man in charge than it does from the fact of the labor. We have but one man that I call to mind in all of our men employed who is addicted to strong drink, or is irregular on account of it. He is a man of such good conditions otherwise that we keep him; but, as a rule, every man is steady. When we have to reduce the labor we give the steady men the preference. I think that the boys will fill any bill of cheap labor intelligently handled.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about your treatment of boys and your success. When they have graduated, so to speak, that is to say, when they have served four years and got their trades, do they continue with you or do you rely upon boys, getting new ones?—A. As a rule the demand upon our business has been so much as to employ every boy worthy of employment.

Q. Do you employ them as men after they have learned their trades?—A. Yes, sir. The first six months after they have served their time we generally pay them $2.50 a day, after that we generally pay them what they are worth. We have some men that we pay $4 a day, but those are old men, the exceptions. Our oldest average about $3.

Q. What is your whole number of employés?—A. About 520.

Q. How many of them are boys?—A. There are at present sixty boys learning their trades.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What is the intelligent public opinion among disinterested people upon this subject; I do not mean those now who are making money or advancing their material interests, but the general intelligent public opinion of the State of California upon the necessity or propriety of legislation restricting the immigration of Chinese?—A. So far as I have had any conversation or observation there seems to be among the laboring classes a very strong feeling that the immigration of the Chinese should be restricted. It seems to arise principally from the fact that while a white laborer settles here with his family and they trade one with another, the Chinese are exclusive and retire within themselves to trade after they have learned to carry on business. That seems to be the principal reason why the white laboring classes wish this restriction, fearing that in the end they will be deprived of all means and avenues of labor. My experience of the people uninterested either one way or the other has been—and I believe it is the unanimous opinion—that white population is superior to Chinese population and more desirable, for the reason that they make their families and homes among us and become part of us.

EDWARD D. WHEELER sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of California?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. A lawyer by profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. At present filling the district bench of the nineteenth district court?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. We have in our State some sixteen or seventeen district courts. It is a *nisi prius* common-law court, next in rank to the supreme bench. You are aware of the general field of discussion upon the Chinese question, and upon the point whether it is desirable to have legislation looking to the restriction of Chinese immigration to this State. State to the commission, if you please, any views you may have on that subject.—A. So far as any details may go I am not very thoroughly prepared to

speak, as I am satisfied that a great many other men have given the matter more consideration and are better prepared to give accurate information. I am aware that the question of the probable immigration of Chinese has occupied a very prominent place in the public mind for the last year or two, and from what I can gather from reading and from conversation with my fellow-citizens I have reached the conclusion, upon which I have no doubt, that the public sentiment of the State is in favor of legislation upon that subject. I think that public opinion probably favors a restricted immigration in preference to an absolute and total exclusion of Chinese coming to this coast hereafter.

Q. What is your opinion as to the desirableness of the Chinese, looking to the future political and moral condition of our State, and state whether you think they can assimilate with us, become homogeneous with our population, and eventually become good American citizens?—A. The principal, and I might say my only objection to the immigration of the Chinese is that I think they never will assimilate with our population here; the matter has been decided in the course of a quarter of a century; they have been in this country more or less during that time; they still, to all appearance, retain their peculiar costume, and follow their original national habits in matters of food and mode of living. Judging from that experience I am disposed to think, and do think, that they never will assimilate; there is no such thing known as social interchange between the Chinese and the white population, as far as I have observed.

Q. Under our present law they cannot become citizens?—A. I am told they cannot. I have never had any application so far for Chinese naturalization; they do not seem so far to be a people who are politically ambitious.

Q. In the administration of justice, so far as you observe in your court or in the courts of your associates, do the Chinese have fair treatment under the law?—A. If I may speak of the district courts of the State, I think both in civil and criminal cases the Chinamen are fully protected. I think they have as fair a hearing and as fair a show in the courts as white men.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Mr. Clarke gave your name as a witness having different views from those you have expressed in your testimony; would you say he was in error?—A. What Mr. Clarke was that?

Q. H. W. K. Clarke.—A. I do not recollect any conversation with Mr. Clarke, but if he says I did have any conversation with him it is undoubtedly true. I suppose if it was any at all, it was a street conversation. I am often stopped on the street and interrogated on these matters, and frequently, to dispose of a long street discussion, perhaps I will give an apparent assent to what a man is saying. I do not remember to have expressed any views to Mr. Clarke contrary to what I entertain.

Q. The views which you express now have been your views all along?—A. Those have been my views for the last year or two. I have never felt anything like animosity toward Chinamen, and have always been in favor of their being fully protected against assault and against any invasion of their rights here. I am in favor of that now to the fullest extent. If I can be said to occupy what is called an anti-Chinese position, it is solely with reference to the effect that their immigration would have upon our social system hereafter.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You spoke about the Chinese population, that it would not assimilate with ours. Do you refer to the adoption of our manners and customs and attachment to our institutions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you consider that that question has been or can be fairly tried so long as our laws prohibit them from becoming citizens?—A. That is a mere matter of opinion, but probably the withholding from them the right of suffrage may operate as a discouragement to any attempt on their part to assimilate in full.

Q. I will ask you whether the fact that they must remain aliens and can never become a part of our people under the law does not have the effect, or would not have the effect, to keep them to themselves?—A. I think that to a certain extent it would.

Q. Would it have the effect to discourage them or prevent them from studying our institutions?—A. I think it would have that effect to a certain extent.

Q. Suppose there was any class of white immigrants who were placed under the same disabilities and could never become a part of our people, would you expect them to become interested in politics and to become a part of our people, socially or in business, or would it have the effect to keep them to themselves?—A. I think it would have that effect to a certain extent, excluding any class from the right of suffrage, but I might say here, take the negro before he was given the ballot in this State, and he showed no such disinclination to assimilate with our white people as the Chinese have always shown, although the negro was not a voter.

Q. The negro was born here, was he not; he never knew any other country or civilization but our own?—A. The most of them did not.

Q. Except those who were imported a great while ago?—A. Most of them were in that condition.

Q. They never knew any other country or civilization except our own, so that their circumstances would be different from that of the Chinamen?—A. Yes, sir; somewhat.

Q. You spoke about a sentiment being here in favor of limiting Chinese immigration.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you think that desirable yourself?—A. I would, most decidedly.

Q. If it is desirable to limit it, why would it not be desirable to prohibit it entirely?—A. For the reason that a limited number of Chinese in this State can be easily managed or controlled; there is no danger of their becoming a turbulent and defiant element. Up to this time we have had no trouble in that respect. I regard them as a peaceable and quiet class of people as a rule, but my fear has been that if there was no restriction upon the immigration inside of the next twenty-five years, we probably, instead of having a hundred thousand, would have a million of them; and I think then, from the experience of other communities, that they would become a very troublesome and dangerous element.

Q. Then your opinion as to the propriety of limiting the immigration grows out of the apprehension of a greater influx hereafter?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say that the number who are here now is not difficult to control?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have had no difficulty up to this time?—A. No, sir; and I think that the sentiment among all thinking men and among all good

citizens is nearly unanimous in favor of protecting those who are here and declining to interfere with them in any manner.

Q. So long as the number of Chinamen here bears the same proportion to the number of white people that it does now, would you think the number too great?—A. I would not think it too great so far as any interference with our social or governmental affairs is concerned. Of course, taking the number who are now present, great complaints come from certain classes of people; from the laboring classes chiefly. Of course about anything touching those details I am not prepared to speak.

Q. Do you think the number is too great now when you take into view the territory of the State, its necessity for development and the amount of labor to be performed? State whether or not in your judgment the number is too great now.—A. No; I do not think we have anything of a mischievous character particularly to apprehend from the number that is here now; and if this percentage were maintained, which I suppose perhaps now is one-sixth or one-seventh of our population, I think that no very serious apprehensions need be entertained.

Q. State whether or not this percentage has increased in the last fifteen years?—A. I think it has very materially increased in the last five years. I am not a statistician and, of course, do not speak from figures, but I think that within the last five years the increase has been very marked.

Q. In view of this want of assimilation and all the other reasons that operate upon your mind, why would it not be a good thing to cut off this immigration entirely? If it is a bad element for our country, why not eliminate it entirely and cut it off in the future?—A. I think that a small percentage of Chinamen here is desirable.

Q. Why so?—A. I think that there is a scarcity of domestic servants in this country, and particularly I think that is the case in the rural districts. A man traveling through this State in a stage, going to small towns and even to farm-houses, will very generally find Chinese domestics. At least that has been my observation, but my travel has not been very extensive. A great many people residing in the country have told me that it was impossible to procure family help from the city, from the large centers of population, that would consent to remain on isolated country ranches. For that reason, I think that a limited number of Chinese would not be objectionable.

Q. Would you maintain that percentage at about what it is now, or would you diminish it or increase it?—A. I am certain I would not increase it.

Q. But for the apprehension of this great influx, would you interfere with Chinese immigration at all by legislation?—A. No, sir. If I had the control of it I would not interfere with it but for that apprehension. I think that one of two results is inevitable, however: that we will either have a large non-voting population, which will not assimilate, and which will in time be troublesome and turbulent and riotous, or, if you give them the ballot, in ten years from now we will have a Chinaman for governor. There is no doubt of that; for the percentage of adult males in that population, of course, is very much greater than it is among the white population. While I am not accustomed to being alarmed about these things, within the last two years, of my own notion and from reading and from what I have seen, I have very serious apprehensions of the effect of this immense immigration upon our American civilization, and particularly upon this coast. I feel that, and I feel it deeply and earnestly.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. If any class of whites were excluded from the privilege of becoming naturalized citizens, would they not show an ambition for it and make a clamor for it?—A. I think they would. I remarked at the beginning of my evidence that the Chinese have never shown any political ambition particularly, and not much disposition to meddle with our governmental affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What proportion of those Chinese do you think would avail themselves of the opportunity of becoming naturalized, if the door were opened to them by our naturalization-laws?—A. I think if the naturalization-laws were open to them they would all become naturalized. I think they run rather in droves and herds, and if the thing was started I believe they would all become naturalized, probably upon the idea that it might give them some more protection than they think they enjoy at present.

Q. Have you seen any indications of a turbulent or riotous character among Chinamen?—A. No, sir.

Q. That is not their disposition?—A. So far as our experience has gone with them, in their deportment toward the white population, they are very quiet. I think their scenes of turbulence or riot, whatever they are, are generally among themselves.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. As I understand you, you do not regard them as a healthy element in our body-politic?—A. No, sir; I would not.

Q. Even if they were to be enfranchised?—A. No, sir; I should consider that the worst of evils. I should consider it an evil any way.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What effect upon the immigration of white families from the East would it have if those who come to stay in the interior upon farms could have no domestic servants?—A. I should presume that in the middle and higher classes it would be an objection.

Q. It would prevent them from coming?—A. It probably would have that tendency.

JOHN RODGERS sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. What position do you hold under the Government of the United States?—Answer. I am a rear-admiral in the Navy.

Q. You are now in active service?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To what station assigned?—A. Mare Island.

Q. You are commandant of that yard?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you had an observation of Chinese in China and in the islands adjacent thereto, and in this country, to some extent?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been in this State?—A. A little over three years.

Q. You have prepared, I believe, a statement containing some views?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You can read that as your statement if you desire.—A. I suppose I was, in all, three years in China. I was twice there. I got what information I could in China, and of course as commanding a vessel, a man-of-war, I had very good opportunities of learning what intelligent people said of the Chinese.

Q. Were you at any time, while commanding an American vessel or squadron there, called upon to send your marines ashore on account of *emeutes?*—A. From some cause or other they had very few troops at Singapore, in 1853, and in India, generally, the proportion of Europeans is very small. They apprehended, in Singapore, that the Chinese would rise then in 1853, and I was waited upon by a deputation to send my marines on shore to meet eventualities. There were intelligent Chinese there who had influence over their countrymen, and who had prospered exceedingly under English rule. They were very strongly in favor of law and order, and in favor of English supremacy, and they used all their influence to dissuade their countrymen from violence, and eventually it passed off. In Java, where there is a very large population, the Dutch are comparatively few. The Chinese and Javanese of course are many. There are about 13,000,000 inhabitants in the island of Java. In 1853 they said it was 10,000,000. The Dutch government creates antipathy between the Chinese and Javanese purposely, so that they may hold one another in check; but it is said that the Chinese there are unquiet and not to be kept in order; that except for apprehension they would take the government to themselves. Father Huc was a Catholic missionary who traveled in Tartary, and he represents the Chinese as exceedingly aggressive politically, overcoming the more peaceful Mongols, and using the arts of a superior race, industry, thrift, foresight, shrewdness, in weeding out the Mongols and gradually usurping their country, getting in a finger and then introducing the hand and eventually turning out the Mongols. The voyages of Father Huc are published, and this account may be easily found. If you will permit me I will read the statement which I have prepared, and afterward I shall be very happy to answer any question which the commission may propound.

The question of the presence of the Chinese in California is not to be regarded as simply a question of the relative advantages of cheap labor, as contrasted with the advantages of dear labor.

It contains that, but it contains more. The various interests of capital and of labor will be advocated on one side or the other, depending upon whether the speaker has to buy labor or to sell it. The contest between labor and capital was deplored in Judea; it convulsed ancient Rome; it agitates Europe; it causes riots in the United States. No sufficient answer has yet been given to this question, but there is another aspect of the case, in which the solution is easier.

No country can attain secure prosperity, except its prosperity be founded upon a population identical in its interests with those of its rulers.

In France, before the revolution, difference of classes weighed heavily upon the peasantry, who, taxed heavily, were ineligible to offices of trust or of honor, and because of this came the revolution, with all its horrors. The revolution, by opening the road for talent wherever found, identified the interests of Frenchmen; and the changes of government have since been bloodless because the people were of one race.

In the Southern States it was found injurious to have the laboring class of a different race from the capitalists. That war, by destroying the conditions under which labor had lived, changed everything, and went far in its results to destroy capital.

France was recently invaded; and while the war lasted things were changed in the places occupied by hostile armies; but as the war passed away so did the effects of the war. The master re-occupied his old chateau, and the peasant cultivated the field as of old on the same old

terms. His interests, his feelings, his habits of thinking, had suffered no change.

Where the races occupying the soil belong to different ethnological divisions, war leaves very different traces. In the first case the path of war leaves no trace in altered social relations. In the second case everything is changed. The servant aspires to be master. The laborer, emancipated from the rules which bound him, seeks other occupation, and foresight is at a loss to divine the future.

China, with her poor, her thrifty, her intelligent, educated, and very industrious population, is able and ready to send men to fill all California's demand for labor. After a short apprenticeship the Chinese can well and cheaply manufacture all our goods, run all our machines, sow and reap all our fields, supply the places of all our domestic servants. They can supplant, by their cheap labor, the more expensive American or European workman in every branch of industry. The effect of this will be to build up a state of society such as existed in the Southern States before the rebellion. This condition would be profitable for the master while it lasted, but it would be insecure; and there would some day be a terrible awakening to the fact that an alien race occupied all the places of labor, and that we had a class of population which could neither be sent away nor kept.

I repeat my belief, that there can be no secure prosperity where the operative and the capitalist are not of the same race.

I do not know the price now, but a few years ago a Chinese was brought from China by steamer, and well found in food (according to his own belief) for $40. Passage by emigrant-cars from the Eastern States costs more than this.

In Java, in Singapore, and in Tartary the Chinese are unquiet, and occasionally they inspire alarm. In Tartary, it is said by the traveler M. Huc, a Catholic missionary, they are very aggressive toward the populations of Mongolia.

Possessed with an idea that their own civilization, as it is oldest is also best, and that their own manners are more refined than ours, and their laws more perfect; clannish, and indifferent to life; such a people will not rest under foreign rule longer than they think they are obliged to do so.

The Chinese can come to California more cheaply, and, according to his standard, more commodiously, than the American or European immigrant, and when here he can supplant him.

When, in the far future, disorder shall arise, and the Chinese seek to overthrow the American task-master, few will pity the capitalist, and, least of all, the supplanted laborer.

If some great cotton-lord in England should say to his workmen, "You ask too much wages; you live too expensively; you drink beer and you eat beef. I will import Hindoos, who eat only rice, who never get drunk, and whose fingers are more dexterous than yours;" none of us would sympathize with him. He would be unwise; for if he persisted in his course it would lead to riots, if not to revolution.

In a new State like California most of the white race are in some sort capitalists, and cheap labor is a boon to them not to be entirely rejected. Some branches of industry could not be carried on without it, and therefore, as no absolutely perfect thing can be attained, and all life is a compromise, in the Chinese question there should be a compromise, neither absolutely rejecting the Chinese, nor granting to them the unlimited right of coming to our shores.

A certain number annually might be allowed to come, so that when

from these are subtracted those who return, there would remain no inordinate increase.

By a verbal rule of interpretation to the Burlingame treaty, it might be considered that as the right of travel and residence only is mentioned in that instrument, the right of hand-labor is not included. Indeed, the rights given and conferred by the treaty are not reciprocal. In some European countries only the people of a parish can work at a trade. The right to hand-labor and to parochial help are restricted and do not follow citizenship. Even less are they allowed to aliens.

Thus, the right of residence and travel does not carry the right to exercise a manual trade.

In the United States this right to work is conceded, but, as far as I know, it is not involved necessarily in any treaty, and may be restrained or denied to aliens at the pleasure of the Government.

No foreigner in China can compete with Chinese labor. The foreign merchant employs only Chinese workmen under the direction of Chinese or foreign superintendents, paying much higher wages to the laborer than a Chinese employer would give for the same service. The servants in European houses in that country are Chinese, and they are paid nearly twice as much as a Chinese would pay them.

The American in China does no hand-work. When he employs Chinese workmen he pays double wages to them. So far from driving them out, he creates new occupations for them, and gives them what the country considers exorbitant compensation.

Thus, the rights and advantages of emigration with labor from one country to the other are not reciprocal.

The Burlingame treaty was not readily accepted in China. Some of the returned Chinese must have acquired abroad ideas inconvenient to a stationary government like their own.

It is not probable that the right of the United States to regulate labor immigration would be denied. With this right conceded or assumed, any proper number, say two thousand or three thousand, immigrant tickets for laborers, properly engraved to prevent falsification, could be sent to the American minister, to be by him distributed to our consuls in that country; the consul to send a manifest, with name and number of each individual immigrant; these tickets to be collected and turned over to the custom-house authorities upon the arrival of the vessel here. The tickets would probably be sold by the consul's agent in China for distribution; but, while this would be wrong, it would not, perhaps, be otherwise objectionable, since an enhancement of the price of tickets would probably secure a better class of immigrants.

If desirable, a separate class of tickets, not restricted in number, might be issued, for officials or other persons to travel in this country, but to be granted only by our minister at Peking.

Our blue flannel and woolen stockings are made in California better than can be made for the same price elsewhere in the United States.

If Chinese labor comes here without restraint, no reason is apparent why the success in these articles might not attend other similar productions, and California thus become the great manufacturing center of the United States, and ultimately starve the operatives of our eastern cities or drive them to Asiatic wages and conditions of life. Americans thus reduced would be unfit for the elective franchise, and hence would arise domestic political complications.

Q. In that last view you have reference to the prosperity of the whole country. You treat it not merely as a local question?—A. The whole

United States is interested in this Chinese question. It is the grand question between Asiatic labor and American labor.

Q. If the effect of unlimited Chinese industry here is to destroy the opportunity of production in the East, then it becomes a question very important to the East?—A. Massachusetts is interested in it, whether the Chinaman is upon her soil or upon ours. If we can introduce Asiatic labor here we can manufacture more cheaply than any other part of the United States, and consequently with unlimited help this must become the great manufacturing center of the United States. From its proximity, of course, they could get the articles in Massachusetts.

Q. What is the difference to Massachusetts under that state of things whether this manufacturing is done here or in China?—A. There is the duty.

Q. What is the difference in effect if the effect is to stop their manufacturing? Is it any difference to them whether the manufacturing is done here by Chinamen or done in China by Chinamen? Is not the duty in both cases against them, in that the Chinamen who manufactured here would not have to pay it?—A. Undoubtedly; their own people introduced into the United States could manufacture in the United States, and their manufactures would not be subject to duty, of course.

Q. Have you any other views that you wish to express in reference to this matter?—A. No; I have said everything I desired upon the question.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do I understand you to say that if the free importation or immigration of Chinese were allowed here we might from this port supply the ports of China with cotton fabrics?—A. Decidedly; they already send from Massachusetts, and they will more cheaply send from California.

Q. Could we not entirely compete with the English in that respect by manufactures here?—A. We could compete with the English, I fancy, with unlimited competition by Chinese labor.

Q. Is it not the fact that the competition between the domestic cotton manufactures which are exported to China is nearly equal in New England and Old England?—A. I am not a merchant and cannot answer by the book, but I have seen in the papers that considerable quantities of cotton have been carried from Massachusetts to England and sold to advantage.

Q. So that if we could reduce the cost of manufacturing here, with the advantages of ocean traffic in our favor, we might hope to obtain the whole of that trade?—A. I think so.

Q. The whole supply of the East?—A. I think so. I think with Asiatic labor, directed by American intelligence, this would become the manufacturing center ultimately of the United States.

Q. Do you not think, also, that it would become the center of exchanges of the eastern trade? The eastern trade is in favor of the Chinese always, is it not? A large amount of bullion has to be sent there?—A. So I believe.

Q. Under those circumstances would it not go from California?—A. Eventually. Bullion goes from where the bullion is made, of course.

Q. It would be sent from here instead of being sent to England and all the way around?—A. Possibly; I suppose so. The shipment of bullion is not very expensive, as it is not heavy compared with its value.

Q. There is great risk in the cost of insurance?—A. I suppose it is less than on silks or on cotton.

Q. Do you not think that it would cost considerably less to send silver from here to Canton direct, than to send it from here to England, and thence around to Canton?—A. I think it would.

Q. And that, of course, would give us the advantage and make this the center of exchange?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. We would have that advantage by virtue of our production of bullion, would we not?—A. I suppose so.

Q. Are the Chinese much engaged in the production of bullion to your knowledge?—A. I have read a great deal of that, but I have not read much in regard to mines of precious metals.

Q. Our bullion products, the Nevada mines, are carried on here by white labor?—A. I think so.

Q. The mines are prospected, and all that, by cheap labor? I own a little quicksilver stock, and they explore the mines by Chinese labor.—A. Perhaps that is so.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You have been a long time in the Navy. Was it not an isolated case when you were called upon at Singapore?—A. I was never called upon before. I know the Chinese were unquiet in Hong-Kong, where they have an English garrison and English men-of-war.

Q. Have you never been called on in Panama to put down unquietness?—A. No.

Q. The Navy has?—A. The Navy has, but I was never ordered to do it.

Q. How long has this been going on in Java?—A. Very long in Java, some hundreds of years; but about Singapore I cannot answer.

Q. Do you not think, from your knowledge of the American character, that there is a sufficient number of Americans on the island of Java to take possession of that country? Would they do it or not under like circumstances?—A. As to number they are very few. An American cannot work in the island of Java; he must needs have horses and employ them. In India the English are only one to a great many Hindoos. The English are a mere handful there.

Q. Take any other country where the Americans become populous, would they not be very apt to take possession of it under like circumstances?—A. Do you mean to ask if the Americans are an aggressive race?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. Undoubtedly they are.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to express an apprehension, if I may call it that, that the importation of Chinese or Asiatic labor on this coast may be such as to make it a manufacturing center, and thus injure Massachusetts and the East?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you seen any evidence of that danger?—A. I see now that the manufacturers here supply flannel to the Navy, and woolen socks, against eastern competition; and, I believe, Army blankets, also. There is the finger in, and it has only been going on a few years.

Q. Do you regard their ability to supply these articles upon this coast as the result of Chinese labor?—A. Undoubtedly. A Chinaman is clever, astute, and possesses all the advantage of a good workman. He comes here single, and even if married his expenses would be a very

small portion compared with the expenses of an American citizen. The Chinaman does not get drunk, and he can work on Monday as well as on any other day of the week.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. On Sunday?—A. It is said that the American workman cannot always work on Monday, the day after Sunday, but the Chinese work as well on Monday as on any other day of the week. As to miscegenation, the intermingling with the people, Agassiz has written the result of his observations in Brazil. The Spaniards and Portuguese are the most mixed race in Europe, and they are, politically, behind the other races; and the intermingling of different ethnological divisions is an injury.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Then state whether, in your judgment, you regard it as good or bad for this coast to be able to furnish the things to the market, blankets, &c., that you speak of. Is it fortunate or unfortunate?—A. It is both. It is fortunate for the capitalists in the sale of the goods, and it is unfortunate for the man who will live here one hundred years hence. It tends upon the old question. If there had been no Chinese this State would have grown up with a white population exclusively. From the immense amount of mineral wealth it would have grown exceptionally fast, owing to the great abundance of gold and silver. But then when you add on this other element of cheap labor, which is a danger as well as an advantage, the growth here has been unprecedented. There has been nothing like it elsewhere. This State is only twenty-five years old, and look at the vast works which have been accomplished in California. Look at the prosperity and wealth which are everywhere about us. There is nothing like it anywhere else. It is very convenient, but it is also very dangerous. It is very pleasant, but it is full of danger.

Q. Then, admiral, I want to get precisely at your meaning. You regard the growth of manufactories here which depend upon Chinese labor for their development, a success; in an economic point of view, as bad?—A. It is mixed; it is bad and good. If you had to sell your labor you would consider it bad; if you want to buy a pair of shoes you consider it good.

Q. Which do you think predominates, taken in its broad view—A. I think the growth is not as healthy as it would be with a pure white population.

Q. You regard that growth, then, only as healthy and beneficial in the long run which is the result of white labor on this coast?—A. I should say that the race ought to be a pure race. The Chinese would be injured, I suspect, by miscegenation with Europeans. As far as the people in China have been trying the experiment with other races, we find that where the white race mingles with a different color it is a deterioration.

Q. There has been no intermingling physically, has there, between the Chinese and white race?—A. As far as I know, not to any extent. I saw an account the other day of a white girl marrying a Chinaman; but that is quite an exceptional thing.

Q. How much of the growth of this State do you think has resulted from Chinese labor; what proportion of its development?—A. It is impossible to say. A gentleman has 75,000 acres of ground, and he cultivates it, and he uses largely Chinese labor. He has great crops of fruit, which he brings in with Chinese help. He would not have planted the trees without Chinese labor; he could not cultivate such large fields

without Chinese. No doubt Chinese labor has developed the industry of this State to an enormous extent. But sometimes a man climbs up by a ladder to a certain height, and then he finds it convenient to kick it away. Now, while I would not absolutely kick the ladder away, I would not climb any higher. I would not increase the Chinese immigration. It should be limited to some number of which you gentlemen are very much more capable than I of judging; but it should not be left unlimited. I would not turn away the Chinese; I would protect them and give them security, as much security as the white man, except the vote. I would not give him that. I do not think it desirable that a mixed race should be enfranchised. In the Southern States it was unavoidable; it arose out of necessities over which we had no control. Here the question is submitted to our volition.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long do you think it would take to develop this experiment; that is, how long in view of the past increase of this people could we stand such a state of affairs as a large immigration of Chinese or as large as we have had in proportion?—A. That depends. No man except a prophet could answer the question. In case of war or invasion the Chinese, I presume, would go where they thought it was their interest to go; but whether that would point one way or another, no one can tell.

Q. We have had them among us for twenty-five years?—A. I presume so.

Q. What serious evil do you discover against civilization from their presence here for twenty-five years?—A. I think the growth of California has been stimulated excessively by Chinese labor. If it would arrive to the same condition without Chinese labor it would not be quite so pleasant to the white man, for the white man gets drunk and strikes. It would not be so pleasant, but it would be more healthy.

Q. We would not be so far advanced?—A. Not nearly so far advanced.

Q. What is the condition of the laboring classes here generally, that is, financially speaking?—A. I suspect that a great many of them employ Chinese labor.

Q. Do not the working classes of the whites usually have their own homes?—A. There are so many gentlemen who live in the city and who can tell you so much more accurately, that really my opinions are not valuable.

Q. You have read of large deposits in the savings-banks? The estimates have been made that there are larger deposits made here than in any other State in the Union?—A. I know very little about that.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to say that you think the growth of California has been greatly stimulated by Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think we have got to that point here now that we can get along well without the Chinese?—A. No, sir; if you sent them away you would ruin a great many people. The man who now sells his orchard of fruit to a Chinaman, who picks it and sends it to market, and dries it, you would ruin him if you should send the Chinese away.

Q. Do you think we have had too many Chinese up to this point?—A. I will not say whether we have had too many or not. I do not know. I do not think, however, that the growth has been as healthy as if they had not been here. California would not be where it is without the Chinese

labor, and if you would send the Chinese away you would ruin a great many people, and I think it would be unfair. A gentleman starts in and cultivates an enormous quantity of land, this labor being here, and you would ruin him. Without increasing the number of Chinese from this point, let there be white development.

Q. Would you keep the proportion of the Chinese to the white people about what it is now, or would you diminish the number of Chinese hereafter?—A. I would not have any proportion. I would keep the Chinese about the same number, and let the whites fill up the rest. Of course then the proportions would be considerably lessened.

Q. In that way you would diminish the proportion hereafter?—A. Let white labor come in, and let a small number each year, say two or three thousand Chinese, which would not more than supply the country, also come in. You gentlemen would know what number to fix much better than I.

Q. If you were to confine the number to two or three thousand a year, in a few years you would have very few here.—A. I think that would be an advantage. I am an American, and go in for my own race.

Q. Where do the Chinese come from who are here?—A. I believe from Hong-Kong principally. I have not heard of them coming from other places. The different parts of China speak a very different language. The written character is everywhere the same; but a man reading a sentence, or talking, cannot be understood by those who speak another dialect. It is like a sum, to explain it. Give a sum in the arithmetic—twice two are four, &c., or the multiplication-table. They would pronounce it differently, and would not understand it when it was pronounced by another; but when put down in figures, all of them understand it. They all have the same character for horse, but they call it by different names, as the different nations of Europe call it differently.

Q. As a naval officer, you have paid a little attention to international law?—A. I have paid a little attention to it.

Q. You have also a knowledge of the general character of our treaties?—A. I have read them.

Q. If we were to legislate and interfere so as to limit the number of Chinamen that might come here, say from the port of Hong-Kong, would that require a revision of our treaty-relations with England?—A. I think not; I think that no Englishman, so far as I know, has an absolute right to have anything to do with it. At least in Massachusetts, and doubtless in other States, we prevent paupers from coming. In England, some time ago, an Englishman was not at liberty to go to any part of England where he pleased to work. The right to labor and the right of residence are not the same. An Englishmen could only go where he claimed his parochial residence, and when an Englishman attempted to make shoes in a town where he was not entitled to go upon the parish, they took legal steps against him. Our mechanics cannot go as of right and work in Germany and take the bread out of German mouths.

Rev. SAMUEL V. BLAKESLEE sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. What is your profession?—Answer. It is an orthodox Congregational minister, acting now as the editor of The Pacific, the oldest religious paper on the coast—established for twenty years.

Q. How long have you resided in the State?—A. Most of the time since 1849.

Q. Have you also exercised the profession of minister?—A. I have.

Q. You are of regular standing in that church?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do your duties call you to travel much in the State?—A. Constantly. I travel about 7,000 miles a year, through all parts of the coast.

Q. What is your opinion, from your travels and your residence in this State, of the moral and religious effect of the immigration of Chinese to this coast?—A. I believe it is very destructive; that it is very degrading. It is in some of the places too fearful to tell of, as where the police of Sacramento talked with me freely and told me the facts which they come at in connection with the Chinese. It is very degrading.

Q. What do you think the effect of their presence is upon our white populations?—A. I think it is to exclude a large white immigration, and exceedingly demoralizing to the present white population of the coast, and that it renders labor contemptible, so that it is difficult for our sons to choose manual labor, and it is almost impossible to induce our daughters to choose manual labor.

Q. Why do they not?—A. It is letting themselves down on a level with the Chinaman.

Q. Do you find that that sentiment grows among our white population?—A. I believe it is growing very largely, like the growth of a similar sentiment at the South when slaves commenced to be introduced there.

Q Do you think that the amount of Christianization that is done to Chinese by missionary efforts among them on this coast is an equivalent for the demoralization produced among the whites?—A. It is nothing like an equivalent. There is a good work being done. We ought to do more; we ought to do all that we can do for christianizing them; out of Christian benevolence we ought to do it; but it does not begin to equal the power of demoralization and unchristianizing influences affecting our population.

Q. What is the opinion of the intelligent classes in this State? With how many are you brought in contact in the course of a year?—A. I think I converse personally with about 20,000 in the course of a year, in the mountains, valleys, cities, and towns.

Q. You have no political mission of any kind?—A. None.

Q. Entirely religious and connected with the interests of your paper?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Which is a religious journal?—A. Religious.

Q. What is the opinion of the various classes of people in this State, as you have thus observed from your travels among them?—A. Those who have in view exclusively money-making as rapidly as they can at present, irrespective of the great future, who might be called moneyed men or monopolists, are in favor of the Chinese coming; but the very large proportion of our white population, and especially the very large proportion of common laborers, are strongly opposed to the Chinese at all.

Q. How do you find it among the small farmers, men who do their own work?—A. They are strongly opposed to the Chinese generally.

Q. How do you find it among the intelligent classes who are not interested pecuniarily in them? I refer to the gentlemen whom you meet, the lawyers, doctors, clergymen, generally the merchant classes, and those who do manual labor, aside from the monopolists?—A. Take those who are glowing with Christian benevolence, and they have great hope of doing good, and they are in favor of the Chinese coming pretty generally; but that, I think, is quite a small class. I believe generally

the ministers glow with Christian benevolence, and hope to do good to the Chinese by coming here, and they are in favor of their coming; but I do not think they look at the question in its future bearing on the interests of the whole country.

Q. How with reference to the merchant-class, and the doctors, and lawyers, as far as you have had an opportunity to converse with them?—A. The merchants have the Chinese generally as servants, and then there is a good deal of trade with them. I think merchants generally would be in favor of the Chinese.

Q. Throughout the State?—A. I think the merchants would.

Q. How with reference to the other classes? What I want to get at is the intelligent opinion of this State aside from the large laboring class and the small farmers, who are perhaps embraced in that class—the average of public opinion among the intelligent classes.—A. The average of public opinion is strongly opposed to them; but if you separate them into different classes, and take the merchants, I rather think the majority would be in favor of the Chinese. The lawyers, I think, the larger portion of them, as they have expressed themselves, are decidedly opposed; but then they do not care much about it; they are devoted to their business. Take the class of school-teachers; I think they do not care very much about it; but, as they express themselves, they are opposed to it, I think.

Q. Suppose you were to strike an average of the opinion of the people of this State, of all classes, would it be for or against the Chinese?—A. It would be very strongly opposed to the Chinese, I think.

Q. Have you any statement that you wish to make further in reference to the matter that I have not directed your attention specifically to?—A. Only to state the general principle, that whatever affects the laboring interests of the country affects the whole country, and the welfare of our nation depends upon the accumulation of wealth, the intelligence, the morality and the patriotism of our small farmers and laboring classes. Anything that comes in competition with them affects us as a people most seriously. I believe that the influx of the Chinese will affect these laborers very adversely, so as to result in a large monopolizing, wealthy class that will be small, while there will result from it a very large class technically called at the South "poor white trash." We are having them here, and we shall have more and more of them by the influx of the Chinese. I think a great deal of this looseness of morals is owing to the fact that our good laboring classes cannot very well secure homes of their own, and of those who are employed to a great extent they have no family interests and no personal interest, and they spend their money in liquors.

Q. In your observation is it becoming more difficult for the laboring class to secure homes for themselves?—A. With the settled laboring class it is more and more difficult. A man can hardly marry, if he is poor, and secure for himself a home in this country as a general thing.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You used the phrase "poor white trash." We all know what that means. I will ask you if there is as large a proportion of very poor white people in California as in the Eastern States to-day?—A. I should suppose not.

Q. I had got the impression that the poor people of this city, for example, more generally own homes than in any of the eastern cities. What is your opinion about that?—A. A large proportion own homes.

Q. A larger proportion of the laboring people own their own homes

than in any eastern city of the same size?—A. I will not speak of the country. They generally own homes to a great extent in this city.

Q. I ask you if they do not own homes more largely here than in the eastern cities?—A. I have been here twenty years, and I do not believe I could draw a comparison with the East. It is my impression, however, that they do own homes more largely here than there.

Q. If that is the case, upon what ground do you reason that they have been injured by the presence of Chinese labor, when they are in a better condition?—A. The thirty thousand who came with me in 1849 went into the mines; and they acquired wealth rapidly. Those who chose homes had money to buy homes. They came to the city and bought homes, and thus, to a great extent, they acquired homes; but now those who are thrown upon us find it very difficult to get homes. Our poor are rapidly increasing. If I go into the country now there are a large class of poor renters who own nothing. They live pretty well, for they will live well; they spend everything for their living almost, but they are poor and becoming poorer.

Q. Do you think that their condition is the result of the competition of Chinese labor?—A. No; it is not in whole by any means, but quite largely it is.

Q. You speak about the effect upon the morals of the country. I will ask you how the morals of San Francisco, for example, compare with the morals of the eastern cities where they have no Chinese, or but very few?—A. I would suppose that our morals are much inferior to New York. It would depend somewhat, perhaps, how we reckon morality; but, putting all things together, we are very immoral. I believe the number of places for assignation or prostitution are much greater here than in New York. I believe that our Sunday-carousing, drinking classes are much greater than in New York. I believe that our swearing class, our open, boastful, ruffian class is much greater here, and it is increasing; our churches, in proportion to the population, are much less, and our stay-at-home class of people much less, and there are more who spend their evenings in rough places.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You do not mean stay at home from church?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you attribute that to the presence of the Chinese or to the character of the people who come to this coast?—A. It is owing to both; but the Chinese element has a strong influence in bringing about this state of things. Our boys, to a great extent, like to wander through the streets where the Chinese are, and they go into those houses, and when they are but eight years old, as the police tell me, they find the Chinese women who will entice them in for nothing, they knowing if they get them when they are young they will get their money when they are older. The police of Sacramento have told me that they have frequently found boys eight years old in bed with Chinese prostitutes.

Q. What is the character of the Chinese, according to your observation, for industry?—A. They are very willing to work where you pay them.

Q. Are they generally industrious?—A. I think they are; but among themselves they are greatly given to gambling.

Q. What is their character as laborers; are they skillful and handy?—A. They are skillful in everything where there is no requirement of intellect. Directed by intelligence, they are good; so far as money-making is concerned they are good, and that is all.

Q. In what particular branch do they come in conflict with white

labor?—A. Everything; where you can just tell them what to do they will do it. They are increasing in their skill in every department of work. There is nothing that an American can do, where no inventive genius is demanded, but what the Chinese can do it as well.

Q. Are they mechanics?—A. They are becoming good mechanics.

Q. Are there any Chinese blacksmiths?—A. There are a great many blacksmiths among them. They are shoeing our horses in many places.

Q. Are there carriage-makers and wagon-makers among them?—A. They are beginning to do that.

Q. Are there coopers?—A. There are a few coopers; not many, I think. I have seen but a few, at least.

Q. Do you think there is more labor upon the coast than there is labor to be performed?—A. There never can be more labor than there is labor to be performed, because some men will secure two hundred thousand acres of land, and can hire any number of laborers and set them to work there. There cannot be more labor than there is labor to be performed. We have room here for ten millions of laborers.

Q. Then the labor market is not crowded?—A. No, sir; but the particular demand for our present civilization is crowded. There are great lands where men can send on their Chinese and raise potatoes and establish factories; but there is no demand in our present civilization for Americans to do that. There will be a demand for Americans very soon, and Americans will do it; but if you send in Chinese, Americans will not come to do it.

Q. If there is labor for all and the field is so large as you describe it to be, in what way do the Chinese deprive the Americans of labor?—A. By coming into competition with Americans in all labor, so that Americans must labor at the same price. If the American labors at the same price, he has got to live at the same price, and that degrades him.

Q. Has the presence of Chinese labor lowered the price of labor?—A. I think it has very much.

Q. How does it compare with ten years ago?—A. The price of labor is steadily falling.

Q. Twenty years ago labor was very high here?—A. It was.

Q. As compared with other parts of the United States?—A. Yes, sir; and hence white labor was rapidly coming in.

Q. How does the price of white labor here now compare with white labor throughout the Middle and Eastern States of the Union?—A. A large number of laboring people who have come from the East here tell me that they could make money faster anywhere East than here.

Q. Do you mean by that that white labor is cheaper here now than it is in the East?—A. In view of the expenses here they tell me that they can make money faster in the East than here. Various mechanics have told me they could do better in Chicago than here. I have not been there.

Q. Is the cost of living here now greater than it has been in the East?—A. I suppose it is.

Q. What is the reason of that?—A. Probably from our former habits in paying more for all products.

Q. I suppose that that is not a question of habit so much as it is a question of production. Does California produce her own vegetables now?—A. She now produces all of them.

Q. Does she not furnish a large amount for export?—A. A large amount.

Q. Then, so far as that is concerned, is there any reason why people cannot live here as cheaply as in the East?—A. So far as that is concerned, I should say they can live as well here as in the East. A farmer

can come from the East and go on his farm and raise all his products just as well as in the East, I suppose.

Q. Grain, fruits, and all products that people live on are produced abundantly here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With a large amount for export?—A. A large amount.

Q. Then is there any reason for saying that the cost of living is any greater on this coast than in the Middle and Eastern States?—A. If we had more white labor and if work was reputable, I suppose we could live here a great deal cheaper than in the East.

Q. I am speaking about the actual cost of living now.—A. If the price of our labor was such as that our products were as cheap as in the East, and a person did not have to buy the products, we could live cheaper.

Q. Then it is the price of labor that makes living more costly?—A. I suppose it is.

Q. Then the cost of labor has not been brought down to compare with other things yet?—A. I think not.

Q. The cost of labor, then, is above the cost of the means of living otherwise?—A. So far as mere labor is concerned.

Q. Would you say, then, that there is too much labor here?—A. No, sir; there is not too much labor, if it was the right kind, if it was white labor; but as it is, it is becoming very disreputable, and the large portion of our white laborers, those who can do without work, despise it and try to avoid it.

Q. You mean to say, then, that the cause of this trouble is that there is a large portion of the white labor that will not work? Is that what you mean to say, that they despise labor?—A. I think there is a large class that does despise labor, who are trying to live by speculation.

Q. And that is what you think makes the cost of living greater here than it is in the East?—A. That is one reason.

Q. And you think that the presence of the Chinese is the cause of this idle white population?—A. It is one great cause; not entirely the cause.

Q. The people will not work along with the Chinese?—A. They do not like to work along with them any more than they like to work with the negro at the South, formerly, where slavery existed.

Q. It is the prejudice of race?—A. That is one great reason, and it is becoming very strong.

Q. What do you think is the remedy for it?—A. The remedy is to make white labor reputable.

Q. How do you propose to do that?—A. I believe if the Chinese were restricted so that no more should come, and then allow those who are here gradually to go away, there would be more and more call for white labor, and white labor would be reputable; men would be proud to be laborers; our sons and daughters would cheerfully step forward to labor, and the country would much more rapidly advance in Christian civilization, and it would advance more rapidly in wealth; a large eastern white population would come in who will not come in now. Some of our large land-holders own, I think, 150,000 acres. Those men employ men, over whom they have to lay very severe laws, and they have no families, no women among them; they are simply men laboring a certain number of hours and spending the rest of their time in drinking and carousing, and degrading themselves until they die. Those lands would be broken up and sold to small farmers, and the small farmers would come in and settle and gradually acquire wealth.

Q. Your idea is that these large land-holders could not cultivate their farms, and would be obliged to sell them?—A. They could not cultivate them unless they had inferior laborers like negroes of the South, like the

Chinamen, and like these bumming white men. As it is now, generally to a large extent, a farming population is a renting population. They rent the lands, and, as a general, thing the owner of the lands takes just as much as he can in order to allow the renter to live. In the San Joaquin Valley half a township is owned by a man living in New York, who receives from his California laborers $70,000; and that for one-half the township. Another large land-holder, back of Benicia, lives here in this city, and he owns nearly half a township. He receives from his rented lands $80,000 or $90,000 every year. These lands are held at $30, $40, and $50 an acre, so that these renters cannot buy them. These laborers get just enough to live from year to year, and thus to a large extent our farming population are not owners of land, but they are renters. They take but little interest therefore in the establishment of schools, in the establishment of churches, in the building of pleasant houses, in the cultivation of fine yards, and in the building of roads. The country, while in comparative richness, is rapidly wearing out. A renter has no interest to restore the land, and the large capitalist cannot restore it by renting. It is constantly worn out until lands which would yield sixty and seventy bushels an acre twenty years ago have had wheat every year, and now they will yield only twenty bushels an acre.

Q. Is the fact that the lands are worn out and the farmers are unable to replenish the soil the result of too much labor, or cheap labor, or is it the result of a scarcity of labor?—A. I think it is the result of the system adopted in regard to labor, where the laborer has no interest in restoring the richness of the soil. If he is a renter, he has no interest in the soil. His object is to get as much as he can out of the land, and then to go off and buy land, while the land is being worn out more and more year after year through that system. If our lands were broken up into 150-acre farms, every owner would restore as much richness to the soil and a little more than he takes away, I suppose.

Q. Then you would adopt a system which would result in breaking all these large farms into small ones?—A. I think that is very desirable, and if the Chinese went out of the country, we should adopt that system.

Q. You know of no other way to do that than to make labor of such a character that those large land-holders cannot employ laborers to cultivate their farms?—A. I would make it for their interest to break them up. There are a number of ways in which that can be done, and it must be done.

Q. To do that would be to deprive the owners of this cheap labor, without which they cannot cultivate their farms, and compel them to sell?—A. If you apply it to the Chinese, I would say yes; that is one of the measures.

Q. You think there are too many Chinese here now?—A. There are very many, certainly. Already labor is exceedingly disreputable. I know of no American lady who is willing to go into a neighbor's house and work, or help that neighbor for a few months in any household work. The milliners are willing to go; they will go and make a dress, but they will not go to do household work.

Q. You say, then, that labor in California has been made disreputable by Chinamen?—A. I say that they have contributed largely to make it disreputable, but it is not entirely owing to them.

Q. You think this idleness on the part of the whites is not because there is not work to do, but because they despise it, and will not do it?—A. That is one great cause. Another cause is the difficulty of getting permanent homes. Hence they only care for labor for themselves.

They have no interest in the country; they have no interest in their families, because they have no families; hence they will drink and carouse, and do bad, many of them.

Q. Is there any other class of foreign labor that you think has that effect also?—A. Yes, all who are really inferior to us; I mean whom we regard as inferior, to whom we consign the work.

Q. What other race would you put in that category?—A. If I were to mention names, I believe the Americans generally regard the Irish as very much in that class, and very much inferior.

Q. Is that your judgment?—A. I believe if the priests were out of the way, if Romanism were out of the way, the Irish would be equal to any people on earth.

Q. But Romanism is not out of the way, and not likely to be.—A. Therefore they are, I think, inferior; inferior in intelligence, inferior in morality.

Q. You regard the presence of the Irish population therefore as injurious to some extent in the same way that the Chinese are injurious?—A. I do, to some extent, in the same way; yet they can assimilate with us; they have sympathies in common with us. The Chinese are different in religion, different in tastes, different in habits, different in their clanish attachments, different in their race prejudices, and essentially different in their language. It is a language that we cannot acquire; it is impossible for us to acquire it. In all these things they are kept separate, and always will be distinct.

Q. You make the effect, therefore, of the Irish population and the Chinese population as differing only in degree?—A. In degree.

Q. But having the same general effect?—A. The same general effect. But we could elevate the Irishmen. A great many of them become imbued with American principles, American ideas, American enterprises, American tastes, and they are thus assimilated with us and become homogeneous; but the Chinese never will.

Q. If you had the power would you limit Chinese immigration for the reasons that you speak of?—A. I think I would, decidedly.

Q. Would you limit the Irish immigration for the same reason?—A. I should like to, if I could.

Q. Is there any other foreign population that you should like to limit if you could?—A. Yes, sir; I should like to limit all those who will not throw themselves open to full, free investigation. That would include, I think, the greater portion of the Portuguese, the Spaniards, the Italians, and especially the Irish. I can welcome the French pretty generally; especially do I welcome the Germans; and, above all, I welcome the English and Scotch. They harmonize fully with us in all our interests in a very short time. We have got to be homogeneous or else we are ruined. We are becoming homogeneous with those nationalities; we assimilate together.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. I understand you to say that this want of desire to work or degradation of labor arises from a difference of race, from race feeling?—A. It is largely owing to the fact that if a man labors he must be right on an equality with an inferior race, the same as did take place in the Southern States when slaves were there.

Q. The same as it is now?—A. Yes, sir, to some extent it is just the same there now.

Q. Could you not say that the same remedy would do just as well, to give the Chinese the ballot? Could it not have the same effect?—A. No, sir.

Q. Could it not elevate them?—A. No, sir; the African was compelled to become an American; he became American in taste, American in feeling, American in religion, American in habits, American in morality. Slavery compelled him to do that; but the Chinese never will, as far as human knowledge can tell.

Q. Can you not compell them the same way?—A. No, sir; we have got to work on Chinese entirely by moral suasion.

Q. You are making the illustration on account of the lack of desire to work with them. Why will not the same remedy apply to laboring men here that applies in the South, where the race antagonism exists. Where you elevate the colored man, does it not do away with that antagonism?—A. It does, but you have already made the colored man an American.

Q. Why would it not do to make the Chinaman an American in the same way?—A. You cannot make him an American.

Q. Can you not make him a voter?—A. That would not make him an American.

Q. Did it not make the negro an American?—A. The negro was an American before he was a voter.

Q. Do you think the elevation of the inferior class tends to prevent this antagonism of the laboring-class to work beside them?—A. I do not think it will much. Give the Chinaman the vote, and the laborer will despise him as much as they despise him now. Only the politicians will be more shrewd to manipulate him.

Q. Is it not the same way with the negro?—A. It is. There is danger of the South, and there is a greater danger with the Chinaman; for, in addition, the Chinaman has a vigor of thought that has brought the nation a character, and he believes himself superior. As soon as he would get the vote he would try politically to become superior, and we should have our Chinese judges, our Chinese justices of the peace, and they will be controlled by their Chinese prejudices.

Q. Would not the negroes do the same?—A. No, sir; the negro is an American with American tastes.

Q. Can he not be made equally ambitious?—A. Yes, sir; I think so.

Q. Why may not the Chinese after a generation equally become citizens?—A. Because we cannot reach them except through moral influences. The African was reached through the power of slavery, and thus Americanized, but we have no power to make the Chinaman an American.

Q. Would not contact with our civilization have the same effect upon the Chinaman as upon the African?—A. No, sir; because the Chinaman despises our civilization; he is proud of his own. He tells us in our face, "You are small potatoes; we were a great nation three thousand years ago."

Q. Are you afraid of the conflict of our civilization with theirs? Which would be the weaker?—A. I am not afraid of their civilization, but in regard to the advancement of my own civilization, it would be tremendously retarded.

Q. You think our civilization would be drawn down, or would the other be elevated?—A. There will be a compromise between the two in morality. Whenever the American comes in connection with a lower class he goes down towards the lower class; he may elevate the lower class, but he will lower himself.

Q. Do you think that of the American people?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think they have ever come down?—A. Yes, sir; the most degraded people on the earth are American people who wander among

the Southern Pacific Islands among the Indians. When they associate with an inferior race they have got to come down.

Q. That is the effect of any lower civilization upon the Americans?—A. If they associate. There is only one power to prevent it, which is the power of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Nothing else will keep a man from going down.

Q. Do you not think that will affect the Chinese?—A. The effect is very small. We have Americanized about 500 out of about 239,000 who have come here.

Q. Your opinion is that the number of Chinese will continue to increase?—A. They will continue to increase until they become a vast, distinct, powerful body in our midst, if they are not restricted.

Q. They may convert us instead of our converting them; is that your idea?—A. They may; they have converted hordes of Americans, and made them abandoned creatures.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I want to get at the basis upon which you say that this is a more immoral community than New York. Have you any statistical information to furnish the commission?—A. There are different points which one must reckon. I was in New York for a little while last summer, for about three weeks. I cannot judge very much from what I saw then; but from my reading I understand that a person, to be a truly moral man, will probably want, once in seven days, to listen to an able argument; he will want to go and hear some good speaker, some one who has carefully prepared himself for that purpose, and he will probably want to go and hear a good sermon; one that is argumentative, not dictatorial. Take the statistics of California, and only a few wish for that. They do not wish to go to church; they do not wish to go and hear any good lecture so eagerly, as a people, as they do in New York.

Q. Have you been to church lately?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In this city?—A. Not in this city; in Oakland.

Q. Do you not have much attendance at church there?—A. There is.

Q. Is there much attendance in this city?—A. Yes, sir; a large attendance.

Q. Where is the point?—A. The proportion is immensely smaller than in the East. Oakland has about 40,000 people, and they have there three Congregational churches within the limits of the corporation. In the East they would have nine, probably fifteen. They have two Presbyterian churches; in the East they would have ten or twelve. They have two Methodist churches; in the East they would have probably twenty.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You have got more Catholics, have you not?—A. Catholics can hardly be said to go to church. They do not go to listen to a sermon; they do not go to be instructed.

Q. What becomes of the rest of our people who do not attend church; what do they do on Sunday?—A. A great many of them go to the beer-gardens, and others go on pic-nics and excursions. Most of our railroads sell cheap tickets on Sunday, and extra trains carry them up and back again.

Q. As to the statistical information which you have, do you know that the police reports in this city, in comparison with any city in the East, are in our favor as to dissipation?—A. That is a phenomenon with our people all over California. There is a wonderful power of self-government among them. They do not conflict with one another.

I can go into a gambling-shop, and have often gone in there, and preach to them, and they will be just as orderly as any household in the East.

Q. Does not that show a morality, that you can do such things?—A. I do not think so, from the definition of the word "morality."

Q. What is the definition of "morality?"—A. As the word "morality" is used, that has exclusive reference to anything moral; you have moral obligation; moral motive. When I speak of morals I speak of high motives, of righteousness, integrity, godliness.

Q. Then, we are more lax in our duties in this city than in New York City?—A. I think so.

Q. In what respects?—A. I do not think there is as much regard for true righteousness; the people have not so much respect for their Creator. They can swear; if they see fit to lie, they can lie; if they see fit to cheat, they will cheat; but they will not break the laws more often.

Q. You think that is a characteristic of our people?—A. I think so.

Q. Do you include classes?—A. O, when you speak of classes, I am only speaking of the people generally. I do not mean to say every man is so; I do not say you are so; I am speaking of them generally.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You think, taking, according to your distinction, the two cities together in proportion to population, that the people here can outlie and outswear the people of New York?—A. I think they can outswear them especially.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. And outdrink them?—A. Yes, sir; outdrink them very greatly. The Sunday carousals are immense.

Q. This is a cosmopolitan city?—A. It seems to me so.

Q. We have every nationality here.—A. About seventy five.

Q. You have been through the city years ago, when you could go whole blocks and not hear the English language spoken?—A. Yes; I came here in 1849.

Q. You state that there is more of dissipation and drinking here than there is in the city of New York?—A. In proportion to the population, I think there is.

Q. Have you walked our streets on Sundays?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are they not quiet and orderly?—A. Yes.

Q. Are not our churches filled?—A. But there are more of them there.

Q. Is there more prostitution here than in New York?—A. I think vastly more.

Q. In what particular?—A. I take that from the reports of individuals. I have talked with them, and I believe there are a great many more houses of abandonment here than in New York.

Q. Do you know that by actual statistical information, to which you have access, in the police department, that prostitution is better guarded, better managed, more confined in this city, than any other city in the Union of its size?—A. I cannot say as to my information; but I can say, if you speak of the number of prostitutes, I believe the police will show that there are more places of prostitution here than in New York.

Q. Do you think the statistics of the police will show that there are more places of prostitution here than in New York?—A. In proportion; yes, sir.

Q. Is this owing to the dereliction of duty of the ministry?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have worked as hard as you could in that line?—A. I have tried to be faithful.

Q. Is there any more prostitution among the Chinese than there is among the white race?—A. You can intermingle between the two.

Q. No, sir; I say prostitution. I mean is there more of it here in proportion than there is of the other?—A. I suppose that the proportion is immensely greater among the Chinese, as far as they have the opportunity. As a race they are immensely more licentious than the Americans.

Q. That is your experience?—A. No, sir; I have no experience on the subject.

Q. What State did you emigrate from?—A. Ohio is my native State.

Q. What are potatoes worth a bushel in Ohio to-day?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you not correspond with your old neighbors?—A. Not upon that question.

Q. What are potatoes worth in Massachusetts?—A. I do not know.

Q. Do you not know that potatoes are $1.50 to $2 a bushel there?—A. I do not know it.

Q. What are potatoes worth here?—A. Six bits a sack.

Q. How many pounds are in a sack?—A. One hundred and thirty.

Q. How do vegetables compare with the East?—A. I guess vegetables would be as cheap.

Q. How would beef, pork, and all kinds of meat compare?—A. Beef, about the same, perhaps a little cheaper.

Q. How would mutton compare?—A. I guess mutton is cheaper here.

Q. You buy the carcass here for 90 cents?—A. I do not know about the carcass, but by the pound. I think that which we produce here is quite as cheap.

Q. What do we eat that we do not produce?—A. We bring in a large amount of imported articles.

Q. Do we import any of the necessaries of life into California?—A. Coffee, tea, sugar, &c., I call necessaries; but so far as wheat and flour, and beef, &c., and those necessaries, the staff of life, I suppose are produced here.

Q. What do farmers pay their white laborers a month?—A. Generally from $20 to $25 a month.

Q. What do they pay them in Ohio?—A. Nearly the same.

Q. Have you any information upon that point?—A. No, sir; no exact information.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Were not the lands when we acquired this country owned in large tracts, in ranches?—A. They were claimed in large tracts.

Q. Were they not owned in large tracts?—A. I do not think they were. I think there were about twelve good claims in California, and of eight hundred which have been recognized I do not think but few were directly owned.

Q. Recognized by the authorities of the United States?—A. Yes sir.

Q. What size were they?—A. From 5,000 to 150,000 or 200,000 acres.

Q. Originally?—A. Originally.

Q. Could those lands be purchased in small tracts where the title was litigated by the tribunals?—A. Very small; often two bits an acre, sometimes less.

Q. I say could they be purchased in small tracts?—A. Not generally

Q. They had to be purchased entirely?—A. If bought in small tracts it was very dangerous, because a man was sure to lose his title.

Q. How many came in litigation?—A. I think about one-half of them are now in litigation.

Q. Can a man who has a small tract of land sell a small farm to a farmer?—A. If he will he can.

Q. Is it to his interest?—A. I believe it is.

Q. If he sells a small farm to a farmer could he not under the fence-law turn his whole pasture open?—A. I think he is compelled to inclose it.

Q. Is not that done every month of the year?—A. Not in many cases.

Q. Do you not see here papers published in this city and Los Angeles for the express purpose of advertising ranches which have just been cut up, inviting farmers to buy?—A. They do advertise many such.

Q. They are not renting all the time?—A. Yes, but they are few compared with the number.

Q. There are more such farms advertised than can be sold?—A. They are always held at the highest price, from $10 to $20, and more.

Q. Do you know of anybody who sells anything for less than he can get for it?—A. Not generally.

Q. The greater portion of these men who you say are idle and do not work are generally drunkards?—A. To a large extent the single men as laborers throughout the country do drink excessively.

Q. I am not speaking of the laborers, I am speaking of those who do not labor?—A. Those without families generally drink.

Q. Are they not drunkards?—A. That is an undefined term. I hardly want to say drunkards.

Q. I am asking the question whether the idle men who you say do not work and have no visible means of subsistence are not as a general rule drunkards?—A. I would not say drunkards; they generally drink. They do not generally stagger; and when a man does not stagger you do not call him drunk.

Q. Do they not drink to excess?—A. I think so. I think if they would drink one glass a day or one glass a week it would be excess, or if they drink at all it is excess.

Q. If they drink what ordinary people drink, do you call it excess?—A. The people of California ordinarily do not drink to excess. At the East it would be considered an excess.

Q. What effect has the habit of drinking upon a man's habits of industry and habits of economy and general welfare in the world?—A. It is ruinous to everything that is manly.

Q. Have there not been more homesteads owned by workingmen, men who have earned their living by their muscle, in the last five years around San Francisco than in all the previous years of her history?—A. I think so.

Q. Are there any such things in San Francisco or near it as tenement-houses?—A. I do not know of any. I am not living in the city, and have but little acquaintance in the city.

Q. Do you know a society here called the Ancient Order of Hibernians?—A. I have heard of them, and I have read of them in the papers.

Q. Have you ever been here on the fourth of July or at any other of their celebrations?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have never seen them on parade?—A. No, sir.

Q. What sort of society is that, as you understand it? Is it an open or secret society?—A. I presume there is a good deal of secrecy about it, that it is designed to perpetuate the Irishmen, or the race, and prevent homogeneity among our people.

Q. Do the Irish assimilate with the American people?—A. They do if they are Protestants, but the priests mean to keep them separate and mean to keep them as a power in America under their control.

Q. Is any one admitted into this order who is not an Irishman?—A. I should suppose not.

Q. Is any one admitted into it who is not a Catholic?—A. I do not know; I do not think practically he would be. Perhaps they would not exclude an Irishman because he was not a Catholic.

Q. Did you ever hear of the Orange lodges?—A. I have.

Q. What are they?—A. They are those who are Irish Protestants, organized to defend themselves against what they consider to be Irish Catholics.

Q. Do you not know that they are opposed to the Ancient Order of Hibernians?—A. I should think they would be.

Mr. PIXLEY. I object to such a line of investigation as this.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose that is a matter of general information. I see the pertinency of the questions, but at the same time we hope to close this examination to-day.

Q. (By Mr. BROOKS.) You say that you prefer the English and Scotch. Do the English and Scotch merchants naturalize?—A. I do not know how it is with the merchants; I suppose they do generally.

Q. You think they do?—A. I think they do. They come to America to stay here, I suppose, and almost all naturalize who come to stay.

Q. You think that an English chartist is preferable to an Irishman?—A. If you want my private choice, I do. I associate with English much better.

Q. I am talking about English chartists. You prefer the English chartist?—A. Because he seems to assimilate with us.

Senator SARGENT. What do you mean by "chartists?"

Mr. BROOKS. I mean the lower order of factory-hands in England who band themselves in unions.

The WITNESS. As far as I know, when they come here they sympathize with us in everything.

Senator SARGENT. An Englishman at my left says an English chartist is a republican.

Q. (By Mr. BROOKS.) Who are the servants of every farmer through the country?—A. To a great extent the Chinese are becoming such, and hence white labor is becoming displaced.

Q. According to your experience are children brought up by their parents in this State to honor labor?—A. The parents are trying to do it to some extent.

Q. Do the parents themselves honor labor?—A. Not much.

Q. Do they all endeavor to elevate themselves above their position?—A. Morally?

Q. No, sir; not morally, but in dress and in associations?—A. There is a general chase in that direction, to live above their income.

Q. Do they not generally endeavor to imitate the manners, dress, and habits of people of more means?—A. They do try to get above the Chinese and the laborers.

Q. Do you not think that practice induces the children to idleness? Are they not taught by their parents to consider the situation in which the parents were born low and degrading?—A. To a great extent that is the case. The Chinese increase that feeling.

Q. I suppose you never go into a theater?—A. I never have gone to a theater in California.

Q. I do not know that you know whether the fact is that the family-circle in a San Francisco theater is universally empty?—A. I do not know it.

Q. While the gallery and the dress-circle may be full.

Mr. PIXLEY. Where is the family-circle in a California theater?

Mr. BROOKS. It is the second tier, and is usually empty. [To the witness.] I understand you to say that in your opinion slavery has reduced the status of society in the South and degraded the white population?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. You think that the white population of the South is inferior to the white population of the East?—A. I believe it.

Q. That their civilization is less?—A. Lower as to their intelligence and moral purposes and principles.

Q. Do you say that the wanderers of the mountains and of the Pacific islands are degraded?—A. Those who associate with degraded races.

Q. Would those people ever have associated with those degraded races if they had not already been degraded or possessed low instincts?—A. All men have the same instincts.

Q. Do you think all men are one race?—A. Yes, sir; they are only distinct as to abilities.

Q. You think there are not "many men of many minds?"—A. O, yes, sir; of many minds and many ideas.

Q. All are equally strong in their propensities?—A. All are equally strong.

Q. Do you not think these people have strong propensities to lead them to evil?—A. Not always. Take the most moral man and throw him out where he will associate with immoral men, and he will become immoral. There is only one-tenth depends on nature and nine-tenths depend on education and association.

Q. I do not understand the distinction you make between heathen and moral. As you define moral, it seems to be religion, and religion of a Protestant kind?—A. They come pretty nearly together. Morality rests on religion. The morality of the Mohammedan is made by his religion; the morality of the Irish is owing to their religion; the morality of Americans is owing to American religion.

Q. As you prefer one people to another, you consider the morality of that people the greater?—A. That would be it.

Q. In a moral aspect you do not consider the religion of the Chinese equal to our religion?—A. By no means. Confucius never taught the Scripture principles.

Q. When he says "whatever you would that men should do unto you do unto them," that is not morality?—A. But there is a difference between the two questions. He does not say so.

Q. What does he say?—A. He says if you do not want to be knocked down, never knock anybody down.

Q. He does not say that?—A. Yes; he says that, though not in that language; he says, "What you do not want a man to do to you, you must not do to him." In that there is no demand for benevolence.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You say it is put in that way, "What you would that men should not do unto you, do you not unto them?"—A. Yes; it is negative.

Q. Take the converse of that proposition, does it not make the Gold-

en Rule?—A. The converse of it does. Christ demands active benevolence; Confucius forbade active malevolence; that is all.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Have you as much prejudice against an American or German Catholic as you have against an Irish Roman Catholic?—A. The word "prejudice" begs the question. I should not like to use the word "prejudice." If you ask, is my judgment more in approval of an American or a German Catholic than an Irish Catholic, I should say it was, because I do not find that the German is so clannish. I do not find that the priests can control him as he can control the Irishman.

Q. You do not know that a priest controls the Irish?—A. I know that from three-fourths of the Irish people, and I read of it.

Q. Does the priest control them for evil or for good?—A. I think the priests control them for their own great organization, and mighty often they control them for bad in that way, but not generally. I believe that the priests generally like to have things about right; but I do think a great many of them teach that the end justifies the means, and that to tell a lie for mother church is honest. I think many of them do that.

Q. Did you ever hear one preach that?—A. Well, they come so near, it is all the same probably; but they do not use those words.

Q. Do you attend the Catholic church much?—A. I have attended a good many of them.

Q. You have heard them preach?—A. No, sir; they do not preach much.

Q. They do not?—A. No, sir; they will stand a long time going through a performance and ring a little bell for a man to rise and kneel down, and then they will rise up again, but they do not preach much.

Q. Do your people kneel down and rise up?—A. We do not kneel; we stand.

Q. You are not humble, then? Then you think a French Catholic is better than an Irish Catholic?—A. They differ from the Irish in their organization. They do not consider that the Pope is infallible to dictate to them. They differ immensely; the French church differs from the Italian church.

JAMES P. DAMERON sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in our State?—Answer. I came here in 1849.

Q. What is your profession?—A. I am a lawyer.

Q. Have you made a specialty, as a matter of taste, of any other field of knowledge, such as scientific investigation?—A. I am somewhat of a naturalist and ethnologist.

Q. You have heard this investigation so far as it has proceeded?—A. I have heard some of the testimony, and I have read a great deal of it.

Q. I wish you to submit to the commission your views on the ethnological question of the difference of races, their relation to each other, and the character of the Chinese, with a view to the future development of our State. In general, answer the question whether it is desirable to limit the Chinese immigration by legislation. I can scarcely lead you by questions directly, but go on and give your opinion.—A. First, it will be necessary for me to state that natural history is divided into two branches. One is zoölogy, and the other is botany. The lowest order of botany is the algæ, and the highest is the tree, perhaps the oak-

tree. The lowest order of zoölogy is the Monera, and the highest is the Caucasian, or the Indo-Germanic race, or Anglo-Saxon. They then divide animals. The zoölogist divides the animals as the botanist divides plants. In zoölogy we classify animals all alike, man and everything else. We group them; and in the great family of mankind we have a group called the prima. There is some similarity between a bat and a monkey and a man. They constitute the prima. Then we divide the human race into the wooly hair and the long hair. Then we come to the curly hair, with fine hair and beard. That is called the curly hair. The long hair is straight, such as characterize Indians and Mongolians and all that class of people. Mankind is divided into four different groups. First, the black; next, the red; next, the brown; and last, the white. Modern scientists have gone on and divided mankind into twelve classes, or twelve different groups. The first is the Papuans; second, the Hottentots; third, the Kaffres; fourth, negroes; fifth, Australians; sixth, Malayans; seventh, Mongolians; eighth, Arctics; ninth, Americans; tenth, Dravidians; eleventh, Nubians; and twelfth, Mediterraneans. The Mediterraneans include all the white people living around the Mediterranean. Science makes scales.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Do you consider these twelve groups as you mention them in an ascending scale?—A. Yes; I named them as they ascend. In the next place, the animal rises. Perhaps I had better illustrate it by this book. (Exhibiting Popular Science Monthly, vol. 4.) Here is a scale. We start with the brain of the herring or salmon; it is supposed to be the highest with the salmon; next comes the serpent; next, the reptile or crocodile; next, the eagle; next, the dog; next, the baboon or gorilla, or whatever you call him; next, the idiot; next, Black Hawk, the Indian; next, the Mongolian, the semi-civilized; and next, Daniel Webster. As the facial angle rises the intelligence increases. As that angle rises the head pushes up, forming a line with the dome or cerebrum until it pushes over, as it were. It begins on a straight line almost and rises until it comes to an angle of 95 degrees, almost a right-angle. The next scale is this, (indicating:) The gorilla is at an angle of 40 degrees; the idiot at 75 degrees. The Indian will rise still higher, and the Mongolian higher still, and Webster's head is supposed to be at an angle of 95 degrees. Webster is the highest type of the American. Naturalists make twelve groups, and this has been well proven by ethnology. Fred. Müller and others advocate the doctrine that there are twelve distinct groups. These twelve races, or types, rather, are distinct. In tracing back the formation of language by ethnology, there is no distinct relationship at all, but they run back into twelve different groups. Some ethnologists have stated that they may be reduced to five, but Fred. Müller, the best author on this subject, says there are twelve, and that they must have had their origin in some pre-historic man or some speechless man. Whilst I am on this subject, if it is not too long, I will read a little article which will show you how we reach these conclusions, my object being also to throw some light on the subject.

Man in his scientific researches into the history of the human species or races has traced him back through countless ages, by aid of archæology, pantology, geology, and philology, to the ape-like man, (*Pithecanthropi*,) which probably took place at the beginning of the Quaternary period, and even possibly at an earlier date, in the more recent Tertiary. According to the unanimous opinion of most eminent philologists, all human languages are not derived from a common pri-

meval language, when he had only a few guttural sounds that enabled him to communicate but a few of his pressing wants and passions to his fellow-man, partly by a language of gestures, partly by feelings or touch, partly by cries or sounds. As he advanced, these sounds were formed into words and words into sentences. So soon as he had originated a language or articulate words, which tended to modify and perfect the larynx, and this modification or adaptation above all others helped to create the deep chasm between man and animal, and which also caused the most important progress in the mental activity and the perfecting of the brain connected with it. The higher differentiation and perfecting of the brain and its mental life, as its highest function, developed in direct correlation with its expression by means of speech. Hence the highest authorities in comparative philology justly see in the development of human speech the most important process which distinguishes man from his animal ancestors, so that by aid of the philologist we are able to trace man's language back to twelve distinct roots, and some say that this number may be reduced to five.

But all learned philologists and ethnologists agree that there is no similarity in the construction of the language of these five great types or races, the Caucasian or Mediterranean, Mongolian, Malayan, Indian or American, and Negro. Freid. Müller, an eminent linguist, says that if the origin of articulate language is considered as the real and principal act of humanification, and the species of the human race are distinguished according to the roots of their language, it might be said that the different races of men had originated independently of one another by different branches of primeval speechless men. Comparative philology is now becoming to be looked upon by the learned as good authority in the matter. Fred. Müller, in his celebrated work on ethnography, has justly placed language in the foreground. Next to it the nature of the hair of the head is of great importance, for although it is in itself of course only a subordinate morphological character, yet it seems to be strictly transmitted with the race. Of the twelve species of men, the four lower species are characterized by the woolly nature of the hair of their heads. Every hair is flattened like a tape, and thus its section is oval. They may be reduced to two groups, tuft-haired and fleecy-haired. The Papuan's and Hottentot's grow in unequally-divided small tufts, (*Lophocomi;*) the woolly or fleecy haired men's (*Eriocomi*) (Caffre's and Negro's) grows equally all over the skin of their heads. All of the woolly-haired men have slanting teeth, long heads, and the color of their skin, hair, and eyes is always very dark.

"The woolly-haired type (*Ulotrichi*) are (says Haeckle) incapable of a true inner culture and a higher mental development, even under the favorable conditions of adaptation now offered to them in the United States of North America. No woolly-haired nation has ever had an important history;" but so soon as left alone to themselves revert back to their barbarous condition, as in Hayti, where they, with the aid of the mulattoes and mixed breeds, freed themselves from the French government. Soon as they had got rid of the whites, the blacks turned upon the mulattoes and have nearly exterminated them. So it is in Jamaica, and will be the same in the Gulf States, where they are largely in the ascendency; for in many places they have already introduced some of their heathen customs, as the obi-man and smoke-worship.

In the eight higher races of men, which are called straight-haired, (*Lissotrichi,*) the hair of the head is never woolly; it is, in some individuals, very frizzled. Every hair is cylindrical, (not like a tape;) its section is circular, (not oval.) These eight races may be divided into two

groups, stiff-haired and curly-haired. Stiff-haired, (*Euthzoomi*,) the hair of whose heads is quite smooth and straight. To this group belongs Australians, Malays, Mongolians, Arctic tribes, and Indians or Americans. Curly-haired men, (*Euplocomi*,) the hair of whose heads is more or less curly, and in whom the beard is more developed than in all other species; this includes the Dravidas, Nubians, and Caucasian or Mediterranean races.

We will begin with the lowest stages, the woolly-haired men, (*Ulotrichi.*) The Papuan (*Homo Papua*) is, perhaps, the most closely related to the original primary form of woolly-haired men. This species now inhabit New Guinea, Solomon's Islands, New Caledonia, the New Hebrides, also Van Diemen's Land. They appear closely related to the Hottentots, though widely separated.

The genuine negro (*Homo Niger*) is confined between the equator and the tropic of Capricorn, and only a small portion has gone beyond this boundary. The color of skin is always more or less pure black, velvety to the touch, and it is characterized by a peculiar offensive exhalation; the forehead flat and low, nose broad and thick, lips large and protruding, chin very short, calves of legs thin, and very long arms.

"The black African races," says Nott and Gliddon, "inhabiting the south of Egypt have been in constant intercourse with her, as we have proved from the monuments, during 4,000 years, yet they have not made a solitary step toward civilization, neither will they, nor can they, until their physical organization becomes changed." Not a single instance of civilization, spontaneous or borrowed, has ever existed to adorn its gloomy past.

The lowest stage of all straight-haired men are the natives of Australia, (*Austral Negro*,) which seems to be exclusively confined to the large island of Australia; it resembles the genuine African Negro, with its black or brown hair and offensive smell of skin, very slanting teeth, and long skull and receding forehead, broad nose, protruding lips, and also by the entire absence of calves; but is much weaker and with more delicate structure of their bones, with long, straight, lank hair. It is probable that they are closely related to the Dravidas. Their language is peculiar, broken up into small branches, which is rude and consists of a few low guttural sounds that convey only a few ideas and the names of a few things; their enumeration seldom extends to number ten.

The Malay, (*Homo Malayus*,) known as the brown race, is not so numerous as other species. They are found in Malacca, Sunda Islands, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, and Sandwich Islands. The Malays, in the formation of body, are nearest akin to the Mongolians. They are generally short-headed, their hair black and stiff, but frequently somewhat curled; color of skin is brown, sometimes yellowish or of a cinnamon-color, sometimes reddish or copper brown; face broad, prominent nose, thick lips; the opening for the eyes not so narrowly cut and slanting as in the Mongols.

Mongol (*Homo Mongolus*) is nigh to the Mediterranean or Caucasian. This race is spread over nearly all of Asia; also the Fins and Lapps, Osmalis in Turkey, and the Magyars in Hungary. There are two branches of the language of the Mongols; it is probably traceable to a common primeval language, but the monosyllabic languages of the Indo-Chinese includes the Thibetans, Birmans, Siamese, and Chinese. The other polysyllabic Mongols are divided into three races: 1st, the Coreo-Japanese; 2d, Tartars, Kirghises, Kalmucks, Buriats, and Tungusians; and, 3d, Samoiedes, Fins; and the Magyars of Hungary are the descendants of the Fins.

The polar man (*Homo Arcticus*) is looked upon as a branch of the Mongols, which includes the Esquimaux and Greenlanders in America, and Jukagirs, Tschuksches, Kurtoks, and Kamtschads.

The Red-skins or Americans, (*Homo Americus.*) Their foreheads broad and low, their nose large, prominent, and often aquiline, high cheek-bones, lips rather thin, skin reddish, coppered, or light red, sometimes deep reddish-brown, yellow-brown, or olive-brown. Their languages numerous, very different, yet all agree in their original foundation. Probably America was first peopled from Northeastern Asia by the same tribe of Mongols from the polar men, yet it is probable that Mongols and Polynesians came over from the Old World from the west and mixed with the former tribes in Mexico and Peru, which gave rise to that peculiar civilization.

The Dravida man, (*Homo Dravida.*) Very near the common primary form of the *Euplocomi* or curly-haired, and perhaps of *Lissotrichi* or straight-haired men. At present this primeval species of men are only found in the southern part of Hindostan and in the mountains of the northeast of Ceylon. Their skin is either of a light or dark brown color, in some tribes of a yellowish-brown, others almost a black-brown. Their hair is more or less curly, or quite smooth. They have a strongly-developed beard. Their oval face seems to be akin to that of the Malays, forehead high, nose prominent, and narrow, thin lips, slightly protruding. Their language is now much mixed with Indo-Germanic elements, but seems to be originally derived from a very peculiar primeval language.

The Nubian (*Homo Nubia*) inhabits the countries of Upper Nile, Dongola, Schangalla, Barabra, Cordofan, and Fulas or Fallatas. They are generally classed with negroes or the Hamitic races, but are essentially different from both. They must therefore be regarded as a different species. Their skin is of a yellowish or reddish brown, more rarely dark brown, approaching black. Their hair is not woolly but curly, even quite smooth, its color dark brown or black. Their beard is more strongly developed than the negro's. The oval form of the face approaches rather the Caucasian than the negro types. The forehead is high and broad, nose prominent, lips not protruding like the negro. Their language appears to possess no relationship to those of the genuine negro.

The Caucasian or Mediterranean man (*Homo Mediterraneus*) for time immemorial has been placed at the head of all races of men as the most highly developed and perfect. Fred. Müller has given him the name of the Mediterranean or midland man, as they have been found around that sea and first rose to a flourishing condition on its shores. Its origin is expressed by the name of Indo-Atlantic. It has now spread over the whole earth, and is overcoming most of all other species in the great struggle for existence. In body as well as mind no human species can equal it. With the exception of the Mongolian it has an actual history. It alone has attained to that degree of civilization which seems to raise man above the rest of nature.

The largest portion of this race the skin is white. However, it exhibits all shades, from pure white or reddish-white through yellow or yellowish-brown to dark-brown, or even black-brown. Their hair is generally strong, more or less curly, the hair of the beard stronger than of any other species. Their skulls show a great development in breadth. It is the only species of men that the body as a whole attains the symmetry in all parts and the equal development which we call the type of perfect humanity and beauty. The languages of all of

these races of this species can by no means be traced to a single common primeval language; we must assume four radical different primeval languages, which are only connected at their root. Two of these races, the Basques and Caucasians, now exist only as small remnants. The Basques are now confined to a narrow strip of land in the northern coast of Spain, in Biscay Bay. The remnant of the Caucasian race (the Doghestans, Tschercassians, Mingrelians, and Gergians) is now confined to the district of Mount Caucasus. The Indo-Germanic race at a very early period separated into two branches, the Ario-Romanic and Sclavo-Germanic branches. Out of the former arose the Arians, (Indians and Iranians,) Greco-Romans, Greeks, Albans, Italians, and Kelts. But of the Sclavo-Germanic branch were developed on the one hand the Sclavonians, (Russian, Bulgarian, Tchec, and the Baltic tribes,) on the other the Germanic, (Scandinavians and Germans, Netherlanders, and Anglo-Saxons,) as may be more fully explained by examining August Schleicher's works, On the Indo-Germanic Races.

The language of the two principal races of the Mediterranean species are Semitic and Indo-Germanic, cannot be traced to a common origin, and consequently these two races must have separated at an early period, and may have descended from different ape-like men, or different roots. The Semitic race includes Egyptians, Arabic, Berbers, Bedsha, Galla, Danakil, Somali, and all the tribes extending from the Mediterranean Sea into Africa to the equator, also the Jews, Armenians, Syrians, and Chaldaceans.

We hold that the intelligence of man makes the man; that the boy inherits certain qualities which impel him, and every man carries in his own head what he will be.

In the great struggle for existence, each type possessed at the start mental instincts, which, driving reason before them, determined each national character. The earliest civilization known to us is that of Egypt, which, perhaps, was borrowed from China; and from this foundation it is commonly said all modern civilizations are derived. Of this science is by no means certain. From Egypt the stream is supposed to have flowed steadily on through Assyria, Palestine, Tyre, Persia, Greece, Rome, Gaul, Germany, Spain, Britain, until it crossed the Atlantic to the United States. Certain it is that Western Europe has rifted the bonds of barbarism only within recent historical times. European races, notwithstanding, possessed these cranial developments and those moral instincts which forced them to play their part in the grand drama as soon as the light penetrated to them, and then forms of government and stability became secured. The Celtic and the Germanic races required no gradual "expansion of brain" through successive generations. Created with the fullest "expansion," they at once adopted it. But not so with the dark races.

Theodore Parker, speaking of this race, says: The Caucasian differs from all other races; he is humane; he is civilized, and progresses. He conquers with the head as well as with his hand. It is intellect after all that conquers, not the strength of a man's arm. The Caucasian has been often master of the other races; never their slave. He has carried his religion to other races, but never takes theirs. In history all religions are of Caucasian origin. All the great limited forms of monarchies are Caucasian; republics are Caucasian. All the great sciences are of Caucasian origin; all inventions are Caucasian; literature and romance came of the same stock. All the great poets are of Caucasian origin. Moses, Luther, Jesus Christ, Zoroaster, Buddha, Pythagoras, were Caucasian. No race can bring up to memory such celebrated names as the

Caucasian race. The Chinese philosopher, Confucius, is an exception to the rule. To the Caucasian race belong the Arabian, Persian, Hebrew, and Egyptian ; and all the European nations are the descendants of the Caucasian race.

There are three fundamental forms of language:

1. Monosyllabic languages. Each word contains but one syllable, and is spoken in China.

2. Agglutinative languages, in which the words are connected. This language is spoken by the negro races, and also many of the yellow races. It is a language of variable terminations attached to each word, modifying, and promotes expression.

3. Inflected languages, which is bent or varying in termination. It is spoken in Europe and by all the white races.

The Chinese language is the most difficult, as each word is of one syllable. So to understand the Chinese language the life of a single man is not long enough to learn all its characters and words. It has a character for each syllable, and every syllable has a character. For example: when a man goes forth to take a walk his com-pan-ions may be pull-ing at him—separating the syllables in this manner, showing the whole theory of Chinese monosyllabism, which sentence is thus expressed in Chinese: Iin chuh-lai tsŏw-taŏu pang-zew-mun lá-la-chang-chay.

Morrison says in the native dictionary, there are 411 simple vocals and 533 aspirates, and the tones swell the number to 1,600, and that a man can get along if he knows some nine or ten thousand of them. In the mandarin or general dialect Mr. Edkins says that to read the classics he will have to learn about 20,000. But a recent work gives the number of characters in the language at about 52,325, and even that will not include all the technical characters, and the difficulty of learning the language prevents the masses from ever learning it. Therefore they remain ignorant, and it leaves its literature in the hands of a few who devote their life-time to study. More time is consumed by the Chinese student in the mastering the written language than is given in other countries to the acquirement of a liberal education, and it is said that there are not over three hundred scholars in China who can read the classics. The masses are all educated in the rudiments, so that they know a few of the characters, and can make a few, but to them the classics, which comprises a large number of books, they cannot read or understand any more than if they were written in Arabic or Hebrew. A merchant may understand the characters of his trade, but may not be able to read any other books. And for this reason is assigned by some writers why China has not made any progress in the last few thousand years. Their language is so cumbersome and difficult that it takes all their time to learn it; so wrapped up in the musty records of the past that they have no thought of the present, but think there is nothing worth knowing but what has been written; like the learned monks of the Middle Ages looking to musty records of the past and the Bible as containing all that was worth knowing, ready to make war upon any one who would attack any of their dogmas, however absurd. For ages they have lived locked and secluded from the world, protected from the outside barbarians on the west and south by the Himalaya or tall snow mountains, which are hard to cross, a mountain-range of three hundred miles in width ; on the east by the ocean, and on the north by their great wall which stretches over mountains and valleys some fifteen hundred miles. This great work was built some two hundred and fifty years before the birth of Christ, by Chung Wang, to protect themselves.

from the inroads of the Tartars. Here let me say that by the order of this emperor all the books were nearly destroyed, burned by his order, to get rid of all the traditions of the past; but these traditions were cherished by the people, for many of them had been committed to memory and rewritten; so their history is full of mystery, and shrouded in allegory and fables, like the early history of Greece, Rome, and Egypt, and it is a question if they had had a Lord Bacon, with a new language to introduce the inductive system of education, they might have made further progress in the arts and sciences. But for ages living in the past, like an old man who thinks all things and all people are better when he was a boy, so China is like the old man, has ripened and fallen into that idea, that the past is far superior to the present or the future. And so deeply is this idea ingrained into them, it is as impossible to make them adopt the modern civilization. Being so vast an empire, sheltered by inaccessible mountains and plains on the west, they, in all probability, will remain the same for ages to come; and in all probability they have arrived at that condition or fixed type of a homogeneous race when they are all like one great family, (looking alike,) the ruts and grooves are worn so deep that they will ever remain the same, having become fixed and typified. The total population of the human races amounts to about 1,350,000,000. About one hundred and fifty millions belong to the woolly-haired races, and about five hundred and fifty millions belong to the Mongols, and about the same to the Mediterranean races. These two races are the most highly developed, far surpassing all other human species in numbers of individuals. The relative number of the other ten remaining species fluctuates every year, and that according to the law of development of Darwin, the survival of the fittest, that, in the struggle for life, the more highly developed, the more favored and larger groups of persons possess the positive inclination and the certain tendency to spread, and at the expense of the lower and smaller groups, which must give way.

Thus the Mediterranean or Indo-Germanic species have, by means of higher development of their brain, surpassed all other races and species in the struggle for life, and have already spread the net of their dominion over the whole globe. The Mongolian species is the only one that can successfully, in any respect, compete with them. For the first time in the history of the world they have met face to face on the virgin soil of California. These hardy Mongolians, with their peculiar civilization, have met us at the Golden Gate, and have begun the contest for the ascendency. The large numbers here, and the constant increase arriving daily, and the nearness and accessibility to the hive, they swarm from, have alarmed the whites in California and the Pacific coast, and well they may be.

The Mongolian race have a history, musty with age, that claims a civilization of five thousand years, and authentic history that goes back of Moses' creation of the world and the exodus of the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt—that shows that even Egypt borrowed her civilization from them; that they were a great and enlightened nation when the Greeks beat down the walls of Troy; that their great philosopher, Confucius, wrote the Shu-Kinger Shan-Shu 550 years before the birth of Christ, and eighty years before the birth of Socrates; that their literature is said to be rich in works of every description, both in verse and in prose, moral philosophy, history, geography, voyages, dramas, romances, tales, and fiction of all kinds; whose government rests on a monarchical basis and educational qualification, somewhat complicated in its form, yet it has withstood the ravages of ages. Says

a great political writer, "That government is best which lasts the longest." If that axiom be true, then their government is the best, for it has stood and seen all the great nations of the Indo-Germanic races rise and fall, and was in the zenith of its greatness when the Anglo-Saxons ran wild in the woods of Germany, and the natives of England were a band of savages.

Yet during all that time there is not one instance, not one effort to free himself from tyranny and oppression and establish a free form of government. While, on the other hand, the white race has deluged Europe in blood to light the fires of liberty, he quietly submits to Chinese or Tartar's rule, and wears his queue or long tail as the badge of his submission and degradation, following in deep ruts of traditions and ancestry, with stoic indifference to all the wants and surroundings, so that he can get enough to satisfy his pressing wants of nature. He cares not for the outside world, its wars, its improvements, its literature, and its struggle for freedom; wrapped up in his own conceit and traditions, he looks on all outside of the Flowery Kingdom as barbarians. He has reduced government, society, and living to a system, the largest number that can live in the smallest space, and on the least food and air. He has become typified, stamped, and finished; so they all look alike, dress and appear alike. They have become a homogeneous race and progress has ended. They have arrived thousands of years ago to the highest attainment of their brain capacity. To change them is to destroy them and their peculiar civilization; so they must remain the same; and to increase their numbers here will make this country an Asiatic colony. For it is beyond a question that they can compete with the whites in almost all branches of industry, while he is willing to work more hours and live on less, what a white laborer would actually starve on, who is a flesh-eating animal and is more expensive food than vegetable. To throw open the country to their immigration and foster and encourage it as we do to the Europeans, we would in a few years be overrun, so that the white man would have to emigrate, or begin a war of races. Learned ethnologists, like Nott, Gliddon, and Dr. Morton, have shown that any race of people whose average heads do not exceed a brain capacity of over 85 cubic inches are not capable of a free form of government; that there is no instance in their history that they ever have attempted it; that the average of Chinese and American negro is about 82 to 83 cubic inches of brain capacity, while the Indo-Germanic race reaches an average as high as 92 to 96 cubic inches of brain capacity, and some going as high as 125 cubic inches.

Table of the brain capacity of the different races.

Name.	Skulls.	Largest, inches.	Smallest, inches.	Average, inches.
Caucasian groups:				
Modern Germans	18	114	70	90
English	5	105	91 and 96	92
Anglo-American	7	97	82 and 90	
Pelasgic:				
Persians, Circassians, Americans	10	94	75	84
Celtic, Native Irish	6	97	78	87
Hindostanic, Bengalese	32	91	67	80
Semitic, Arabs	3	98	84	89
Chinese, fairly	6	91	70	82
Malays, fairly	20	97	68	85
Arecert, Peruvian	155	101	58	75
Indians of America:				
Iroquois, Cherokees, Shoshones	161	104	70	84
Negro groups:				
Native African	62	99	65	83
American-born African	12	89	73	82
Hottentot	3	83	68	75
Australian	8	83	63	75

Dr. Wyman, in his post-mortem examination of Daniel Webster's head, found the internal capacity of the cranium to be 122 cubic inches, with a circumference of $23\frac{3}{4}$ inches; longitudinal diameter, $7\frac{7}{8}$ inches; transverse, $5\frac{3}{8}$ inches; vertical, $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches. So you can see at a glance that, not having the brain capacity, they never can attain the high position of being freemen and using the ballot wisely and honorably in the selection of the best and purest men to office to rule and govern them, but look upon it as something put into their hands by which they may make a few dollars at the risk of liberty and human progress; and such a class of voters are dangerous to republics, and their immigration should be looked upon with disfavor by all true lovers of freedom and progress, for it is a hard struggle to preserve a free form of government even with the highest type of the Indo-Germanic races. It has heretofore proven a failure, for there are a vast number of them that fall below the average of 85 cubic inches of brain capacity; and as we have already reduced the average below that of England or Germany, it may endanger the cause of liberty and free government to introduce any more of the inferior races, as science has shown that the brain capacity of any animal is determined by the volume of its brain. The gorilla has about 45 cubic inches of brain, while the lowest of the negro or human race is not less than about 63 cubic inches, while the negro of the United States rises to 82 cubic inches; but this is owing to the mixture with the whites, as there are but few pure African-blooded negroes in this country, and much mixed with the different tribes of Africa who have been sold into slavery. This raises them to the average of the Chinaman, while the average of the Anglo-American rises to 90 cubic inches, the English to 96 cubic inches. The facial angle of the gorilla is at an angle of 40°, while the negro rises to 85° and the white race to 95°.

As the Chinese arrived, thousands of years ago, to the height of their brain capacity, they will, like the Indian, who is a Mongolian, suffer extermination rather than change their mode of life and adopt Western civilization. As they are an inferior race to the white man in brain capacity, it perhaps would be as well to let him remain where he is, and encourage trade and friendly relations; and as they have a deep love for their own country, let them remain where they are, as they are an inferior race to the white, and of a different type and a different civilization, and as no two races can live together on equal terms and not amalgamate, and as nature has placed its mark in color and odor.

Here let me say that all naturalists will tell you that every species is protected by nature in its color or its odor, or something of that kind. It is useless for a government to attempt to remove it, for nature has, in its wisdom, made certain distinctions and placed certain safeguards around the Anglo-Saxon race that it never has amalgamated with the inferior races, but in all their emigrations have carried their families with them, while the Latin races have amalgamated, and we see the effect on the races in the United States and South American States—amalgamation with inferior races. Their offspring generally inherit all the vices of the superior races, and but little of their virtues.

And as they are of a less brain capacity, falling below the Anglo-Saxon, which averages from 90 to 96 cubic inches of brain-matter, while the Chinaman falls below 85 cubic inches of brain-matter; so that, to preserve the harmony of society, it will perhaps be the best to discourage their immigration. If they could be confined to the reclaiming of tule-land and its cultivation and to the growth of rice, silk-worms, and the manufacture of silks, they would be an advantage.

The admission of the Chinese immigration would not be so dangerous if they were restricted in certain classes of labor; but the moment they set their foot on the soil they have a right to enter into any branch of business. They generally select that which pays the best and easiest, thus depriving a certain class of laborers of employment, who are forced to seek a living by prostitution, which debases them and destroys their usefulness as wives and mothers, for the poor white women have to work for a living. Washing, sewing, cooking, and nursing are always open to them, which affords ready employment to the unfortunate, who are forced to seek a living as menials and servants. This last resort of the unfortunate and poor is rapidly being monopolized by the Chinamen, and if they could speak the English language readily, would drive out all competition before them. They take the places in the factories, where the labor of the poor boys and girls might be utilized, throwing them out on the streets to grow up in idleness, to be hoodlums.

The reversionary tendency and the unfortunate of all races have a large supply of this kind of labor that have to be provided for as cheap laborers or supported at the public expense, and to fill it up with cheap labor of another race is unnatural and unjust. It at once disorganizes society, engenders an ill-feeling between the two different races, for the poor and unfortunate whites will feel that their places are taken from them and given to another race, when they might be able to earn an honest living, however humble; that they are unable to compete with the hardy, economical Chinaman, who has no family to support, no children to educate, and no taxes to pay, no churches to contribute to, and no God to worship, who are cold and selfish, almost destitute of feelings of sympathy or charity; intent on making money, that they may return to their native land; like a swarm of busy ants, coming with nothing, and toting all they can get away, impoverishing the country and enriching

their own; bringing their loathsome diseases and leprosy, which has not heretofore made its appearance in the virgin soil of America, with their low morals and vices, which tend to degrade the youths of the white race; spreading loathsome diseases into the best and purest blood of the Anglo-Saxon race, which brings that loathsome disease in our minds that makes us shrink back with horror and disgust from its contamination.

They are our antipodes in every sense; they are our opposites in almost everything; their seat of honor is on the left, while ours is on the right; they wear white for mourning, we black; they think it no harm to lie and cheat, we do; they think it no harm to kill a child or drown a girl baby as a blind puppy, we do; they worship the Evil Spirit, for they say they have nothing to fear from the Good Spirit, while we worship the Great Good Spirit and detest the Evil One.

Like wine and water, we will never mix, and in the great struggle for existence the Chinaman will come to the top every time if left to free and equal competition. The first law of nature is self-preservation, and to do this Chinese immigration must be discouraged. In a free country there cannot well exist two different classes or races of people possessing a different brain capacity. The cry of oppression will be raised, and that these inferior races must have the ballot to protect themselves. And whenever it is necessary for the dominant power to put the ballot in the hands of Chinese to control the elections of California and the Pacific coast, it will be done, as it was placed in the hands of the negroes of the South, who are far below the Chinese in intelligence; belonging to one of the lowest types, while the Chinaman stands next to the white man.

These, united with the negroes of the South, will endanger the elective franchise, and sink it below that average of intelligence and virtue that is necessary to preserve a free form of government.

It was necessary to give the negro the ballot to protect his right; so it will be with the Chinaman whenever the time comes and they demand it. And as the vexed negro question of the South has and will endanger the liberty and harmony of the Government, and it was an evil day to America when they were first introduced under the plea of necessity that they were good laborers and made better servants than the Indians, so the vexed China question will in time grow with an increase of numbers, and we may have two vexed questions instead of one. The negro question one hundred years ago was of little or no importance. So it may be with the Chinese question one hundred years hence. They may then control the entire Pacific States, if left to an unrestricted immigration. They are learning our language, and find out that they can do better by staying here, as many of us did who came here in the early days of California. None thought of staying, but necessity forced us to stay until we got weaned of our prejudices and love of home. So it is with the Chinaman. California did not prosper until we commenced to make homes here and get our families here. The Chinaman takes all the surplus wealth he earns out of the country; so he helps to impoverish by taking all away. But it is better he do this than stay and become a citizen.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Are you a disciple of Darwin?—A. No, sir; I read all scientists. I only take the doctrine as it is given to me, and I have no fixed faith in it. I give you what science says. I am certain that the world has evolved, and that from the lower to the higher there are, as we may say, connecting links.

Q. You believe in the doctrine of evolution?—A. Evolution, of course. All scientific men, although I hardly claim to be one, believe that pretty much. As you have heard a great deal upon the resources and origin of China and its form of government, it, perhaps, may not be necessary, yet I have compiled a paper here which ought to be read as a whole, and which will throw some light on the subject.

China, called by Chinese Tsin, or Toistsing, is an immense empire, next to that of Russia in territory. It comprises the eighteen provinces, or China Proper; Mantchooria, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Ili, or Chinese Turkistan, Koko-Nor, and Thibet; Corea and the Loochoo Islands are nominal dependencies. It is bounded on north and northeast by Asiatic Russia; on east and southeast by Corea and the Yellow and China seas; south by Gulf of Tonquin, Anam, Siam, and Burmah; and southwest and west by India and the states of Independent Tartary. It extends from latitude 53° north to latitude 18° north; has an area, deducting the territory ceded to the Russians in 1858, which was 300,000 square miles, of about 5,000,000 square miles.

China Proper, called by the Chinese Chung Kwoh, (or Middle Kingdom,) or Chung-hwa, (Central or Flowery Land.) This country is bounded on the north by the great wall; east by the ocean; south by Gulf of Tonquin, Anam Siam, and Burmah; west by Thibet and Chinese Tartary, or the Great Snow Mountains.

Its area of territory is about 1,500,000 square miles, which is seven times larger than France, or one-half of Europe. Its mountains are full of minerals. Professor Dana says that next to Pennsylvania coal-lands, which are 46,000 square miles, are the coal-fields of Sharei, which has an area of 36,000 square miles, which is traversed by the river Hoang-ho, and that there is a plenty of iron-ore in that vicinity. Gold is found in the beds of the Yang-tse. It will be well in connection here to say that China, perhaps, we have overestimated.

The population of China Proper is estimated from three hundred and fifty to four hundred millions. Its imports amount to $80,000,000 and exports extend to $74,000,000. Its imports from England are $29,000,000 and its exports to England are $38,000,000.

Its imports from Hong-Kong are	$25,000,000
Its exports to Hong-Kong are	12,000,000
Its imports from United States are	500,000
Its exports to United States are	11,500,000

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. That is, the Chinese exports are $500,000?—Answer. Yes; and we send into their country $11,500,000.

Q. They export to us $500,000 and we export to them $11,500,000?—A. Yes, sir.

The number of foreign vessels entering her ports in 1871 was 14,963. Total tonnage was 7,381,557.

The number of English vessels were 7,161, whose tonnage was 3,187,643 tons. American vessels for that year were 4,600; tonnage was 3,187,643 tons.

Germany for that year was 1,480 vessels, and tonnage 428,747 tons. The revenues of the government, yearly, as estimated by Medherst, are about $200,958,694. Of this land-tax, $42,327,795 in grain, $12,692,871 is sent to Pekin, and $38,273,500 in money and $105,689,707 in grain is left in the provinces, and $1,974,662 in duties.

Hue estimated that there were 700,000 Catholic converts in China. Others estimate it from 400,000 to 1,000,000. Protestants number about

5,629, and several millions of Mohammedans. They are indifferent in religious matters. They have no corresponding term for the word "religion." "Kiao," the word that comes the nearest to it, means doctrine or creed. The lowest class are mostly Buddhists, which has sunk into coarse Paganism and idolatry. The priests of this profession are over one million, who are low and ignorant, and have no great respect for virtue. The higher class believe in Confucius, or Laotes, which is little more than moral philosophy clothed in fantastic symbols. Confucius teaches that from all original substance (tai-ki) two principles emanate—Yang, the principle of perfection, of the heavenly, of light and warmth, the masculine symbol, by ——; and Yin, the feminine principle, or that of perfection of the terrestrial, of darkness and cold, symbolized — —, and by the combination of them. Four symbols are presented: ☰ ☱ ☲ ☳ ☴ ☵ ☶ ☷, corresponding to the four cardinal virtues—piety, morality, justice, and wisdom, and from a double combination resulted eight signs, Kua, viz: ☰, which stands for heaven; ☵, moistness; ☲, fire; ☴, wind; ☶, mountains; ☳, thunder; ☷, earth; and by arranging these symbols into a circle Confucius described the universe, and, making them correspond with all moral and mental properties, constituted an ethical system scarcely to be styled a religion. Lao-tse, born 604 B. C. and fifty-four years before Confucius, the religion of Tao, Supreme Reason, which, according to him, was anterior to and the source of Divinity Ki-Ki Krui. No religion is taught in the common schools.

The Chinese are indifferent to all religion, and will worship in any temple, whether it be Buddhist or Tao, or Confucius. The only creed upon which all agree is the worship of their dead ancestors.

The form of the Chinese government is monarchical, but not despotic. The Emperor is bound by the ancient laws and customs, and could not without danger disregard the advice or remonstrance of his ministers or boards of administrators. He is never called by his true name, but assumes another when he becomes Emperor. He never appears in public unless proceeded by a large body-guard. His courtiers and chamberlains amount to about one thousand, mostly eunuchs. He has one legitimate wife, called empress, and two wives of inferior rank, called queens, and a great number of concubines. The Emperor makes a selection of his successor from his sons of his three wives, but keeps it a profound secret until his death.

The daughters are married to Mongolian or Mantchoo princes. Every succeeding generation of this imperial offspring sinks one grade lower in the rank of nobility until it reaches the seventh generation; then they lose their rank, but are governed by a special board of the imperial clan. Only the highest class of nobility is compelled to live at court. Besides this nobility of birth, there is a personal dignity, generally, connected with official rank, which is open to all, irrespective of birth, subjected to an educational qualification. The five ancient degrees of dignity are, kung, ham, pirtse, and nan, which are sometimes regarded as similar to duke, marquis, earl, viscount, and baron.

The administration of the imperial government is complicated. A cabinet of four chancellors and master of assessors has the superintendence of the legislation of the country. Two of this board or cabinet are Mantchoos and the other two Chinese; the former have a veto on the latter. The Emperor takes a part in the labor of this board. Of late a portion of its powers have been invested in a cabinet council of five, which corresponds to the ministry of the western powers, who are se-

lected by the Emperor. Their duty relates to the ministry of all the departments of government.

The principal executive bodies under them are the six boards:

First, board of civil service.

Second, board of revenues.

Third, board of rites.

Fourth, board of war.

Fifth, board of justice, possessing the functions of supreme court.

Sixth, board of public works.

Each department has two presidents, and four vice-presidents; one-half Chinese and the other half Mantchoos. Under these are the subordinate grades of officers or directors, under-secretaries and comptrollers, besides a great many clerks. But no board is entirely independent of the other in its acts.

It has also a board of examiners, whose business is to examine all the official acts of the ministry and cabinet, and determine the best interests of the country, and even to stop them, and is similar to that of the tribunes of ancient Rome, a substitute for a popular representation.

They have also a colonial office to look after the interest of the vassal states. Also a western office to hold relation with the outside world or strangers.

The eighteen provinces are divided into departments of two million inhabitants each; these departments are divided into districts.

The larger provinces are governed by a governor-general, or viceroy, and two or three of the lesser provinces are governed by a viceroy, but each province has a governor, and at the head of the departments are intendents of circuit, at the head of districts magistrates, and under them are petty officers who keep the peace and collect the revenue. The civil mandarins number 15,000, military mandarins number 20,000. Each are divided into nine classes, and each class rank alike.

Officials of the first rank wear a ruby button placed in the top of the skull-cap; the second rank, a red coral button; third, a sapphire button; the fourth, a blue, opaque stone button; fifth, a crystal button; sixth, a white shell button; seventh, a plain gold button; eighth, a worked gold button; ninth, a worked silver button on the top of his skull cap or hat. All civil offices are open to any citizen of China, except that of the Emperor, which descends to the son of his chosen; but all aspirants to office must pass what is called the board of education, as to his literary attainments, which is open to all. First they must pass a board of education in the district, then in the province, and then the highest board of examiners at Pekin, and the one that passes there the best examination is invested with almost royal power, and is pensioned, and becomes the sage or the wise man of the nation. The rejected applicants are made teachers in the common schools, which are open to all.

ARMY.

The regular army, or the Eight Banners, says De Guignes, consists of 100,000 matchoos, 21,000 Mongolian Tartars, and 27,000 Chinese.

The militia, or Green Banners, numbers 700.000 men, mostly farmers and merchants, beside some irregular corps, which brings the army up to 1,230,000. The pay of foot-soldiers is from three to four dollars per month; horsemen, or cavalry, get five dollars per month.

NAVY.

The navy consists of 1,951 war-junks and 20 vessels of the foreign style, manned at first by Europeans, but of late by Chinese, who are inefficient and not skilled.

Q. From what I gather from your observations, you find that scientists all agree that the brain-power of the Chinese is less than up to the average standard that will enable them to be a self-governing, independent race?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That any government which they compose will fail because of the intrinsic inferiority of their mental capacity?—A. Yes, sir. No other besides the Indo-Germanic race seems to have what we call a coolness of judgment. They are not disposed to run off on impulses, and have what we call a well-balanced head. A man may be very smart in one thing and very deficient in another. A Chinaman may be very smart in his civilization and in his way, but he has no capacity for adopting our civilization or our form of government.

Q. Then, in that respect, he would, in your opinion, be a dangerous element in our political society?—A. Very.

Q. And in the future not desirable?—A. Not desirable; no more so than the negro of the South. They would either sell their votes or else they would make this an Asiatic country. From their nearness to their own country they can very easily get a majority here and overwhelm us at the ballot-box.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. The same thing, you say, applies to the negro race?—A. Yes, sir; the negro is still lower than the Chinaman; but the American negro has been raised by mixture and crossing until the average runs up to about the Chinaman.

Q. Would not the same mixture of the Chinaman help him?—A. The mixture of races with the negro has been more by mixing the different tribes of Africa, the Hottentot with the Papuan; the woolen hair with the turfed hair. One is higher than the other.

Q. But still the highest of them is below the Caucasian?—A. Yes, sir. The trouble is that whenever one type intermarries with the other type, the lower type generally inherits all the vices and but little of the virtues of the higher type; as we see, for instance, in Mexico and South America. What is called the Latin race, that is, one branch of the Germanic race, has more or less amalgamated with the natives all through the country, and therefore they have bred an inferior race of people; but one peculiarity of the Indo-Germanic or Anglo-Saxon race is that they have never intermixed; they always carry their wives with them. In their forays and invasions of England they carried their wives over with them. For that reason almost all of the English stock was Anglo-Saxon.

Q. The deduction you draw is from the writings of scientists?—A. Yes, sir; the leading modern scientists.

Q. Is it calculated to establish or overturn the Mosaic history of the creation of man?—A. Science has nothing to do with that. Science is matter of fact; the other is matter of faith.

Q. To what does it lead when you follow science?—A. If you follow the scientists it overturns it, necessarily. There is some little conflict; but Moses, you know, wrote according to his idea of things.

Q. You cannot sustain what he says by science?—A. It would perhaps run afoul.

Q. Have you ever read the book some fellow has lately written to prove that Abraham was an Irishman?—A. I have not. The Celt or Kelt race have been mostly the French and Irish. These two are pretty much the same race of people in brain capacity; they are quick, fiery, and in certain things they excel; but they want what the German calls

balance, the faculty of keeping cool, quiet, and not to fly off the helm, as we sometimes say.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. The point of your argument I understand to be that the brain capacity of the Chinese race is such that they cannot maintain a free government?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That they are not equal to it?—A. They are not equal to it. It is something they cannot conceive of any more than a man measuring 65 or 75 inches can form an idea of a one God. As the man rises from the lower scale to the higher his brain expands, and it pushes up his intellectual organism.

Q. You say the doctrine of evolution is accepted by scientific men?—A. Pretty much.

Q. What do you mean by evolution?—A. I mean an unfolding, a general building up of the world from lower to higher.

Q. That a higher race has gradually been evolved from a lower race of animal life?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That of course rejects the Mosaic account of the creation absolutely?—A. Well, as I say, one is a matter of fact, and of course the other is a matter of faith.

Q. Is it not absolutely in conflict with it? I am asking you as a scientific man.—A. Scientists or physicists—I am not a scientist so much as a physicist—do not believe that the laws of nature have changed, nor that miracles and all such things are compatible with facts and science.

Q. I am not making any argument, but simply ask the question. You spoke about the doctrine of evolution being accepted by all scientific men?—A. If you give it a liberal construction there might not be so much difference, but by a strict construction, I think there would be a little difference.

Q. As to this division into classes, and the question of the average size of the brain in different races, I ask you if very much of that is not pure speculation?—A. No, I think not. Facts, and calculations, and tables lie; figures hardly ever lie.

Q. They can be made to lie?—A. Yes, sometimes, but if you calculate them rightly, they will not lie. If you want to compound interest, sometimes with a little slip you may make a little more interest.

Q. The point of your statement, I understand is, that the Chinese are intellectually incapable of sustaining free institutions?—A. I think so.

Q. And therefore, that their introduction into our country for that reason would be unfortunate?—A. Yes, sir; just the same as the introduction of the negro was two hundred years ago nearly, into the United States. The same question perhaps is involved now, and if we look wisely ahead, we may avoid an Asiatic trouble here. Had our ancestors one hundred and fifty or two hundred years ago met the negro question as we meet the Chinese question, we perhaps would have had no trouble on that score.

Q. As I understood you, civilization took its rise in Egypt?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And thence traveled eastward?—A. As Dr. Morton shows here, there are regular Mongolian tombs at Thebes, which show that the Mongolians were there, and it is found by paintings, and drawings, that Egypt took her civilization from China.

Q. You therefore locate the beginning of civilization from China?—A. We cannot go back further than Egypt, but it is perhaps borrowed from China.

JAMES PATTERSON sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. In this city.

Q. What business are you engaged in?—A. Saw-manufacturing.

Q. How long have you been engaged in that business?—A. Between ten and eleven years.

Q. How many employés have you?—A. We employ from twenty-five to thirty men and boys together.

Q. Do you employ any Chinese?—A. No, sir.

Q. How long have you carried on that manufactory with white labor?—A. Between ten and eleven years.

Q. Have you found any difficulty in procuring proper white labor?—A. No, sir.

Q. Make any statement in regard to that which you wish.—A. We have always been able to get what help we wanted. We keep our men steadily employed from one year to another and never have any difficulty with them. We get all the labor we want, but there is no extra surplus that I know of in that particular line.

Q. How do you find the boys?—A. Very good; as good as there are in any other place.

Q. Are they reliable and industrious?—A. Yes, sir; we find them so.

Q. Do they throw around your property in any way or wantonly destroy it?—A. No, sir; they are just as good as boys generally are.

Q. Do you find any difficulty in your business in competing with the rest of the world?—A. No, sir; we have kept along pretty well. We started some ten or eleven years ago with two men, and now employ between twenty-five and thirty.

Q. Is there any competition in your business?—A. Goods are sent here the same as to all other parts of the world. They are sent here from Great Britain and also from the Eastern States.

Q. What wages do you pay?—A. Our average pay for mechanics is four dollars a day. Laboring men from two dollars to two dollars and a half. Apprentice-boys we start at three dollars and a half a week, and keep on raising them as they increase in importance to us until they get up to ten or twelve dollars. They are nearly out of their time when they get to twelve dollars.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you think if white boys were treated kindly and intelligently in all the mechanical pursuits in this State that they would work industriously and could be used advantageously to themselves, to the community, and to the proprietors?—A. From my experience I have no trouble whatever either with boys or with men.

Q. Do you think that would obtain in all the other manufacturing pursuits as well as yours?—A. I do not know any reason why it should not.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Are there not a very large number of boys employed in the factories of this State?—A. Yes, sir; I should judge there were.

Q. Girls also?—A. I cannot state as to the number of girls employed, though there are some factories where they employ a large number of boys, but still not as much as what might be done, probably, if there were no Chinese here.

Q. In paper-box manufactories, are there not many girls?—A. I am not conversant with that line, and cannot answer.

Q. In the manufacture of fancy boxes?—A. I do not know.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many operatives do you employ?—A. From twenty-five to thirty. We have now about twenty-two men and five boys.

Q. All white?—A. All white.

Q. Does your business require skilled labor in whole or in part?—A. The same as any mechanical branch. Of course we have to learn apprentices the trade, the same as blacksmithing, molding, or iron-work, or anything of that kind.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. What State are you from?—A. I am a Scotchman by birth. I learned my trade in New York.

Q. Are the boys here, as a general rule, as good boys as where you came from?—A. Just as good. Some of the boys are a little wild.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Are the white boys here willing to work, like they are anywhere else?—A. Yes, sir; there is scarcely a week that we do not have applications for boys.

Q. Do you notice any less inclination on the part of white people to work here than anywhere else?—A. I do not know that I do. There are some people, of course, everywhere who do not pretend to work, but I think the generality of people here intend to work if they can get it to do.

JOHN ARNOUP sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in our State?—Answer. Five years; fourteen years on the coast.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. I am a journalist.

Q. Where upon the coast have you resided, elsewhere than San Francisco?—A. Oregon, Washington Territory, and British Columbia.

Q. During that time, have you had your attention called to the subject-matter of this investigation, or any point that we are discussing?—A. Yes, sir; I have made it a continual study.

Q. Give to the commission, in as brief way as you can, for we are hurried for time, your evidence upon the propriety of legislation upon this subject of restricting the immigration of Chinese here?—A. Would you not prefer to extract my opinions by questions?

Q. Give your opinion as to the general scope of this investigation?—A. I have come to the conclusion that the Chinaman, as overshadowed by civilized laws and by the presence of the white man, is a very different being on this coast from when those restraints are absent. For instance, on the banks of the Frazer, in 1863, a friend of mine was lost when to lose the trail meant starvation. On the second day he came upon a camp of about twenty Chinamen who were mining there. He told them his condition. In fact they could see it; and they knew that he was starving. He went to them five or six times in the day and they refused him food. I have been a great deal among the Indians, and that is a thing I never knew an Indian to be guilty of. That and other things have led me to believe that the Chinamen, left without the influences I have mentioned, is a very different kind of being from what we see him. Again, I have seen in this State where the wages of the white man have been directly lessened by the Chinaman and indirectly. In 1864, during the excavation of the dry-dock on Mare Island, I saw white men employed there. They were supplanted by Chinamen at a less rate of

wages, and I found that generally to be the case. Then, again, observation has taught me that the employers of Chinese themselves are to some extent demoralized by acquiring a feeling of dominancy, brute rule, I may call it, similar to what would be engendered by ruling an inferior class in any part of the country. I may further state that I have taken pains to come to correct conclusions; that I have met the advance of Chinese immigration without prejudice; but I never found a strong advocate of Chinese immigration who was not actuated either by fanaticism or by selfishness, selfishness perhaps in some cases pardonable, but in other cases not. I have seen some employers who perhaps were compelled to employ Chinamen; but I have seen other men, American born, who certainly would, if I may use a strong expression, employ devils from hell if the devils would work for 25 cents less than a white man, even though that white man may be an American citizen who had gone through all the rebellion. It is impossible for me at one time to recollect all that I might say on this subject.

Q. As the result you have come to from your observation of Chinese and their effect upon our civilization, their capacity of assimilation, considering their homogeneity, their capacity of understanding our language, is it, or is it not, in your opinion, desirable to restrict or enlarge the immigration?—A. Most decidedly it is not desirable.

Q. From your observation of the people of this State, independent of those who are interested in Chinese money-making, does the intelligent popular opinion of a disinterested kind favor or disfavor legislation to this end?—A. It favors it most decidedly.

DAVID C. WOODS sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are a seaman by profession?—Answer. By profession, I am.

Q. And by early education?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You are at present superintendent of the industrial school of the city and county of San Francisco?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been such?—A. Nearly three years.

Q. How many boys have you there in the institution?—A. On an average, 175 since I have been there. I have but 140 now. I have had as low as 117.

Q. How many girls?—A. I have 67 girls to-day.

Q. You know the scope of this investigation generally?—A. I do, but my knowledge of the Chinese is very limited.

Q. Speak of it to the extent of the effect they have?—A. I can merely speak of the few evils I know.

Q. Name them, if you please.—A. I consider them a curse to this community.

Q. Why?—A. Morally and physically both.

Q. First physically?—A. Physically, they introduce venereal diseases among my boys. There is hardly a day since I have been at the school that I have not had boys under treatment by the doctors, and they have invariably got the disease in Chinatown.

Q. From Chinese prostitutes?—A. That is what they tell me.

Q. That information you gather from the boys themselves?—A. From the boys themselves.

Q. To what extent is it prevalent among the boys, so far as your observation goes?—A. Probably one-twentieth of the boys I receive have it.

Q. What is the effect of that disease upon their health and morals?—A. It does not affect their health much. They are young boys; they

soon get over it by proper treatment, but they have it very badly at times. One boy I had to send to the county hospital, and have just received him back. I had to send him where he could get better treatment than we give; that is, where he could get scientific treatment.

Q. How do you think the introduction of Chinese here affects the boys as to employment for them? They suffer for employment?—A. Yes, sir, very materially. I have been trying to get employment for my boys ever since I have been there, and I have always been headed by Chinamen; Chinamen will hire so much cheaper.

Q. If the Chinamen were not here, how would it be?—A. If the Chinamen were not here the young boys would be employed, especially in shoemaking and such trades as that.

Q. As to the character of the boys, do you think they would do well if they had a chance?—A. Yes, sir; they are as good boys as you find anywhere.

Q. They are good average boys?—A. Good average boys.

Q. Have you any special observations to submit with reference to girls?—A. Only that the boys, being inoculated by the Chinese girls, it extends to my white girls, also. It extends to the white girls also, for the hoodlum element, you know, is rampant, and will not let the girls alone.

Q. Yours is a semi-criminal institution?—A. Yes, sir. I spoke of the boys being inoculated by the Chinese. The girls also have the disease.

Q. Is there anything further that you desire to state?—A. No, sir; nothing that I know of.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the character of your institution?—A. It is an industrial school; a house of refuge, you would call it in the East.

Q. It is a public institution?—A. Yes, sir; it is a city institution.

Q. What kind of inmates do you receive?—A. Young criminals under the age of eighteen, and they have to remain with me until they are twenty-one.

Q. Are they confined?—A. They are confined in the school by a high fence.

Q. They do not go out?—A. No, sir; they do not go out in the world.

Q. They are not allowed to go out to Chinatown while they are with you?—A. No, sir; not unless they run away.

Q. You speak about their condition, therefore, when they come there?—A. When they come there; I have had them come to me after they had been diseased in order to get cured.

Q. Do you say that these boys acquire the syphilis in Chinatown and communicate it to the girls?—A. When they are in town.

Q. You do not mean the girls under your care?—A. No, sir; but before they come under my care. They acknowledge they have been with these young men. The thing is introduced here by little Chinese girls.

Q. Do you mean to say that it is introduced into the city by Chinese girls?—A. There is a certain disease introduced by them called the China-pox, distinguished from other syphilis by that name.

ROMULUS C. GALLEGO sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. What is your occupation?—A. I superintend the bag-factory of E. Detrick & Co.

Q. How long have you been in that position?—A. Ever since they started, about 8 or 9 years ago.

Q. How long are you a resident of the town?—A. Fourteen years, I believe.

Q. Do you work white or Chinese labor in your bag-factory?—A. We work all white labor, consisting of men, boys, and girls.

Q. State to the commission the result of your observation and experience in reference to white labor in this town, and then incidentally what effect the Chinese have upon labor generally.—A. As far as Chinese labor goes I have given it very little thought, but I find that we can manufacture just as cheap with white labor as we can with Chinese labor, if not cheaper. I have never seen the time yet when I have not been able to get all the hands I wanted, and, in fact, more. We have to turn away in the busy season, which consists of about seven months in the year, twenty girls every day, on the average, who want work, and nearly as many boys.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many hands do you employ?—A. We employ, in the busy season, for over seven months, two hundred hands; at present we employ seventy.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What proportion of boys?—A. We have about fifteen men, I think: about fifty small boys and twenty-five or thirty small girls, and the rest are girls, all the way from fifteen up to sixteen or seventeen years old.

Q. You say you have found no difficulty in obtaining that kind of labor?—A. None at all.

Q. Have you found any difficulty in managing the help and making it useful?—A. No, sir.

Q. Then, what character do you give to our boys and girls and our common labor, such as you employ?—A. I find them as good as any that I have ever had anything to do with. They seem to be just as intelligent and smart and active, and willing to work.

Q. Might you supply them by Chinese labor that would be a little cheaper?—A. It might be at the start, but after we keep the Chinamen and employ them for a year, I do not think it would be as cheap.

Q. Considering the intelligence of the laborers, you think the whites are equally desirable with the Chinese?—A. Yes; two years and a half ago we were offered all the Chinamen we wanted at half a dollar a day, and at that time we were paying all hands by the day; the girls a dollar and a half a day.

Q. What was the object of offering you that labor at fifty cents a day?—A. The object of that was, I think, merely to make an inroad into our business, so that they could understand it and then carry it on themselves; that is my idea; I may not be correct.

Q. As to the number, you say that during your busy season you have applications so that you could employ twenty girls a day extra?—A. Yes, sir; fully twenty.

Q. We have had very many employers and manufacturers of different kinds here who have given our laborers an exceptionally bad reputation, and they have represented to this commission that it was impossible to utilize white labor profitably and comfortably. Is that your observation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Whence in your opinion comes this unkind comment upon our American labor?—A. I do not know; I am not at liberty to express my opinion; I do not think it would hardly be right for me to do it. I have no right to condemn anybody for their opinion. I have my own.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many men do you employ?—A. We have about fifteen men on an average.

Q. Do you find the boys and girls are willing to work?—A. They are very willing indeed. I will give you an instance. Even on the third of July, I called all the boys and girls up and said, "I am very busy; I want to work; are you willing to work?" I only had two dissenting voices out of the whole of them.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Do you consider that work healthy for girls?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Running machines by hand?—A. We are running machines by steam principally.

Q. Do you consider it healthy employment for girls to run sewing-machines steadily on heavy work?—A. If by steam, certainly.

Q: If not by steam?—A. Small boys of thirteen or fourteen years old can do it; but I do not consider it healthy for any lady to run a sewing-machine, large or small.

Q. You would not consider it any disadvantage, then, if the work of the girls there in running those sewing-machines by hand or foot was transferred to Chinese boys?—A. I think they might as well transfer it to white boys; there are plenty of them to do it.

Q. To transfer it from white girls to China boys would be no disadvantage?—A. I should think it would be a disadvantage, as long as we can get white labor, to employ Chinamen.

Q. You would rather have white girls to run sewing-machines not run by steam than Chinese boys?—A. I would rather have them run, not by girls, but by white boys. There seems to be plenty of boys.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long have you been making bags?—A. We have been making bags, I think, about ten years.

Q. What material do you use in their manufacture?—A. We use burlaps for grain-bags, jute, hessians; and for flour-bags we use cotton goods.

Q. Do you make grain-bags?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where does the material come from that you manufacture grain-bags out of?—A. The material now comes from Dundee, and also some from Calcutta.

Q. Do you use any material that is made here at the jute works?—A. No, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understood you to say that you thought it a little more profitable to employ white labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In view of the fact that it is more profitable to employ white labor and of the readiness of white girls and boys to work, why are they not generally employed in preference to Chinese?—A. I think the reason is because persons have not got enough patience with them. A boy is a boy all the world over, and it is the same way with a girl; but if they are dealt with as they ought to be, they are just as good as any labor a person wants. Down there at our factory you may go along and you will not hear a word spoken. I venture to say if you would go down to our factory you would see everybody at work.

Q. Why does it take more patience to teach boys and girls, who understand our language, than to teach Chinese, who do not understand it?—A. If you tell a Chinaman to go and do a thing, he will go and do

it. He never has a thought of his own; while the white boy and also the white girl have a thought of their own. Take a white operative of any kind, on any machine, and the whole of the time he will be making an improvement on it. The Chinaman will do the work all the time, year after year, just so much work every day, and when he gets through he will stop.

Q. You speak about white boys and girls not being employed because they require more patience. Why is it that it requires more patience to teach a white boy, who speaks the language and can understand it, than it does to teach the Chinese, who do not speak the language, and cannot understand it?—A. I do not know why it does. I do not think I can answer the question. Persons have an idea, for instance, that a white boy or girl sometimes may get miffed, or something of that kind, and leave, which Chinamen will not do. If you hire a Chinaman, you do not hire the man himself; you get him from a certain Chinaman, who furnishes you so many who will go where you like; and in hiring those men, that Chinaman is responsible for them. When you hire boys, if you say anything to a boy he may get miffed, if they are not accustomed to work, and the girls may take a notion to go away. When you hire Chinamen, you go to the office and say "I want so many men." The Chinaman furnishes you those men, and he will put an account down there. You will tell these men what to do, and this Chinaman will see that the men do it.

Q. Do you mean to say that the Chinese once employed is more steady and less liable to get angry and go away than the whites? Is that what you mean?—A. No; I do not mean that; I mean that if you employ boys and girls and get them accustomed to working, they become attached to their work and you cannot drive them away. You hire a Chinaman and he cannot leave you, because he is afraid; it is against the rule; it is against the rule of the man he works for or against the rule of the company he belongs to. If they put a certain man in a certain place, he has got to stay there; their system is so good, that is the difference.

Q. Then do you mean that Chinese labor is more reliable than white labor?—A. I consider that to a certain extent Chinese labor is reliable, but it is no more reliable than white labor. I say if you hire white hands, boys or girls—I am not speaking of men—and treat them as you ought to treat them, you can keep them just as long as you want them. On the other hand, you hire a Chinaman, as I said, from another man. You do not go to this man or that man and pick him up and say, "I want you to work for me," but you go to the boss and hire so many, and he furnishes so many men; and their system is so good that the Chinaman will not leave that place until he has permission from that boss or from the company that he belongs to.

Q. The effect is that the Chinamen remain more steadily at work?—A. That is the effect of it.

Q. That is the reason, you think, the Chinamen are employed?—A. That is the reason a great many of them are employed.

Q. Instead of white boys and girls?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But you mean to be understood as saying that white boys and girls can be employed here as profitably as Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; that is my experience.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. In other words, you think that white labor is better than semi-servile labor?—A. Yes, sir; I have had my experience of that kind of labor in the South as well as here.

JOHN W. DWINELLE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of California?—Answer. I have been here since October, 1849.

Q. And long a resident of San Francisco and Oakland?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Your profession is the law?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you had your attention called to the question that is under examination before this congressional commission regarding Chinese immigration, its effect upon our industry, our morals, and the political question involved in the Chinese as immigrants? If so, you will state your views, keeping in mind the idea of whether it is or is not desirable, by restrictive legislation, to limit the influx of that class of population to our coast, giving you the broad field for your answer.—A. I have considered that question since I have been resident here with various opinions, varying according to my experience. I do not consider it desirable to have the Chinese here.

Q. Why?—A. In the first place I do not consider that they are capable of assimilating with us. They do not come here with the intention of residing here and growing up with the country, but only to acquire a certain competency and return back to their own country. They have no desire to acquire our language or assimilate with our institutions, as they are incapable of doing so. Cheap labor is not desirable in California. The whole theory of our institutions, and particularly of our common-school system that we boast of so much, is that we are to advance the population of the country as rapidly as possible in moral and æsthetic culture; and as we do advance our people, it will be perfect folly to say to them that they shall not advance in the enjoyment of this culture which we propose to them, and for which they pay so much money. It is better for California that our lands should remain waste than be wasted. The land-killing system of California is a curse to the country, and it is sustained mainly by Chinese labor. It would be better that California should progress slowly and spend her resources in possible and probable irrigation, collecting the rain-fall in the Sierras and distributing it gradually over the plains, so that not only wheat, which is the land-killing crop, but mixed crops should be cultivated, and as this sort of cultivation progresses over the country we should see the lands broken up into large farms, larger than those of the East, because we have not that crop of snow which retards and prevents cultivation for a portion of the year. It would be better for the country to be broken up into small farms, as perhaps 320 acres apiece, and be cultivated by the resident population that shall build up school-houses and churches and all institutions of civilization, rather than that it should remain in the hands of large speculators and be engrossed in that way. I do not know that that is a full answer to your question. Your question is a pretty sweeping one, and I did not expect an interrogatory of that kind.

Q. In reference to what I please to call the heresy of cheap labor, is it desirable in your opinion that in this country we should have cheap labor, or would it not be better that we should have cheap capital?—A. We should have cheap capital rather than cheap labor. I think that the world has just reached the acme and crisis of dear capital. I understand that there are about $16,000,000,000,000 that, down to the last year, have been quotable in London at an average interest of 7 per cent. to 10 per cent. in gold. I understand that by the catastrophe of Spanish

bonds, Turkish bonds, South American bonds, and western railroad bonds, that thing has reached its acme, and that capital is now being piled up in London, in Paris, and in Germany, because it cannot get investments at the old rates of 7 per cent. and 10 per cent. in gold, and they will not take any less. I understand that it is a sound rule of political economy, that the more a man has got the less he shall get upon it annually. It ought to be so, and it is so in the inherent system of things; because I see capitalists here in this city of from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000, when small men can get from 3 per cent. to 5 per cent. a month on their interest, still invest in county bonds at 6 per cent. My opinion is that that bubble has burst, and that although capital is accumulating in this way, and refusing investment because it cannot get it at the old rates, it must by and by come down and have productive enterprises and interest at reasonable rates. I think we had better wait. Instead of allowing this land-killing system and making a desert waste of the agricultural lands of California which have been lying here and are rich in their virgin richness from having lain waste for hundreds of years, it would be better to wait a year rather than to allow, not the mass of the people, but a few large land-holders, to get rich suddenly and to make enormous profits.

Q. Present profits?—A. Present profits. I have talked with some of these men. I have known men who have made $35,000 or $36,000 in a single year on grain, and they told me that they propose to just invest it in buying other lands, just running them down. I said to them, "That is a land-killing system," and they said, "Yes; we propose to practice it." They talked like the French nobility before the French revolution, "After us the deluge; we will have a good time while we live." I do not think that is profitable to the country, and I think that this system of employing Chinese labor to carry out that land-killing system is to the detriment of the intelligent eastern labor that comes here seeking to engage in agriculture.

Q. What is the effect that Chinese immigration has upon the present white labor and labor that otherwise might come here?—A. I think it degrades it and turns it down into tramps.

Q. If I understand you, you would preserve the broad domain occupied now as the heritage of our future American people, rather than exhaust those lands for the benefit of great landed proprietors by cheap Chinese labor?—A. That is the position. It is better that our population should go on more slowly, and when it does come it should be such population as I was accustomed to in Central New York, where you and I were born, and such population as is found in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

Q. Now, then, regarding the future welfare of this country on this side of the continent, if developed by the small landed proprietor, who himself and his family would be industrious tillers of the soil, and a future with great proprietors developing the country by Chinese cheap labor, what would be the effect upon the moral and political system of the nation, upon the commonwealth, the State, in the broader sense, leaving the material interest out of the question?—A. I regard the existence of two different populations as a morbid hybridism which is disastrous to both parties. I do not know that politically it would have much effect, because the Chinese generally show no particular disposition to become citizens.

Q. Then, considering a helot population, not having the privilege of the elective franchise, an inferior population here for toil, whose labor would be semi-servile, what would be the effect upon our institutions in that

respect? Would that be desirable?—A. I do not think it would be. I was thinking of an illustration. I have thought of this matter a great deal. I have traveled abroad, and I have seen something that seems to me to be analogous to what is going on here. If these men who have these rope-factories and other establishments of that sort, who testify that they can only carry on their enterprises by the labor of these people, could employ fairies, or devils, or gnomes, or genii, and did not pay any wages at all, and the profit was greater, as they did not eat or drink anything, I do not think that would be profitable to this country. When I was in Ireland, traveling there, I had pointed out to me a dozen farms that had been torn up where a dozen farmers had lived for five or six hundred years, occupying just about the middle class of society, that you and I, Mr. Pixley, come from, sending their sons to school, educating some of them as agriculturists and others as lawyers, sending others to the colonies. I have seen instances pointed out to me where a dozen of those farms were all torn up and thrust into one; where the hedges were pulled up by machinery, and where the farm-houses and outhouses and residences were used as stone-quarries. When I asked why was that done, the reply was, "Because one man can pay more rent than others." But what became of those farmers in the course of two or three generations? They became laborers, or must be exiled to America.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where was that?—A. In Ireland. I went out from Cork to Blarney Castle, and I saw there men blowing up old farm-houses, and using the stones or quarries. I was told that that was the cause, and I know it was the cause just as I know that Washington and Napoleon existed. I have seen since a reference to the same thing going on in England. Here were men who had been living in affluence as farmers for hundreds of years who were turned out, and their only resource was to immigrate to America and become laborers. I remember a man by the name of Trench, who, a few years ago published a book, saying that he had in the course of a few years, at an expense of fifty thousand pounds, denuded whole tracts of land in Ireland of population on the principle of going to the tenant and saying, "Now we are going to turn you out anyway, and if you will go to New York with your whole family we will pay your passage and give you a sum of money when you arrive there." That book was put out in a very boastful way, and I believe it received the condemnation of all economists, on the ground that it was not steam-engines or sheep that made a country, but that it was an active population, living on the soil. Then I remember, as you will see from history, that after Henry VIII had confiscated the church-lands in England and turned them over to the family of Russell and others to work them, within twelve years Parliament had to pass a law that only a certain portion of the land should be devoted to sheep; that they should put a large portion of it, I think about three-fourths, into pastoral lands. I state these things from memory, because it seems to me they have a bearing on the condition of things which we are approaching here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Has there not been a tendency on the part of the landed lords in Scotland and in the north of England to remove the population and devote the lands to sheep-culture; and has not that been a subject-matter of parliamentary inquiry?—A. It has. I want to state another thing. When your soil is exhausted, it is almost impossible to renew it. I have lived in Oakland five or six years, in that sandy soil, which is a little garden-spot; but after it has been destroyed by over cultivation you

cannot renew it. A great many gentlemen here from the Southern States have told me that when they had exhausted the soil by overculture in sugar, tobacco, and cotton, the had to let the native forest grow up again. In Germany—the whole extent of which I traveled three or four times—when the soil gets exhausted in that way, they deem it entirely impossible to renew it by artificial means, but turn it out a hundred years into forest, and the only consolation is that in the course of a hundred years they get a pretty good crop of timber.

Q. That process of destroying our soil, or, to use the language of Mr. Hollister, "a large landed proprietor," turning it into a desert, is going on now?—A. It is going on here.

Q. And one of the causes that produces that is the ability of these great landed-estate proprietors to cultivate by cheap Chinese labor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you ever seen any disposition manifested on the part of the Chinese who have immigrated to this country to acquire a knowledge of or to take any interest in our institutions?—A. None at all.

Q. Do you know of any evidence exhibited by them of a capacity or adaptation to self-government, as we understand republican government, in contradistinction from a monarchy or a tyranny, or a one-man power like that of Asia?—A. They are complete slaves of tradition.

Q. Would you favor making the experiment of giving the Chinese the elective franchise or vote, to see if we could improve their condition?—A. I would not.

Q. Then, if you would not give them that privilege, is it or is it not desirable, in your opinion, to have a country in which there is an inferior, non-voting, helot population?—A. I think it would contribute to a moral hybridism, which would be detrimental to both races.

Q. If our State of California should be developed more slowly, and our soil should be segregated and divided into small proprietary farms of that class as you suggest in Central and Western New York, where the farmer has an industrious wife, sons and daughters, and they cultivate their own lands, what would be the result as to the development of morals, of culture, the building of churches, the construction of school-houses, and the general advancement of the tone, and character, and degree of our civilization here, as compared all the time with Chinese?—A. I cannot conceive of the Chinese fulfilling the terms of your proposition; that is, that they should ever live here and cultivate their own farms, and be in a condition of homegeneity with our race.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I understand you to be of the opinion that it would be better for your land to lie waste, that is to say, uncultivated, than to be cultivated with Chinese labor; a system by which the lands are exhausted?—A. Yes, sir; I mean that the lands should lie in their primordial condition, just as we found them, because then there would be a possibility that they might be occupied by a homogeneous race.

Q. The effect of that would be, as I understand you, that these large ranches would be broken up; that the owners of them could make no use of them?—A. They could use them by grazing—by sheep-culture. The use of those lands by grazing and sheep-culture would not reduce them to a desert condition, because, as I understand it, there is no culture in the world that is more profitable to a land than sheep-culture, because the droppings are not only very rich, but they are more equally distributed than any other. That is the case in relation to neat-cattle, except that the droppings are not so widely distributed.

Q. It is the abundance of cheap labor that leads to this cultivation

which exhausts the land?—A. I think so; and not only that, but it turns all eastern labor that comes here into tramps. I except the counties of Marin, and Sonoma, and Mendicino, where we have such a climate, owing to the fogs which supplement the rain, that they can use mixed crops. Then, in a large portion of this land they could use rotation of crops if they would, but it would not be so profitable. It would not be so profitable at once; it might be in the long run, because one crop would supplement the other. There is hardly any place here where they could not raise flax, the croton bean, and a great many other products, and where they could not, in an average season, raise clover, which would restore to the soil that thing which is most exerted by clover, that is nitrogen, and make it fixed.

Q. If the farms had to be cultivated by more costly labor, would that have the effect to increase the price of production?—A. Undoubtedly it would; that is, the production of a particular crop.

Q. For instance, take the wheat-crop?—It would, undoubtedly; because the constant culture of the wheat-crop is a gambling adventure.

Q. Would that so increase the cost of the wheat-crop as to render it non-exportable, in your judgment?—A. It might, possibly, so that wheat could not be exported to profit; but a certain quantity, a limited quantity, might be raised, and still the farmer make a reasonable profit on the investment.

Q. The farmer could raise what would be required for home consumption?—A. Yes, sir; for home consumption.

Q. But he could not raise wheat for exportation?—A. No, sir.

Q. Do you think there are too many Chinese here now?—A. I am, perhaps, not as fully posted as I ought to be on that subject; but I think it would be better if we had none here at all.

Q. Better if there never had been any here?—A. It would have been better if we never had had any, if we never had come in contact with that race. I will tell you what I think about it. I believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; but I do not believe the Chinaman is a man or a brother. I do not believe he belongs to us at all.

Q. You do not believe that he belongs to the human family?—A. He belongs to the human family, because he is the same structure that we are, but I mean that in moral and social sympathy he does not belong to us at all, and cannot belong to us. I believe he belongs to a race that has ripened and is now rotting.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. The Bushman has the same anatomical structure and he is a man?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. In your opinion, you would prohibit the further importation of Chinese?—A. I certainly would. This is a conclusion that I have come to very slowly. I believe in the Chinaman; but I have had him in my family; I have talked with him, and I find that he is perfectly incorrigible, that he despises us as much as the worst anti-Chinaman despises him.

Q. He has no reason for doing that?—A. Yes; tradition teaches him that his institutions are better than ours. I think he cannot construct an astronomical table or run a steam-engine when it is put in his hands; yet he thinks that all our appliances of civilization, our railroads, our telegraphs, our balloons, everything of that sort, are like so many tricks.

Q. You spoke about breaking up farms in Ireland. What use was made of those lands when the farms were taken?—A. They were thrown into one large farm.

Q. They were still farmed?—A. The object of taking up the hedges was to cultivate them by steam-farming.

Q. It was the introduction of labor-saving machinery that brought about these results?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you think of the effect of labor-saving machinery generally?—A. I have always been a free-trader; but my experience and my thought have brought me down to the conclusion that there ought to be some limitation about it.

Q. Some limitation about labor-saving machinery?—A. Yes; because if you carry that along to its ultimate effect, you would supersede all human industry by the machine and its enginery. I am satisfied that there probably is a limitation to all absolute propositions in political economy, and that there must be a limitation to labor-saving machinery.

Q. Do you think it would be well to prohibit the further increase of labor saving machinery?—A. If you ask me what my private opinion is I am very much of that opinion. We must do it, because I do not believe that it is right. I think it is the most despairing sight in all civilization to see a man who is able to work, and who wants to work, but who cannot get work. If I saw a thousand men of that sort looking at a machine doing the work that they want to do, while they are starving for bread, and a man standing at the end of the steam-engine and doing that work for them, I should sympathize with those fellows who used to break up the looms.

Q. You are not of the opinion that labor-saving machinery opens up new avenues and extends the business of society in such a manner as, after all, not to diminish the labor to be performed by hands?—A. I think there is some limitation about that. I am not a man of intellect enough to solve those propositions. I would not put myself in competition at once with such men as Say, in France, or John Stuart Mill, in England; but very likely those men in running out their abstract propositions have committed the same error that I, as a practical man, looking at men who are starving for want of work, would commit on my side.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. In the term "men" in that sentence, you would not include a Chinaman?—A. No; I did not mean him; he is not the sort of man I meant.

Q. Seeing him stand idle for want of work would not affect you in that way?—A. O, well, a Chinaman does not want work in his own country. Here is something [exhibiting] called a cash, and there are three or four hundred of them in a dollar. A Chinaman can get a meal of victuals in his own country for that. It is a metal so base that you cannot coin it by stamping it, and you have got to cast it.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. There are a thousand cash in a dollar.—A. Yes; it is a thousand; it takes a thousand to make a dollar. It is a metal so base that if you undertake to coin it by stamping it would break all to pieces. Now that in China will save a man from starving and give him a meal of victuals. So Huc says, and all the other travelers in China.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. They can always get work there?—A. They can get work there; tney do not starve to death.

Q. Their population is more crowded than ours?—A. O, yes; it is more crowded and the means of subsistence are greater.

Q. Why should our people remain idle, then?—A. Because our necessities are higher; we are an educated people; we are educated to higher moral, intellectual, and æsthetic comprehensions.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. You say that one cash is equal in purchasing power to a cent?—A. I said so, but I was mistaken about that. Mr. Pliper corrected me.

Q. You said more than that, that one cash is equal to a meal of victuals?—A. I understand that it is.

Q. As a matter of fact it is equal in purchasing power to a cent?—A. I do not know; it has no currency here.

The CHAIRMAN. That would make it worth a mill, if it took a thousnnd of them to make a dollar.

Mr. BROOKS. But in purchasing power it goes as far there as one cent here?

The WITNESS. I never said that.

Q. (By Mr. BROOKS.) You said it would purchase a meal of victuals?—A. O, yes,

Q. Assuming that the purchasing power of a cash in China is equal to a cent, and you can get a thousand of them for a dollar, how much would the purchasing power of five dollars be equal to in China?—A. You are asking me now to perform an arithmetical proposition that you can as well perform yourself.

Q. I want you to perform it for me.—A. If you want me to sit down and delay this commission by multiplication and division, I can do it; but I do not know how that is.

Q. Then you do not adhere to the statement that they can buy a meal of victuals for a cash?—A. I understand it is so, but how many meals of victuals a Chinaman would want, or how many cash it would take to purchase the victuals of a Chinaman, I cannot tell.

Q. Three cash, then, would buy three meals of victuals?—A. I do not know anything about those conundrums. I understand mathematics pretty well, but to perform arithmetical problems is one of the most difficult things to me in the world. You are asking me questions that you ought to have reserved and figured out yourself, if your purpose is to show that my testimony is not reliable.

Q. What is the rate of wages in France?—A. I think if a man gets two francs a day there that it is pretty fair wages.

Q. What is the rate of interest there?—A. I do not know what the rate of interest is in France.

Q. Is it not very low?—A. I think it is when you look at the quotation of their stocks.

Q. Does it not appear then that the lower value of capital, low interest, does not make cheap labor?—A. I tell you a man will live on two francs in France a great deal better than he will live on $1.25 here.

Q. Do you mean to say that the necessaries of life are cheaper there than they are here?—A. I think they are in the country.

Q. Is it not the effect of a low rate of wages to create a demand for capital and bring it into use?—A. I do not know that it is.

Q. Suppose you reduce the rate of wages? The cost of wages is a

large part of the expense of manufacturing operations, is it not?—A. I think so. The wages, yes.

Q. Would not capital compete for it?—A. No.

Q. Why not? If you reduce the price of the article, why will not purchasers compete for it?—A. Of course they will; but you start at the wrong end of the proposition. Capital in France and in England is cheaper than it is here.

Q. Because capitalists do not gamble with their investments as they do here? I think that would hardly be an explanation. Is it not because there is more of it?—A. I do not know. You are asking me questions in political economy that I do not feel competent to answer.

Q. You were answering some questions about political economy, and it was in that view that I called your attention to this fact, as you stated you had traveled all through those countries. I want to know if it is not a fact that where capital is cheap labor is also cheap?—A. I do not think it is cheapened in proportion, because I know that a hundred locomotives, for instance, were refused in England because they could not get the capital to carry them on and to pay the rate of wages demanded.

Q. Do you know that there are $500,000,000 of capital at present lying idle?—A. I understand so.

Q. If the owners of that capital could employ it profitably, would not they do so?—A. No.

Q. Why?—A. I will tell you why: Because up to this last year they have been able to invest capital in what they considered profitable investments at from 7 to 10 per cent. interest, and they cannot get it now, and they are unwilling to come down in their rate. The capitalists of the world will not recognize the fact that the rate of interest is going down, and that they have got to take a less rate of interest.

Q. Is it not a fact that they cannot invest in manufacturing enterprises at any profit at all at the present prices of labor?—A. No, sir, when they want 7 and 10 per cent. They could invest very well at 3 or 4 per cent., if they were willing to take it.

Q. What is the effect of the non-employment of capital upon labor?—A. The effect is that capital is eating itself up in deposit in England, in France, and in Germany, and it is the same as if it did not exist. It makes everything dear; it enhances the price of money.

Q. That is hardly answering my question.—A. I say I think it is. It is the same when the capital is not invested as if it did not exist, as if it was taken out here and anchored in the middle of the bay, and it makes money dear.

Q. That is not answering my question.—A. What is your question?

Q. Is not the effect of the non-use of capital the lying idle of labor?—A. That labor lies idle, undoubtedly.

Q. If capital is employed, is not labor employed necessarily?—A. Undoubtedly.

Q. If labor is not employed, can it purchase?—A. Exactly; but do not substitute a false conclusion from your question. If capital, instead of being locked up in London, in Frankfort, and in Paris, were employed at reasonable rates, labor would be employed; but when it is locked up, and they say, "We will have from 7 to 10 per cent. for our money," the operatives who employ labor cannot afford to pay that for it, and, of course, labor is thrown out of employment.

Q. My question, then, was, that labor being unemployed is unable to purchase?—A. Labor being unemployed, because capital will not lend itself at reasonable rates, ceases to be a purchasing-power.

Q. And the labor element is the great purchasing-power, is it not?—A. When you come to reduce it down, the labor element is the great consumer.

Q. And when they are not laboring, not earning and not purchasing, the consequence is an accumulation of products unsold?—A. O, no; if they do not labor because they cannot get any money, they do not make any products.

Q. What is manufactured cannot be sold?—A. Unquestionably; a thousand men, who cannot be employed because labor does not produce anything, do not purchase anything.

Q. Did the farmers cultivate land differently before the Chinese were used in agriculture from what they cultivate it now?—A. The agriculture of California grew up simultaneously with the introduction of the Chinese.

Q. There was no agriculture before the Chinese came?—A. I do not think there was at all.

Q. Has there ever been a time in this State when the manuring of land has been usual or customary?—A. In sections it has been done.

Q. Has it been customary?—A. I do not think that the manuring of land has been practiced in this State to any great extent. On the contrary, the people have burned up manure instead of putting it back on the land, and I think that system results from Chinese labor.

Q. Have you any idea what it costs per acre to manure land?—A. I do not know; I have no idea at all.

Q. Do you know how much it would add to the cost of the production of labor to manure land?—A. I think in some sections of the State they do manure the land where the atmosphere and soil are so damp that manure will decay. One of the objections to this land-killing system is that they do not wait until they can introduce irrigation, so that the manure shall be returned to the soil.

Q. At the present time, do you think they could manure land and cultivate it at the present rate with white labor and export the product at a profit?—A. I think if they cannot do that the cultivation of land had better be interrupted until those come in who will do it on agricultural principles.

Q. Will you be kind enough to answer the question whether land could be now manured with white labor at the present price and the product exported at a profit?—A. I do not think that this present system of land-killing is capable of renewing the soil with manure.

Q. Still you do not answer my question, whether, at the present cost of white labor, you can manure the land and produce a crop that you can sell with profit.—A. Do you mean as the land is cultivated now?

Q. If you manure the land it would not be cultivated as it is now. I am adding to the cost of the production of these two elements, that you produce the crop with white labor and manure the land, which is an additional cost. Can you do that and export the crop with profit?—A. Not as the land is cultivated at present; but the whole system is vicious.

Q. It would stop the wheat-export trade as at present prosecuted?—A. O, it would put a stop to it gradually as the land was reduced down to a desert waste.

Q. What do you consider low wages?—A. I do not know.

Q. What is the standard? What is it measured by?—A. Do you mean in dollars and cents?

Q. Yes; what is any standard of wages?—A. I cannot answer the question in dollars and cents, but if you will allow me to make my own

answer, substantially, to your question, it is this: If a man who is accustomed to agriculture, twenty-one years of age, comes here, anything is low wages that compels him to live like a heathen, and does not give him a good chance to radicate in the soil; to live like a Christian man as he has been accustomed to do in the Eastern States, with the hope of having a wife and family and children of his own, and to have his children as well educated as he was at the East, with all the institutions of civilization and enjoyment around him.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Anything that will not produce that condition is low wages?—A. Yes; low wages.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. In France are there not seven million land-owners?—A. I do not know; I never counted them.

Q. With the rate of wages there, which you say is two francs, is not every family able to own its own homestead?—A. I have been down among the French peasantry, and it is the general condition of the people there that they own their own homesteads.

Q. Do they live like heathens?—A. No, they do not live like heathens. They live well.

Q. Do they all work, men, women, and children?—A. Men, women, and children work.

Q. And they live on two francs a day?—A. They live on two francs a day.

Q. Is wheat any cheaper there than here?—A. No, I do not know that it is.

Q. Is beef any cheaper?—A. No, it is not any cheaper.

Q. Is bread any cheaper?—A. No, I think not.

Q. What is it of the necessaries of life that is cheaper? Is fuel any cheaper?—A. No, nothing at all is cheaper.

Q. What necessaries of life, then, are cheaper in France than here?—A. I do not know that anything is cheaper. There may be a general tariff of a small percentage.

Q. As a general rule are not those necessaries of life cheaper here really?—A. Yes.

Q. That is all.—A. O, no, I want to tell you something more. A French peasant does not as an ordinary thing have meat once a day.

Q. Is that living like a heathen?—A. No, it is not living like a heathen because they come down to the necessities of the thing. I will tell you one thing they do not do. They never put a mortgage on a homestead. A man is perfectly disgraced if he does that. They have what they call pot-à-feu, and at the season I was there, if they could put horse-flesh into it once a week they considered they were well off. When their crop fails they will run through the winter on cabbages, carrots, and turnips, rather than put a mortgage on the farm.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Since the time of Napoleon the First there has been no law of primogeniture, no law of entail in France?—A. None at all.

Q. The result has been to divide lands up into little tracts, and the proprietary farmer lives upon and cultivates those lands?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are a very industrious and thrifty people?—A. Yes.

Q. And in the aggregate a very wealthy people?—A. Yes.

Q. A very economical people and very industrious?—A. Yes; and the gentleman who told me that said if the crop failed they would run

through the winter on carrots and turnips and cabbage, and still they would put a five-franc piece into the family stocking.

Q. The result of that is that in a population of 35,000,000 people, upon a territory the area of which is not much larger than California, they are yet a well-governed, industrious, intelligent, and moral people?—A. They are a highly moral people.

Q. And that would be the result if California could be settled by a similar class? Although the rate of wages as such might be low, yet we would have our soil cultivated by men who own it, and the result would be that degree of moral and political intelligence?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. You speak about the peasantry of France. I understand you to say that you have been among them?—A. I have been down among those people who wear wooden shoes, and I have talked with them.

Q. I understand you to say that they do not have meat upon their tables perhaps once a week?—A. Sometimes, in seasons of scarcity.

Q. I ask you whether, as a general thing, the peasantry of France eat meat every day?—A. No.

Q. I ask you further whether or not meat upon the tables of the peasantry, those you speak of, who live upon these small places, is not very infrequent?—A. I do not think it is in ordinary seasons. I think three or four times a week they will have meat upon their tables.

Q. How is it in England?—A. The peasantry of England, those who go around and do agricultural work, have no meat at all, as an ordinary thing, except during the burden of the harvest, and then their employers give it to them just as we give oats to a horse that is taken in from grass.

Q. They do not have meat at all except upon very rare occasions?—A. No.

Q. Is that the case also in Scotland and Ireland?—A. I do not know so much about Scotland and Ireland, but in Italy it is so; in Italy they will come down and live upon the plains all summer without anything but black bread and a pint of sour wine, but when they come to the harvest or to the vintage the proprietors give them meat on economic principles.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You are speaking of Northern Italy, Lombardy?—A. Yes, sir.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. I will ask you if they live about as cheaply as the Chinese do here?—A. I think the Chinaman lives a great deal better here. I believe the reason why the Chinaman is so good a cook is because he has got a sweet tooth of his own. The Chinamen are very fond of pig, and of duck particularly, and on Sundays, when we do not employ them, on account of our religious principles, they live very well, I am told.

Q. The reason why I ask you that question is because it has been complained here that they live so cheaply, and live on rice, so that they can underwork other people. You say they live better here than the working classes do in those countries that you mentioned?—A. Yes; but you must understand that the Chinese live on refuse that the working classes of those countries would not touch; for instance, they live on intestines, and they live on liver and on pickings—at least I am told they do—that we would not use at all.

Q. They live chiefly on rice?—A. They live a great deal on rice, but

at the same time they make great delicacies of things that are our refuse.

Q. I understood you to say a little while ago that they live much better than those people you spoke of in other countries, and that a Chinaman has a sweet tooth?—A. Undoubtedly: but I supposed your question pointed to the means of sustenance, because although we reject these particular portions of animals that they eat, still there is sustenance in them. I remember a time in the country where I live when the people would not touch a calf's liver, or the lights, the sweetbreads.

Q. You spoke, I think, about the Chinese not assimilating. What is their notion in regard to our institutions?—A. That it is all something inferior to their own.

Q. Are they in favor of a despotic form of government?—A. I do not know about that. I never got so far as that with them. I tried to instruct them to read and write, and that is about as far as I got.

Q. You have no notion then as to whether they are in favor of a despotic form of government or not?—A. No. So far as their political notions are concerned, I do not know them at all. I had some experience with domestics in my family, and I found that they could not assimilate at all. After one of them had learned to read and write and got beyond pigeon English in the family, instead of saying "me catchee," and all that, my wife suggested to him one day when he could read very well, "You go home to China and teach your father to read and write English." He said "China boy teach his father; no;" and he never would touch the spelling-book or the writing implements after that.

Q. You are of the opinion, from your travels in France, that the condition of the country people there is an improvement upon the condition of our country people?—A. In a great many respects. Their horror of getting in debt, and their determination to live within their means, their submitting to privations, and their truthfulness not only in declaration but in their business operations, struck me as comparing very highly with our countrymen.

Q. Did you write a book on French society or French government?—A. No; I wrote a little pamphlet called "American Opinions." O, yes; I wrote an article on Louis Napoleon that ran through two numbers of the Overland Monthly, but I do not think that was a very popular article.

Q. In that pamphlet did you make a comparison between the government of Louis Napoleon and our Government as to which was the better?—A. Not at all. I did not make any comparison, but I did express my opinion that the French peasantry, although economists in Paris complained that they were bovine, they did have all the honest steadiness of the cow nature; but the thing you allude to, the pamphlet, was probably another thing. I published in London and in Paris, in January, 1870, a little thing called "American Opinions." I expressed the opinion as early as that date that Chinese immigration was a pest and a detriment to California. I took the point of departure at that time from the political party to which I belonged.

Q. What party was that?—A. The republican party.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You say that the French peasantry are a moral people?—A. I think those that I saw were a very highly moral people.

Q. One of the witnesses before this commission has spoken of their being inferior in morality to the Chinese. You think that a just state-

ment?—A. I do not think that the Chinese form any comparison with the French at all.

Q. Are you acquainted with French literature?—A. I am of French origin, and because I am of French origin I have cultivated the language since I was a boy.

Q. Somebody testified before the commission with reference to the writings of Confucius, that he teaches the duty of parent to child, child to parent, &c. Are you at all familiar with the writings of Confucius?—A. I have read something that purports to be a translation of his teachings.

Q. Do you find anything in that superior to Telemaque, written by Fénélon, in his injunctions to his pupil?—A. No; the fact is, that I consider the writings of Confucius as a series of platitudes.

Q. How with reference to this French work written by Bishop Fénné lon for the instruction of his royal pupil, ordinarily called the Adventures of Telemaque. You are familiar with that work?—A. I am familiar with that work.

Q. Does it not contain the highest morality and the finest teachings?—A. I think so.

Q. Equal to Confucius?—A. I think so.

Q. Are you familiar with the ser mons of Bossuet and Bourdaloue?—A. Yes, sir; Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon.

Q. Do they contain a high spi rit of morality l—A. A high standard of Christian morality.

Q. The person, then, who referred to French literature must have drawn his inference from certain French novels, and not from the class of writings with which Confucius might appropriately be compared?—A. I do not know what you allude to; but French novels certainly are not of a very high grade of morality; nor English novels either.

Q. Have you not seen some French novels which do inculcate morality, and which are on a high plane?—A. Undoubtedly; I have had a French teacher in my family five years, and he has given French novels, under my direction, to my daughters to read. The novels of Edmond About are just as good as any novels we have.

CHARLES T. JONES sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are a resident of the city of Sacramento?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you resided in the State?—A. Since 1854.

Q. You are by profession a lawyer?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Occupying the position now of district attorney of the city and county of Sacramento?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State, if you please, any views that you may entertain in reference to the Chinese question, as you understand it, under investigation, and any facts that you may have to illustrate your opinion.—A. The only attention that I have given to the Chinese subject at all is as it has come under my immediate observation as an officer. I find that the Chinese are a great deal more likely to commit crime than the other races here. I find that they are a great deal harder to convict. Punishment does not follow them as surely as it does the others for the reason that the Chinese protect them. We do not find that those among the Chinese that we would expect to be good citizens and ferret out crime lend us the aid the Caucasian does. For that reason we find it a great deal harder to convict them or punish them. I think the Chinese have no respect for our laws at all. I am forced to that conclusion. I am satisfied that

they have courts wherein they try cases that occur between themselves, although such courts are in violation of our law; and that they respect the decision of such a court in preference to our own. I find that the one is in direct antagonism to the other.

Q. On what experience is that opinion founded?—A. My experience as an officer; that is all.

Q. Have you ever known of any Chinese advertising to take life?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Recite such an instance.—A. I will state that in February of this year it was brought to my notice that Mr. F. W. Fratt, of Sacramento, had rented the basement of the Orleans Hotel, and turned it into a laundry for Chinamen. There appeared to be a Chinese laundry association there. One of their rules was that no Chinaman should establish a laundry within so many doors where there was one existing. They notified this Chinaman that he had violated the rules of the Chinese association or the Chinese law, and that he must leave. The Chinaman communicated this intelligence to Mr. Fratt, and told him he was afraid; that he would not dare to longer remain there. Mr. Fratt, told him that our law would protect him; that he need not fear. A short time after that the Chinaman came one Sunday afternoon and informed Mr. Fratt that he had been approached by three members of this association, who drew knives and pistols upon him, and demanded that he should pay them $110; that he had been fined that amount. They threatened to kill him on the spot if he did not pay this fine; and he delivered over all the money that he had. Mr. Fratt became incensed at this treatment and offered a reward for the arrest of these Chinese. A Chinaman afterward reported to the authorities that there had been a reward offered to anybody who would kill this Chinaman. We paid considerable attention to the matter. We were informed about a week or ten days after that that the same association was in session. The chief of police and a number of officers went there and arrested some 47 of them. I came along about three minutes, I presume, after they took the Chinese down. I told them to go back to see if they could find any papers. A few of the officers went back and found some papers, which were translated by Rev. Mr. Condit. [Producing papers.] These papers [indicating] were pasted on the door; and those papers [indicating] were found in the room.

Senator SARGENT. I will submit these papers to you, Mr. Gibson, [presenting papers.] Is that translation practically correct?

Rev. Mr. GIBSON. I have looked over these papers. This is what I should call a manuscript hand. I am not familiar with it, but the translation is substantially the same as the original.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) Who translated these papers?—A. Rev. Mr. Condit.

Q. Is he a Chinese scholar?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is capable of translating Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He is not in this part of the State?—A. I have not seen him since we had him in Sacramento as interpreter.

Senator SARGENT. He is in Los Angeles. I have not been able to get him here. I will read this paper:

Because hear a country has laws and customs which they observe, afterwards families also mutually follow, how much more have come down to us for a long time—each man doing his duty dares not *not* observe them.

At this time *Wong Yee Nui*, on Second street, Orleans laundry, secretly has opened business, so broken rules, resting on his own force, cannot oppose him, therefore assemble in hall. We men, one heart, put forth exertion mutually to aid, must clean him out and avoid

after trouble Therefore deliberate the following particulars: In our companies number of friend who has ability first to kill *Wong Sau Chee*, thankfully give him 2,000 round dollars. Afterwards also take *Wong Yee Nui*, destroy his name, thankfully give him 600 round dollars. If only wound him, not kill, also give him one-half in his hand. At this time what trouble comes cannot tell. If he cannot get away, is seized by foreigners and put in jail, then our company manage the whole affair. Do not swallow our words; this poster is put up as evidence.

Kwong Sui first year, fifth month. Lucky day fixed.

Kwong Hong Tong put forth.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You have other papers here?—A. [Producing a paper.] This is a contract entered into by the parties, as Mr. Condit testified, attending to the business on the day this meeting was broken up.

Q. These other papers were also translated by Mr. Condit?—A. Yes, sir.

Senator SARGENT. I will read them:

This long white paper is a solemn compact proposed for adoption by the members of the company.

Introduction.

Quong-Hing-Ton, so many shops, so many men establish this agreement, because Wong-Yee-Nui will not obey the rules of our company, and on Second street has secretly opened a laundry and forcibly encroached on our grounds, and injured the business of all our shops. If we do not fix a plan to drive him away, we will soon have great trouble. In anger we assemble to consult, and must establish a plan. First. We expel Wong-Yee-Nui from our company, and will have him taken into court and tried, and that others may take warning; thus pull out the tares that pure grain may be left, and care for the roots that the leaves may flourish. Since the end of this may be long, the results uncertain, and much misery or happiness come, therefore we must all be united in heart and effort as if a wall surrounded us. If we are faithful in our efforts, we may hope for success.

We adopt the following resolutions:

1. If there is one who succeeds in taking Wong-Yee-Nui to court and convicting him and closing his shop never to be opened again, then after six months he shall receive ——— money. We will pay him —— money in advance, but he must get a reliable shop to go his security.

2. We agree to furnish a reliable, able man to assist the above man and pay him ——— dollars per day.

3. If any one, whether he belongs to our company or not, goes to this laundry to work, we will, without mercy, have him taken to the court and convicted.

4. If this laundry shall take any of our men, for any reason whatever, to jail, we will give him three dollars for every day he is in jail.

5. We have spoken of using laws and not of force, but if we cannot avoid fighting, and any of our men are wounded, we will furnish money to cure them, and if any are killed we will pay —— dollars.

6. Lawing will cost money; we know not how much. We will first use all the money we have. If more is necessary, we will levy on the shops for it.

7. If this laundry, by the help of foreigners, injures any of our men, this is a matter we will all help in. If in the court, or on steamer in going to another town, money is needed, we will all assist in furnishing money; or if any are confined in jail, we will pay them three dollars a day as above stated.

8. (Begun writing, but not finished.)

This is the first copy of a poster:

There is now evidence that Wong-Yee-Nui has opened a laundry on Second street, and works with a foreigner. We do not allow him to go out to gather clothes, and do not allow him to give out Chinese tickets for clothes, of which we have evidence that he does. We have examined and have evidence he is working for himself and not for foreigners. We now expel him, and any friends who may work for him, from our company, and shall never let them re-enter. Any who shall detect him in doing the above prohibitions shall receive —— money.

Because business in the court has arisen and the money is insufficient, we decree that each shop shall pay in $30 within three weeks, paying ten dollars each week.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Those are documents which were found at the time of the arrest of the Chinese when this difficulty was going on in reference to the Second-street laundry?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. There is no doubt of their identity and genuineness, and that they were found where the officers described them to you?—A. No doubt at all. I will state that these two Chinamen were convicted, that the case was taken to the supreme court and the judgment affirmed. Just before they were sent to the State's prison, friends of these men came to me and asked me to delay their being sent to San Quentin for some little time, and they informed me that they wanted to arrange with this association; that this money was paid; that the money was to be deposited for these men in compliance with this contract; and they informed me that they were to get so much money for every day they were there. Since they have been in prison, I have been informed by the Chinese that the association has failed to pay the money as prescribed, and I was approached and asked if I would not give them these papers, so that they could enforce the contract, which I refused to do.

Q. Are there any suggestions that you desire to make in this connection?—A. No, sir.

Q. What is the standard of the Chinese valuation of a Christian oath?—A. I do not think they have any regard for an oath at all.

Q. They are not bound by the moral obligation, except so far as fears and penalties may go?—A. No, sir. I will explain that Mr. Condit made this explanation of that contract: where they spoke about offering so much money to the man who takes this man Wong-Yee-Nui into court, that he understood the man who framed some fictitious charge against him and arrested him in that way. I know by my own experience that it is very often the manner by which they revenge themselves upon another. For instance, if they want to get possession of a Chinese woman, I have often had them come to me and make a charge against the man, her protector, of larceny of some kind, in order to have him placed in jail, and then they run the woman off, and when the case comes up for examination there is nobody there. They use our courts for the very reverse of what they are intended.

Q. We have in San Francisco what is known as the Chinese quarter, evidence of which has been given here as to its squalor, filth, and wretchedness, a place where prostitutes, gamblers, idlers, thieves, vagabonds, and heathen congregate. Is there any such place in Sacramento?—A. Yes, sir; there is a place known as I street.

Q. Describe to the commission, if you please, the general character of the Chinese quarter of I street.—A. It is on this side of the Slough principally. There are some few places across the Slough, on the other side.

Q. Describe its extent and the character of its inhabitants.—A. It extends from about Seventh and I up to Fourth and I. It is more thickly populated there with Chinese, and then from Fourth up to Fifth. It is the most filthy place that I could imagine, almost filled with Chinese prostitutes and gamblers. There are some Chinese merchants along there who have respectable places. In winter it is particularly disagreeable, unpleasant, and unhealthy.

Q. During the rainy season?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do they or do they not crowd their tenements?—A. O, yes.

Q. How many of them would live in a room of this size, if it was partitioned to their convenience?—A. I suppose a hundred or more.

Q. Upon what food do they principally subsist?—A. I do not know anything about the food they subsist upon.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where do you reside?—A. In Sacramento City.

Q. I understand that you are the district attorney there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now in office?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Where were these papers found?—A. They were found in Sacramento City, in a house on the north side of I street, west of Fifth street.

Q. Who found them?—A. The two officers who found them were Officers Thomas Coffee and Walter D. Ferrell.

Q. How do you know that they were found there?—A. I know that I met them, I should judge, twenty or thirty feet from the door. The Chinese had just passed down I street. I asked them if they had made search for any papers. They said "No." I said to them, "Go back and get any papers you may find in the place." They went back and came down almost immediately and stated that they had found these papers on the table in the room. They reported having found this paper that was first read pasted on a door. Of course, I did not see them take these papers myself. I know from the Chinese afterward that they admitted that these papers were taken from the room. There was no denial of that fact.

Q. What else did they say about the affair?—A. They said it was not anything in violation of our law at all; that it was a private association of their own.

Q. Did they deny any purpose to kill this man?—A. They certainly denied that until after they were convicted. They then admitted, in substance, just exactly what is in that document.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Upon what charge were they convicted?—A. They were convicted of robbery.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Were they convicted on Chinese testimony or white testimony?—A. Partly Chinese and partly white.

Q. Convicted of robbing whom?—A. Of robbing this man, Wong Yee Nui. His name is mentioned in this paper. He was the proprietor of the Chinese laundry.

Q. Was he the one they were to expel?—A. Yes, sir. He stated that he never was a member of their association at all, and that he had no connection with them. He came from Stockton, and was employed and went into partnership with Mr. Fratt. They represented that he had formerly been a member of their society, and they expelled him, and then they claimed a right to fine him, and collect the money. The way in which these parties were arrested and tried for robbery, was that they fined him $110, and sent out three men to collect it. They met him on the street, and demanded the money, and told him they would kill him if he did not deliver it over immediately, and they took his money away from him.

Q. That was the payment of this fine imposed by the society?—A. That they claimed.

Q. They claimed that he belonged to their society, and he denied it?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Then he preferred this charge against them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was there any other proof, except his own testimony, as to the fact of their taking the money from him?—A. Yes, sir; there was a police officer who testified to the meeting being held that day. He was called upon by the Chinese and asked to take charge of the door, as they

told him, to keep hoodlum Chinese from coming in. He testified that just about the time that this man testified he was robbed, three men came in with three twenty-dollar rolls. He saw them come in and go up and lay the money on the table. The man testified to sixty dollars being taken from him in three twenty-dollar rolls. There was another Chinaman in company with this man who related the robbery, and testified the facts just as he did, and it was proven that he left the Orleans Hotel at a certain time of the afternoon, and was gone just about long enough for such an occurrence to happen. He returned immediately and told Mr. Fratt just what did occur. It was sometime ago now, and I do not know that I recollect all the testimony.

Q. You say that those men denied that there was any intention to kill him?—A. They denied it at the time.

Q. They claimed that he belonged to their society?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did they admit the taking of the money for the payment of the fine?—A. They did not; they denied that they had any transaction with him at all. They said that he had been fined, but that they never tried to collect it. They denied the whole transaction in regard to collecting money or having any altercation on the street, or any attempt to rob or take anything from him by force. They denied that until after they were convicted.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Then what did they do?—A. They virtually admitted it. A man who was managing the whole offense told me the thing and admitted it. He said the purpose was to steal the money; that they had a right to take it because this man belonged to the society, and, according to Chinese law, they had a right to do it. Since then they have asked me for these papers. They said the Chinese company had not fulfilled their part of the contract, and they wanted them to do it.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What was this association; what was it for?—A. I am sure I cannot tell you.

Q. Was there not some proof in regard to the nature of the organization, what the purpose of it was?—A. The only proof was that it was a Chinese laundry society for the protection of the Chinese laundrymen.

Q. A sort of trades union?—A. They claimed that they had a Chinese laundry association for their mutual protection. They admitted that they had such a society.

Q. It was something in the nature of a trades union?—A. I presume so.

Q. Did this man deny that he belonged to the society?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the proof whether he belonged or not?—A. The testimony was very conflicting. I do not know whether he belonged or not. He only had two Chinese witnesses. They both testified that he did not belong. Any number of them swore that he did belong to the society. This was not a Chinese fight like often occurs, where one company is arrayed against the other. It was these two solitary Chinamen, with the protection of the white men to assist them, who prosecuted the whole company. While this prosecution was going on they did not dare to go on I street, and they would scarcely leave the laundry unless they had an officer with them. They would not come up to the court-house unless an officer was sent down to come with them. They would not leave the court-room unless there was an officer with them all the time to protect them. They seemed to be fearful of any Chinamen.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did you have on that trial a list of the names of the members of the laundrymen's union there?—A. No, sir; I have the list here, though.

Q. Was there a list presented to the court when this trial was going on?—A. A list of the wash-house association?

Q. A list of those members belonging to it?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. (Presenting a paper.) What is that?—A. This is a list of the members of the wash-house association.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did this Chinaman's name appear on the list?—A. It was not found on the list.

Q. Where do the courts come in? You stated that you had information that they had courts in defiance of our law in which they tried criminals for actions pertaining to themselves?—A. I have been frequently told so by Chinese. I know one case where there was a Chinaman murdered in Sacramento, and a short time after that there were three others murdered, one set belonging to one side and the other to the other. The Chinese came up from San Francisco and held what the Chinese called a court in, I believe, the same room where this court was held, and they decided they would drop the prosecution of all the individuals, with the exception of the prosecution of those who killed the first man. The reason I knew this at that time is, because I was employed to prosecute one of the men and defend one of the others, and I was so informed. They told me that they did not want me, that there would be no necessity for the defense. I remember I was offended at it.

Q. Then this was a municipal court in which they ferreted out the criminals and brought them to our courts?—A. I do not understand it that way.

Q. Then how did they bring up this man? Where was he prosecuted?—A. The usual way they do it, I suppose; if a man is killed by a member of the opposition company, they hold a meeting and they decide as to what he is worth. If the other company is willing to pay the amount that they demand for that murdered man, they drop it, and if not they prosecute it.

Q. Prosecute it in our courts?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever hear an instance of that kind in the white race?—A. No, sir.

Q. What court tries our citizens in China? Suppose an American citizen infringes upon the laws of China, where is he tried?—A. He is tried by the American law.

Q. That is rather a sad example to them in your opinion as a lawyer?—A. I do not know but that it is.

Q. Have you ever heard of a white man being killed for the infringement of trades-union laws and regulations?—A. I do not know that I ever did.

Q. Have you read the dispatches from Pennsylvania during the last year?—A. O yes, sir; I have read them.

Q. Have you heard of men being killed there who went to work in the coal mines?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It was quite a common occurrence there?—A. It was very common at that time.

Q. Have you in your experience as a lawyer heard of malicious prosecutions against white people?—A. Very often.

Q. The same as with the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is your experience of perjury by white people in the courts?—A. I have seen perjury committed by a great many white people.

Q. To the same degree as Chinese?—A. I think not.

Q. Do you not, in your experience as a district attorney, hear of perjury committed every day in your courts by white people?—A. Almost every day.

Q. Do you hear of it every day by Chinese?—A. We do not have cases every day of Chinese.

Q. You have municipal laws in Sacramento to prevent prostitution and gambling so publicly as it is on I street?—A. Yes,sir.

Q. Do you make any effort to suppress in?—A. We do.

Q. Do you succeed?—A. No, sir.

Q. For what reason?—A. For various reasons. In the first place, there does not seem to be a desire to prosecute Chinese for prostitution, because there are various places of white prostitution.

Q. And you do not like to discriminate?—A. We do not like to discriminate.

Q. You are very good. We are not so particular here.—A. We have had both whites and Chinese prosecuted there.

CHARLES H. PETERSON sworn and examined.

By Senator SARGENT:

Question. What are the papers you hold in your hand?—Answer. Petitions from Monterey County.

Q. Do they all have the same text?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the number of signers?—A. Altogether, 949.

Q. How do you happen to have them here?—A. They have been sent to me through express by some of my friends in Monterey County.

Q. With the request that you lay them before this commission?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Show by the analysis which you hold in your hand the character of the signers of those petitions?—A. No. 1, 121 signers, from Salinas City, prominent men, all property-owners; among whom are two physicians, one judge, all the county officers, and Vanderhurst & Co., the principal merchants. The second petition has 114 signers, also from Salinas; and 33 property owners, one judge, one ex-sheriff, and the editor of the Salinas Index. The third has 113 signers from Monterey; 36 property owners, all the merchants, and D. Jacks, the largest property-owner in the county. The fourth has 68 signers, Monterey County; the county judge signed this petition. The fifth has 60 signers, from Chular; principally farmers. The sixth petition has 26 signers, Chular County; farmers principally. The seventh petition has 62 signers, from Gonzales County; one justice of the peace, merchants and farmers. The eighth petition has 50 signers, from Gonzales County; principally merchants and farmers. The ninth petition has 23 signers, from Blanco; merchants, farmers, and laboring men. The tenth petition has 81 signers, from Castorville; merchants and farmers. No. 11 has 21 signers, from Natividad. These are the places where they were signed. Natividad is a small town. They are principally farmers. The twelfth petition has 21 signers, from Salinas; hotel-keepers, &c. The thirteenth petition has 49 signers, Salinas; merchants and brewers. The fourteenth petition has 57 signers, Salinas; one physician, one lawyer, &c. No. 15 has 22 signers, Salinas; one physician, one justice of the peace, &c. No. 16 has 28 signers, Salinas; merchants, &c. No.

17 has 33 signers, from Santa Rita; one school-teacher, merchants, and farmers. I will state to the committee that I am personally acquainted with a great many of these signers; that I have talked to some of them and I know them generally.

Q. What is the general character of those you are acquainted with?—A. They are business men, men of good character, lawyers and physicians. Among the rest there is one minister of the gospel in the Baptist church.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What minister is that?—A. His name is Joseph Beaven. I have got his name here.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. When were these petitions signed?—A. These petitions have been signed since the 26th of October, with the understanding that they would not be presented to the commission until after the election. They were all signed irrespective of politics; that was the understanding when they were signed.

Q. They were all pretty unanimous on that question before the election?—A. To a great extent.

Senator SARGENT. Please read the text of the petitions.

The witness read as follows:

To the honorable United States congressional committee in session at the city of San Francisco, Cal., to investigate the Chinese problem:

GENTLEMEN: In view of the objects of your mission to the Pacific coast, we, citizens of the county of Monterey, Cal., most respectfully represent to you—

1. That there are now in this county about nine hundred Chinese, all engaged in labor of various kinds.

2. That this county, although large in extent, is sparsely settled, there being but a few towns and villages within its limits, Salinas City, the county seat, having a population of about twenty-five hundred, being the largest.

3. That the principal portion of the permanent Chinese population is crowded into our towns and villages, where, in all of the ordinary occupations of life, they compete with the white laboring man and woman, and work so cheaply as to a great extent deprive them of the means of livelihood; and many in consequence are the objects of charity in our midst.

4. That the Salinas Valley in particular is one vast agricultural country, in which the present season an immense amount of grain was raised, capable of employing thousands of white men during the harvest season; yet it is a fact that a great many of them lay idle for days at a time because of the competitive labor of the Chinese.

5. That their habits are generally filthy and the air all around them filled with noisome smells, which cannot fail to affect the health of our own people around them, and in consequence of which real estate depreciates in value wherever they reside, and property remains unoccupied on both sides of them. Furthermore, buildings that have been once occupied by Chinese are extremely difficult to rent afterwards to white persons at any price.

6. That the women are almost entirely prostitutes, and by their boldness and vices corrupt the morals, especially of our boys.

7. That the Chinese deal as little with our people as possible, except for their own benefit, and thereby exhaust the county of much of its circulating medium, which they constantly ship to China, whence but little of it ever returns to our own country; causing financial embarrassment and trouble to all classes of our people.

Wherefore, the undersigned, citizens as aforesaid, most respectfully petition that you will carefully examine into the Chinese question, to the end that they may be removed from the land if possible, or at least that the immigration to this coast be permanently stopped.

MONTEREY COUNTY, *October* 26, 1876.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What county is this list from?—A. Monterey County.

Q. How many inhabitants has Monterey County?—A. Somewhere about 12,000.

Q. How many signatures have you altogether here?—A. Nine hundred and forty-nine.

Q. These petitions were circulated before the election?—A. Before and after the election both. I got them here day before yesterday.

Q. How do you know they were circulated before and after?—A. I know because I am very much conversant in the matter.

Q. How conversant are you?—A. They were circulated by my friends, I know, down there.

Q. Have you seen them since?—A. I have seen some of them. I had letters from them very frequently in regard to it.

Q. Who have you seen since they signed?—A. I saw Mr. Beard, of the Globe Hotel.

Q. Is he in town now?—A. No, I guess not.

Q. The petitions were pretty generally circulated, were they?—A. They were circulated, and they are from different townships, as you can see by looking at them. I was not there, but I know a good many of those people. I lived there about five months this summer.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Where does Mr. Abbott, the farmer, reside?—A. In Salinas Valley. If I am not mistaken, he was in the legislature.

Q. He is one of the Abbott brothers, large land-owners there?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. J. G. Armstrong, farmer?—A. Yes, sir; he lives above Salinas City.

Q. M. Riordan, farmer and capitalist?—A. Yes, sir; he lives close to Natividad. He is not on the Salinas petition.

Q. Do you know whether the petition expresses the opinion of the people generally down there?—A. It does, as far as I understand.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where do you reside?—A. Here in the city.

Q. Who got up this petition?—A. The people of Salinas.

Q. Who prepared it?—A. Mr. Beard and others.

Q. Where do they live?—A. They live in Salinas. Mr. Beard is proprietor and keeper of the Globe Hotel.

Q. In Salinas?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he draw up the petition?—A. I am not sure whether he did or not, because I was here in the city at the time. I wrote to them about the commission wishing facts, and for the petition to be sent around, and they did so.

Q. When did you write to them?—A. I wrote to them, I think, the first of October. I was down there this summer, and left last September. I came up to the city and wrote to them about it after I came here.

Q. Was it after this commission came here or before that you wrote to them?—A. I think it was after, but I am not sure about it.

Q. These petitions were sent to you?—A. They were sent to me to present to this commission.

Q. You are taking considerable interest in this question?—A. Yes; somewhat.

Q. Are you acting in any official capacity; that is to say, in connection with any society?—A. Yes, sir; I am an officer of a society.

Q. What is the society?—A. They call it the Order of Caucasians. It originated in Salinas.

Q. Has it been established here?—A. No; not that particular society. I believe there are others of different kinds here having the same object.

Q. What is the purpose of that society?—A. It is for the purpose of protecting labor. I have a circular here if you wish to see it, [producing.] That expresses exactly what the society are doing.

Senator SARGENT. Read it.

The witness read as follows:

Circular of the Grand Workshop of the Order of Caucasians, of Salinas City, Monterey County, California.

To all whom it may concern:

This circular is issued by authority of the Grand Workshop of the Order of Caucasians, for the purpose of imparting general information to those interested and who desire to establish local workshops under the auspices and charter of the Grand Workshop of this order.

Its object is as follows: The taking of active steps toward instituting a labor reform movement in favor of white as against Mongolian labor in the State of California.

The order does not aim to create any feeling of vindictiveness against the Mongolians nor against any white men, merchants or others, who employ them. Its sole object is to aid and assist all white men and women in securing work at living prices, when such work is needed and the persons are competent, in preference to the employment of Chinese or Mongolian labor. It makes no war against any one, not even the Chinese, except so far as to claim that American or other merchants, manufacturers, &c., who derive their sustenance, support, and profits almost entirely from white laboring men and women, shall, when they have labor to offer, for white men and women to do, give it to them and not to a class who spend as little money in our midst as possible, and who drain our country of money by shipments to China, that never return, of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. The order is liberal, in that it does not condemn any person who, under a great necessity, is compelled to employ Chinese labor, having first tried to procure white labor.

But it does go to the extent of pledging members solemnly to refuse purchasing anything of a merchant, manufacturer, mill-man, or any other class of men or women who live off the white laborers' industry, when it becomes evident that, without necessity, they, or any of them, persist in the employment of Chinese to the exclusion of white labor.

We believe that this order, properly maintained by the laboring men and women, can and will accomplish great good, and that it ought to spread all over this coast. It will do more than all else that has ever been undertaken to stop the flow of the Mongolian race to the Pacific coast.

All communications should be addressed to C. H. Peterson, deputy G. C., 407 Third street, San Francisco, Cal.

H. HUDSON, G. C.,
C. R. BEARD, G. F.,
D. J. QUIGLEY, G. T.,
Committee.

SALINAS CITY, *April*, 1876.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Did that materially aid you in getting these petitions signed? Do you think this declaration of principles helped you?—A. I am not sure whether it did or not. The people down there seem to be willing that there shall be no Chinamen among them, if possible.

Q. I believe there were only 2,500 votes cast there at the last election?—A. I am not sure, but I think there was about that number.

Q. Did you exercise in getting those signatures any influences from your association?—A. I did not, for I was here.

Q. Have you any information to that effect?—A. My friends passed the petition around to the various places in the county, and they were signed by those people.

Q. Is this society carrying into effect these pledges that you will not trade with a man who employs Chinese?—A. They are to a certain extent, I believe.

Q. It would be very likely that a man would sign that petition very readily when presented to him, as you have ostracised all those who employ Chinese?—A. I presume so.

Q. There are a good many who would not dare to withhold their signatures?—A. O, not at all. I do not think there is anything of that kind.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. At the time your petition was circulated, was there any understanding or instructions to the persons carrying them that they should take down the names of those who refused to sign?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was that done?—A. No, sir; not to my knowledge. I will state that I had a letter from a gentleman saying that there was but one person who refused to sign to whom the petition was presented.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How many members are there of this society?—A. I do not know how many. It is not many. It is a new society, incorporated by the laws of the State.

Q. About how many?—A. We may have one hundred, more or less, in Salinas.

JOEL RUSSELL sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Where do you reside?—Answer. At Haywood, Alameda County.

Q. What is your occupation?—A. My principal business is that of farming.

Q. What is the extent of your farming in acreage?—A. I have a farm in Alameda County of about four hundred acres, and one in Merced County of six hundred acres.

Q. You have been in attendance here upon this commission somewhat. Did you hear the testimony of Mr. Hollister?—A. I did not hear it. I read it as it was reported in the papers. I read it in the Post, I think.

Q. State, if you please, any views you may have in reference to his testimony.—A. Upon reading his testimony at Haywood in reference to the value of Chinese labor, as connected with the interest of the State, I thought it was neither correct nor true, and my neighbors at Haywood also thought so, and they asked me to come here and give my testimony, so far as I was acquainted with the subject, or at least my opinion, and to report for them that they are opposed to the presence of Chinese, and believe that their presence conflicts with the interest of farmers, and that the effect is generally different from what Mr. Hollister stated.

Q. What is the general occupation of these people, your neighbors, who differ from Mr. Hollister's views on the subject, and who asked you to come here? Is it a farming community?—A. It is generally a farming community; that is coast-farming, grain-growing, and fruit-growing, especially small fruits, such as currants. I may mention, among those who wished me to come, merchants and contractors and farmers.

Q. Farmers and the general character of people in a small village like Haywood?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Hollister stated, if I did not misunderstand him, and I do not desire to do so, that the rule in reference to the white laborer, to which there are exceptions, is that he is a bummer and a drunkard. Is that your observation?—A. It is not true, so far as my observation is concerned.

Q. He also stated that those qualities extended very largely to the small proprietary farmers throughout the State. Is that your observation?—A. That is decidedly untrue, so far as my observation is concerned.

Q. What, in your opinion, is the character of the small proprietary farmers, who work their own lands?—A. Do you mean in reference to their moral character?

Q. In all the qualifications that go to make up good citizens.—A. I think they are among the very best men in the State, for the reason that they are the producers of the State. They produce with their own efforts, and they have a personal interest in producing, different from some others. So far as Mr. Hollister's testimony is concerned, as to the advantages of Chinese labor in the farming interest, I think, as regards the land-owner who wishes to monopolize that business so as to exclude the small farmer, he is so far partially correct; but so far as the presence of the Chinese goes to the interest of a small farmer, I do not think he is correct.

Q. State whether public opinion among the small farmers, those who do not employ Chinese labor as a rule, and yet who may occasionally employ an exceptional Chinaman under a pressure of labor, is in favor of the introduction of Chinese labor or its inhibition from coming?—A. In the first place I would answer that they are not; but in the application of the question you need not withhold those who employ Chinamen, for it is true that there are a great many persons who employ Chinamen who, if called upon to express their views upon the practicability of the presence of Chinamen as connected with farming interests, would say, "We do not want them." Still, circumstances have been brought about by which it is often very necessary, almost indispensable, for them to employ them.

Q. Then, in reference to the general intelligent opinion of intelligent and disinterested people throughout the State, would they or would they not favor legislation that would restrict Chinese immigration?—A. So far as my observation extends, and I am tolerably well acquainted throughout the San Joaquin Valley and my own county, I am very sure that such legislation is the wish of nine-tenths of the agriculturists.

Q. In speaking of the agriculturists you mean in their numbers and not in their ownership of lands?—A. Of course I do, because if you come to the ownership of lands, you would reckon in some of those men who cultivate thirty thousand acres, and that would be a little too big an advantage on their side.

Q. Those men who do cultivate these large tracts of land, and who are proprietors of large tracts, say of over five thousand acres, are generally in favor of the introduction of Chinese labor because it is cheap and convenient?—A. That is true to a certain extent with reference to grain-growing, but it is more especially true with reference to those men who grow currants and small fruits, because the use of Chinese labor in growing the small fruits, such as currants, has become quite a trade here. The presence of Chinese labor gives the man who has the land and the capital to put out the plants with a view of growing those currants the monopoly of the trade, when, if there were no Chinamen here, he would not have it. This applies especially to my immediate vicinity. They would not have done that there. Still, it is my opinion that the currants would have been grown sufficient to supply the demand of the State, and the labor occupied in the growth of those currants would have been one of the industries of white families that would take the place of the Chinese. If those men had not monopolized the growth of currants in large quantities by the aid of Chinese labor, even with the Chinese here and they holding their lands, those currants would be grown by men who would use their own children, their girls and boys, in the picking of these currants, when now they are precluded from that from the fact that when a man with a family of children who would be very glad and very anxious to get into the work attempts to do it, the man who has from thirty to forty or a hundred

acres of currants can so control the market that they come to a price that the man cannot afford to sell at who works white labor.

Q. Let us suppose we had no Chinese at all coming to this country from the year 1849 till to day—when I say none, I mean none except those who came in here in connection with merchandise; no Chinese laborers—would our country have filled up faster than it has?—A. So far as the white population is concerned, I think it would have filled up very much faster. I have not been here ever since 1849, but still I was here in 1850. I have been in that county since 1852, and I am of the opinion, from my own observation, that there is a very large number of persons who used to cultivate the land and work on the farms who, by some means, have gone from the State. They are not here, and I think it is the presence of the Chinese that has driven them away. I think if the Chinese had not been here, it follows as a certainty as to the lands now occupied in that county by a large class, that either one of three conditions would have resulted: one would be that white labor would have worked those lands, or they would be rented to white men, or they would be cut up and sold to white men. One of those three things would have been very naturally the result.

Q. And any one of those conditions would be preferable to the condition of holding in large estates and working the Chinese?—A. Most decidedly. The feeling is very prevalent. I have heard it said here that very many merchants are in favor of the presence of Chinese. That may be true in some localities, but I am sure it is not true where I am acquainted, for this reason: every thinking country merchant reasons that if these lands that are now held in large quantities were worked by one hundred white men, then there would be one hundred more customers for the stores than there are now, from the fact that the Chinamen do not buy many of the things that the white men must have to live. The Chinaman eats rice, it is true, and he buys that, and there are some other things which he buys.

Q. He generally imports it himself?—A. He does; but that does not make much difference; it comes to about the same. If you will look into the houses where those Chinese live that are working the lands, you will find no chairs, none of such things which are positively necessary for well-regulated American society, or laborers, even. They get along with so much less of such things that they can afford to work for less wages. They deprive the merchants of trade in those articles, and therefore the merchants are not in favor of their remaining. They can see an advantage to their business if they were away, to take no higher view of it.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. I wish you would give me the names of some of the people who wanted you to come over here.—A. Mr. Collins, for one, who is a merchant; Mr. Larabee, a contractor.

Q. What kind of a contractor?—A. A carpenter and builder.

Q. Do the Chinese interfere with his business?—A. He says this much about it, that if the Chinamen were away from his vicinity he thinks the white men would live in houses more.

Q. There would be more white population?—A. More white population and more building.

Q. Give more names.—A. T. A. Cunningham.

Q. What is his business?—A. A general farmer. He raises currants, somewhat.

Q. Does he employ Chinese?—A. He does. It is true many men em-

ploy Chinese who would be very glad if white labor were here in their stead.

Q. What is another name?—A. I do not remember, especially, all the names.

Q. There are three—— —A. I have mentioned four.

Q. One is a merchant, and one a contractor, and the other a farmer who employs Chinese. Why does he employ them?—A. Mainly they employ Chinese because at the time when they want labor that is about the only labor at hand. Sometimes many of the farmers have a portion of their work that they cannot do with Chinese labor, so that when they can get the white labor they use it, where it is positively necessary, and then they turn them away for a while, and when they want a man they can always find a Chinaman who, they say, owns Chinamen. I do not know that they own them, but still they have the control of them, and the farmers can go to a head Chinaman and get help.

Q. It is very convenient to have them around in your neighborhood?—A. I cannot say that it is not sometimes a convenience, but the condition of things made necessary by their presence is such that I think the people there would be very glad to forgo that convenience.

Q. It is quite a thrifty community around Haywood?—A. Tolerably so; as much so as one would expect, so far as farming is concerned.

Q. How much of a town is Haywood?—A. It is an incorporated town.

Q. What is the character of the business carried on in the vicinity of the town?—A. It is mainly farming.

Q. Is there much fruit raised there?—A. Considerable fruit.

Q. Is not two-thirds of the land really cultivated there in fruit and berries?—A. It depends upon how much country you take in. For a strip along San Lorenzo Creek, perhaps that would be true; and so taking in De Soto ranch.

Q. What is the largest interest, then, in your neighborhood, in the line of agriculture?—A. The most extensive is that of grain-growing—taking the township.

Q. There is a great deal of fruit raised there?—A. There is a great deal of fruit raised there.

Q. What labor do they employ in the fruit business?—A. They employ Chinese considerably. Of the men who own the larger tracts, the larger quantity employ Chinese labor, I think. Take a strip of land there a mile wide from Haywood to the bay, and for perhaps three or four months, many times, in the year you can readily count a thousand Chinamen at work.

Q. Is that cheap labor?—A. It is so considered by some. For some especial kinds of business it is.

Q. For what kinds of business have they this cheap labor?—A. Such labor as they can do by being shown what it is; labor that does not require any great exercise of judgment or originality about it.

Q. How long have you been in this State?—A. I have been in this State since March, 1850.

Q. Have you been East since?—A. I never have been out of the State except to Oregon.

Q. Do you know what the rate of wages for white laborers is in Oregon?—A. No; I do not. I have done no business in Oregon for twenty years.

Q. Have you any information of the rate in Ohio, Iowa, Indiana?—A. I have not.

Q. Do you not know that farm-hands work the year around there for

$15 a month?—A. I do not know it. I have no reason to doubt it, however.

Q. Can you hire a Chinaman for $15 a month?—A. If I should hire him as they hire help in the Eastern States, and was willing to put up with him, under certain circumstances I certainly could.

Q. You think they could be hired at $15 a month?—A. If you board them and give them a bed to sleep in as all laborers have.

Q. If you took him into your family, and all that?—A. I think very likely he would be glad to come at $15 a month.

Q. Why would he? Does he like domestic life so much better as to work for $10 a month less?—A. Not especially that. I have never hired any in that way, and I do not want to hire any in that way.

Q. Do you know of any who have hired in that way?—A. No, sir; not exactly. The usual way is to have a little crib where they can sleep, and a little place where they can do some cooking. They dig a hole in the ground and put a big pan on with some sods laid up around, and they build a fire in that, and when they come in to dinner there it is all ready for them, because some one has remained and cooked it. Then they take their chop-sticks and sit about the pan and eat. In that way they can work for less than men can who think it desirable to sit around a table and eat like white men.

Q. Are there not white laborers about Haywood?—A. O, yes; there are some.

Q. Most of those farmers have white laborers as well as Chinese?—A. It is necessary for every farmer to have white laborers as well as Chinese. There are some kinds of labor that cannot be done by Chinese.

Q. Do you think they could carry on this labor without Chinese?—A. I think there are instances where they could. If you should ask me this question: If lightning should strike these thousand Chinamen and kill them, with no possibility of getting other Chinamen, I think it would be a great drawback upon the interests of parties who do employ them.

Q. Then you state that as a fair simile of the condition of farming here now?—A. I am speaking of the employment of Chinese.

Q. The equal chances are that a farmer would be struck with lightning as that he could gather his crops without Chinese labor?—A. No, I did not say that. You asked me the question previous to that, something like this: What would be the effect if Chinese labor were removed?

A. Yes, sir; how would the farmers get along?—A. My answer was: If they should be removed suddenly, and I gave as an example, without the possibility of replacing them by Chinamen, there would be a check to the interest of those parties who employ them, temporarily, at least.

Q. You are raising a great many currants over there?—A. We do.

Q. Who fixes the price of currants?—A. That is controlled very much by those large growers: For instance, there are men there who I think have 60, 70, 25 and 30 acres; and if currants are not fetching a paying price, they can withhold sending them into market.

Q. Then they have the power to control the price?—A. To a certain extent they do.

Q. That is an advantage to the small grower, is it not? He takes advantage of the ruling rate?—A. As a matter of course he takes that so far as he can, but if the currants were all sent in that are grown——

Q. We understand that. Can you name a large farmer who employs Chinese?—A. I can.

Q. Name him.—A. Mr. Meek, over there, is one.

Q. How many acres does he cultivate?—A. In all his ranch, right

there in front of the town, I think he has twenty-two or twenty-three hundred acres.

Q. How many does he employ in harvesting or pulling mustard?—A. I do not know. I do not think he employs very many to pull mustard, for they have learned a trick that is rather shutting off the employment of Chinamen in pulling mustard. It is charged upon them, and the evidence, I think, goes to show it to be true, that they scatter the seed one year to make a growth the next year so as to make a job. Therefore they do not employ Chinamen much to pull mustard now. They scatter the mustard seed one year for the growth of the next, so as to give them a job the next year.

Q. Do you get that from pretty good authority?—A. I have seen mustard growing alleged to have been sown in that way.

CHARLES C. O'DONNELL sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in our State?—Answer. Twenty-six years about.

Q. What is your profession?—A. Physician.

Q. On what street do you reside?—A. On Kearney street, between Jackson and Washington.

Q. What reference has that to the Chinese quarter?—A. We have the bulk of the Chinese right there in our midst.

Q. Are you conversant with them, with their habits and their manners, and have you had opportunities to observe them?—A. Yes, sir; I have practiced as a physician among them for a great many years, and I have studied their habits, and I think I know something about them.

Q. State to the commission the result of your observations, taking such drift as you may please in regard to the general idea of their character and habits, and as to cleanliness—hygiene, if that is the proper word—and so on, all through the category of virtues and vices.—A. I have lived in that vicinity for over twenty years, right in the midst of them. I have visited all their gambling-houses and baguios. I have been very careful to study their habits, and their habits are very immoral, low, degrading, and very filthy. In regard to filth, the stench in that vicinity is sufficient, I should think, to produce any disease. I have discovered among them leprosy and any amount of small-pox patients. They were the first that introduced the small-pox here about five years ago. This last time it originated from them, because the first case that occurred in this last epidemic was a teamster who lived in Hayes Valley, and at that time a ship by the name of the Crocus, I think, brought a gang of these pirates here. The captain said they were pirates.

Q. That is the English steamer Crocus, Captain Joy?—A. Yes. He said they were all a lot pirates.

Mr. BEE. Let me correct that right here. The captain wrote a note stating that he did not call them pirates.

Senator SARGENT. Where is that note?

Mr. BEE. I saw it published.

The WITNESS. I visited the ship, and the captain told me they were pirates. He told me the only way to keep them in subjection was by using hot pokers. He said he had to keep a brigade of hot pokers to keep them in subjection. The captain said that to me. One of the custom-house officers told me this ship had arrived. It was about 6 o'clock in the morning, and he was going down to get aboard the steamer. He said he had to go. I asked him why. He said because there was small-pox on board. I immediately got my buggy and horse and went down

there. They had discharged the ship on Sunday. I met one of these Chinaman on the corner of Second and Brannan streets. He was broken out all over with the eruption of small-pox. I immediately drove back to the health-office and informed them there, and I was told by one of the detectives that there was no case of small-pox on board. I told him I had seen one case particularly that I knew to be small-pox, that had left the ship. That is where this first epidemic originated.

Q. (By Mr. PIXLEY.) You were prompted to take this interest and make this inquiry because of your profession as a physician?—A. Yes, sir. I was informed by one of the custom-house officers that there was small-pox aboard the ship.

Q. The steamer Crocus was an English ship?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Captain Joy was an English commander?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Her cargo was consigned to Parrott & Co.?—A. Yes, sir.

Q And she brought 830 passengers, I think it was?—A. The captain said there was about that number, but there were over that number on board.

Q. Can you not state, so that it may go into the record, what Captain Joy said in reference to the former occupation and the general character of this ship-load of immigrants that he brought?—A. He said there was very little difference between them; that the most of those who come are of a low type; that they are slaves sent here for so many years to pay for their passage; for instance, the heads of the companies, I understand, pay their way. To understand what kind of slavery it is, I will state that it was described to me in this way by the captain himself and one of the mates: For instance, a certain party of capitalists, or farmers, or manufacturers require so many Chinamen, and they only need to make the arrangement with the Chinese Company; the company furnishes so many passages and such an amount of money. These Chinamen then have to pay a certain amount—a percentage. Seventy-five dollars is what they have to pay above their expenses. They are hired out to work for a certain length of time until that amount is paid.

Q. With interest upon it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As to the character of these people. If they were pirates, what do you mean, and what did Captain Joy mean?—A. He said they are a very low class of Chinamen who come here. He said it was not the general inhabitants, but those who were on the outside of the walls, who were shipped here from an English port, Hong-Kong. He said they were a very low type.

Q. Cantonese boatmen and river-thieves?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. He did not say that?—A. He did say so; and that I will swear to.

Q. That they came from Hong-Kong?—A. He said the most of them come from Hong-Kong, an English port, and that they are imported.

Q. Mr. Pixley wanted you to say that they come from Canton?—A. They come from Canton to Hong-Kong. That is what I said. They are imported from Hong-Kong here.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. What did the captain say about the necessity of discipline, in order to bring them with safety into the port, if anything?—A. He said the only way in which he could bring the ship here in safety was by keeping a brigade armed with red-hot pokers. He said that was the only way he could subjugate them.

Q. Do you know whether he stopped at one of the ports of Japan to increase his white crew because of the necessity of a strong force?—A. I understood that he did.

Q. That ship, you think, not only brought thieves, and pirates, and criminals, but it brought the small-pox?—A. I know that for a fact, because I knew of the first case that occurred here. I knew of the first case that occcurred of the epidemic previous to that, a man by the name of Hogan, a policeman. I attended him. He caught the small-pox on Jackson street. That was the first case that occurred. Those coolies that come here are the very lowest type. It is not the general class of Chinamen who come here.

Q. It has been represented here that those who are opposed to Chinese immigration are confined to the lower class of white people. State to the commission whether, in your opinion, the intelligent, popular, disinterested opinion of California is in favor of or opposed to Chinese immigration.—A. They are opposed to the Chinese. As far as I can understand, none but capitalists, and those who can make money out of them by swindling, are in favor of them. That is the class I find here. There is nobody else, I think.

Q. Men who can make money out of the Chinese want them?—A. The men who can make money out of them want them; but seven-tenths of the inhabitants of the State of California are opposed to the Chinamen. That I will swear to to the best of my knowledge, because I have been here for the last twenty-six years, and I have interested myself among them, and studied their habits.

Q. How many Chinese prostitutes are there plying their vocation in San Francisco? What do they generally average in numbers?—A. It is almost impossible to say; but very nearly, I suppose, nineteen-twentieths of them are prostitutes. There is one in twenty that is not. The disease that they have spread among young men is horrible. No one can understand, except a physician who has lived in their vicinity, of the young men who have been ruined by them. They stand in their houses and coax in these young men, you know.

Q. Speaking of young men, how young are they?—A. All the way from the age of thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen, right along to eighteen.

Q. Is the character of this particular syphilis that belongs to the Chinese something distinctive, do you think?—A. Yes, sir; the virus of the cooly, in my opinion, is almost sure death to a white man. That is my opinion, because I have seen it. There are cases of syphilis among the whites that originated from these Chinese prostitutes which are incurable. I have practiced among them, and my practice among the Chinese themselves amounts to from $25 to $30 a day on an average.

Q. The Chinese are not as much affected by the syphilis as the whites?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is Mr. Woods who keeps the industrial school a man of any truth and veracity?—A. I am not very well acquainted with him, only by reputation.

Q. What is his reputation for truth and veracity?—A. I do not think it is anything extra.

Q. What do you base that opinion on?—A. I say it is nothing extra. His character is not extra.

Q. What do you mean by that?—A. It is just as good as the rest of the people, but it is nothing extra.

Q. About an equal, then?—A. About an equal with the rest of them.

Q. He is a pretty good man, then?—A. Well——

Q. Suppose he should swear before this commission that the syphilis contracted by the boys which he has under his charge, from Chinese women, amounted to nothing; that there was only one case that was serious; what would you say?—A. I would not believe a man of that kind on his oath who would state such a fact as that. He might have seen very mild types that he did not know anything about. I would think such a man did not know anything about the disease at all.

Q. At what date did this ship Crocus arrive here?—A. I do not remember exactly the date.

Q. How does it come that you are so positive about the first case of small-pox?—A. I could tell by referring to my books. I saw the first case, and I believe the next morning I made an address in regard to the matter, warning the people.

Q. Telling them that small-pox was here?—A. That small-pox was here.

Q. Had the Colorado arrived then?—A. I do not remember. I think not.

Q. When did the Colorado arrive here?—A. I do remember the date.

Q. Was it not charged that the Colorado brought the small-pox?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did they not have a good deal of trouble here because she did not stop and quarantine and they quarantined them in the wharf several days?—A. Yes.

Q. What was that done for?—A. Because she had small-pox on board, too.

Q. Did not the Colorado arrive before the Crocus?—A. No, sir; I think the Crocus arrived before the Colorado.

Q. We had the small-pox before the Colorado arrived?—A. Not here in the city before the Crocus arrived. The first case that occurred was a teamster who had hauled up a lot of baggage for those Chinamen from the Crocus. He lived out in Hayes Valley.

Q. Was that not about two years ago?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was it a year ago?—A. No, sir.

Q. Was it six months ago?—A. Yes, sir; more.

Q. Was it eight months ago?—A. I do not remember the exact date. I know that vessel by that yellow name, and she had a yellow lot of pirates aboard of her.

Q. How do you know they were pirates?—A. Because the captain told me so.

Q. Suppose the captain had told you they were devils, would you have believed it?—A. Undoubtedly I would, if he had them under his control. They looked very much like devils, anyhow. He told me they were pirates.

Q. You are a practicing physician?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have a diploma?—A. Yes, sir; from the University of Maryland, Baltimore City.

Q. You say that the sentiment of this State is seven-tenths against the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How did you get that information? We have been trying here three weeks to get it.—A. I have been all through in every town nearly in California. I made addresses in many places, and I could imagine from the opposition I would see against them.

Q. On what subject were you addressing the people?—A. On the Chinese question.

Q. Politically viewed?—A. O, no; not altogether.

Q. You were stumping the State on this Chinese issue?—A. No, sir.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. You were not a candidate for office?—A. No candidate at all; not a particle.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Who sent you out to canvass?—A. Nobody. I went there of my own free will.

Q. Do you belong to any anti-cooly club?—A. I do not know that I belong to any now. I organized one.

Q. You were taking an active part against the Chinese?—A. I have; yes, sir.

Q. You are very much prejudiced?—A. Not to give my testimony before you under oath.

Q. No; but your prejudices would carry you to a considerable extent?—A. Not at all; I can control my prejudices against them. My oath controls me.

Q. Which party made the most votes in this late canvass on the Chinese question?—A. I should judge that the democrats did, for they did not believe what the republicans believed, as shown by the paper which I have here, [producing,] issued from the Republican Central Executive Committee at Washington City, on the 12th day of October, 1876, in which they indorse Chinese immigration, and say that the Chinese are superior to the laboring class of white men!

Q. The republican party have issued this document?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And successfully carried this election on it?—A. No, sir; they got defeated on it.

Q. Who is elected? I have not heard anything to-day.—A. They were scattered all over the different States, in New York and Indiana, but not in California.

Q. Were the republicans only defeated in those two States?—A. Those two States defeated them. If the working class of men had got hold of this paper I do not think the republican party would have got many votes in California.

Q. Is this a secret document?—A. No, sir.

Q. It was published for distribution?—A. Yes, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How do you know this paper was distributed in the East?—A. I got a copy that was picked up, I think, in Ohio.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. It did get into Ohio?—A. Yes.

Q. And Hayes carried Ohio with that document circulated there?—A. Well, he did not carry Indiana.

Q. Did any of these documents get into Oregon or California?—A. I think not. I do not think the republicans would have carried California if the people had seen this document; but I did not get hold of it in time to publish it.

Q. A very intimate friend of mine, a physician, whom I think a great deal of, was removed as quarantine officer here almost wholly because it was stated that he let the Colorado pass in without going into quarantine when she had small-pox on board. Do you believe she had small-pox on board?—A. I am not able to say.

Q. No case was reported from her?—A. I do not know.

Q. You say the Crocus arrived before that?—A. I believe all these diseases, or most of them, originate in China and are brought here.

Q. One or two physicians state differently.—A. I think almost all those diseases originate in the marshes of Hindostan and along the river Nile. This leprosy was unknown to us until it was brought here by the Chinese. I understand that the Sandwich Islands were depopulated by these coolies; that the inhabitants there were the most healthy people on the face of the globe, and there was no disease among them until the Chinamen got among them and they brought leprosy there.

Q. Were there any Chinamen there when Cook was killed at Otaheite? He found leprosy there.—A. No, he did not find it there, or if he did, either shortly before or after he arrived there were Chinamen there.

Q. I do not think they were there until fifty years afterwards.—A. Yes, I think they were there then.

Q. Have there been any Chinamen in Canada? They have a large colony of lepers there.—A. I do not know anything about that. It originated with the Chinese, and we have a great many cases here.

Q. Have we had leprosy here?—A. Yes, sir; we have.

Q. Chinese lepers?—A. Yes, sir; Chinese lepers.

Q. Did not the medical fraternity go through that subject pretty thoroughly two years ago and decide there were no lepers here?—A. No, sir; they did not do anything of the kind, because I could have shown them 150 cases. I think there is some gentleman who belongs to the press, in this room—he was here to-day, I think—that I escorted through Chinatown and showed him cases of it.

Q. There are 150 cases of leprosy here now?—A. More, scattered around through Chinatown.

Q. All among the Chinese?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are you the O'Donnell who had the difficulty with Marriott, of the News Letter?—A. I have had difficulties with a good many men.

Q. You have been arrested several times for the crime of abortion since you have been a practicing physician here?—A. Have you been arrested for stealing?

Q. Never in my life.—A. As it is brought before me now I will answer it. If they want it on the record I will answer the question, and that brings up the character of other men who have been brought before you as evidence.

Q. I do not want you to state with such emphasis that there are one hundred and fifty lepers here.—A. I should like to take you through Chinatown, and I think if you had the constitution of a rhinoceros you could not stand it.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You are a very strong democrat?—A. Yes, sir; I am a democrat.

Q. Which would you rather do, beat the republicans or get rid of the evils of Chinese immigration?—A. I would sooner get rid of Chinese immigration in any manner or way in the world to ged rid of them. I should like to get rid of them. Now I give my testimony unbiased.

WILLIAM VALE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. Your name has been mentioned here, in connection with an incident, I think by Mr Hollister, of the importation of certain immigrants from Europe. State, if you please, your connection with it and the facts in relation to it, whatever they are.—Answer. Would you be kind enough to tell to me briefly the subject of Mr. Hollister's testimony?

Q. The question came up as to the practicability of importing from Europe a class of immigrants to take the place of farm-laborers. If I understood Mr. Hollister, and he is present now, he stated that he endeavored to import from Sweden, I think, and that the result was a failure, that he was unable to get men from there, and that the agent whom he employed, if it was yourself, on his return to New York obtained two and brought them here; that one of them remained but a short time, Mr. Hollister paying the expense, and he went away from him, and the other stayed out his year, but he was a very worthless fellow and it would have been better if he had not had him.—A. In the latter part of 1862 I was commissioned by several residents of California to procure farm-laborers, gardeners, cooks, and a general assortment of household and farm servants from different sections of Europe. Mr. Hollister ordered five, agreeing to pay, I think, $25 a month. Mr. Hollister's neighbor and copartner, I believe, Mr. Elwood Cooper, of Santa Barbara, also ordered ten farm-laborers. I procured, out of the five that Mr. Hollister ordered, two, and I rather think eight or nine for Mr. Cooper. I have in my possession the contracts, and some letters which I received from Mr. Cooper a year after my arrival with these people, after they had commenced their contract in California, extolling them very highly indeed, and he spoke of them as being admirable men, a little slow, however. Mr. Cooper's people were Scotchmen. Subsequently, probably three or four months afterward, I received another letter from Mr. Cooper, wherein he spoke of Mr. Hollister and himself projecting a large enterprise of planting oranges, walnuts, almonds, &c., and that they would require between two and three hundred men. I had changed my business relations and made an engagement with the Bulletin, and dropped the matter at that time. I did not follow it up except a little informal correspondence with Mr. Cooper. My impression has been that all the people I brought to Mr. Cooper and Mr. Hollister gave entire satisfaction; at least I have some of Mr. Cooper's letters in my possession which I could file with the commission. I should like to correct the statement that Mr. Hollister made. I do not think he lost anything. I do not believe Mr. Hollister lost a dollar; my impression is that both of them paid every dollar back. I know that one remained about ten months; the other I lost sight of.

Q. From your observation of the general character of European immigrants, such as you have imported to this country from Scotland and also from England—from Sweden and Norway any?—A. Yes; quite a number. I have brought quite a number from the Rhenish provinces, and from Alsace and Lorraine quite a number of people.

Q. You have a knowledge of their career since, to some extent?—A. Of quite a number.

Q. Comparing their merits as laborers in this country and looking to the future development of the country, how are they comparable with Chinese immigrants?—A. I could cite cases of quite a number of them who are enjoying from the fruits of their labor here $300 or $400 a month. I know one man who is doing quite a large business; some of the women married farmers very respectably. A girl I procured in Warwickshire married a gentleman in this city, and has three domestics, I think, herself, and is circulating in the good society of San Francisco; they all turned out very nicely.

Q. The character of the immigrants you brought out had in them the elements of honorable citizenship?—A. Undoubtedly; they are not eligible yet, but they are all good classes of citizens. One man has an extensive livery-stable here in this city

Q. If an effort had been made or should be made, an organized effort by our capitalists, to bring from Europe this class of immigration, would it, in your opinion, be successfully accomplished?—A. I believe 50,000 eligible immigrants could be procured from different sections of Europe. Some would bring a little money with them.

Q. And all good laborers, both male and female?—A. I think so.

Q. In reference to the true development of the State, looking to the moral and the religious aspect, and the political aspect as building up a State in the broad sense, they would be preferable to any other class that could be brought from Asia?—A. I think they would be invaluable.

Q. With reference to your observations in this State, where do you think the balance or bulk of the intelligent popular opinion rests in comparing these two classes of immigrants; leaving out those men who are making money, who are advancing their own personal and material interests by hiring Chinese, where does intelligent popular opinion rest on this subject?—A. If I may so state it, I think it exists with the great middle classes. I hardly believe that the bulk of our capitalists are in sympathy with Chinese labor. I could, as an illustration, cite the names of probably twenty of our prominent men who gave me orders, such men as Mr. Mills, George H. Howard, Faxon D. Atherton, Milton S. Latham, Elwood Cooper, of Santa Barbara, and Mr. Hollister, of Santa Barbara.

Q. And men of that character?—A. Yes; I suppose sixty or seventy prominent men. I have a record of all their names.

Q. They are representatives of the wealth and intelligence of our State?—A. They are mostly all representative men.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know whether Mr. Atherton and Mr. Howard and those gentlemen are opposed to the Chinese?—A. That I cannot say. I can speak for Mr. Howard. I have heard Mr. Howard express himself, I think, positively on the question of being opposed to Chinese labor. I will add the name of Alvinza Hayward. I procured, I think, seven or eight for Mr. Hayward.

Q. You say that these Swedes have all done well that you brought here?—A. I think so.

Q. What business are they engaged in generally? You mentioned one as a livery-stable keeper.—A. No; that was an Englishman.

Q. You said a lady employed domestic servants. Were they Chinese or white?—A. A question of delicacy would prevent me giving any details. She is living on Rincon Hill in a nice establishment, and I am glad of it.

Q. Do any of these immigrants that you brought over employ Chinese?—A. I do not know as to that. I should very much like to get the testimony of Mr. Hollister as to his information and belief in regard to Mr. Cooper's experience in this matter. I know it is of the most positive nature, and most gratifying.

Q. How do you know that the man who staid only twenty-five days with Mr. Hollister refunded him the money? You stated that you did not believe that Mr. Hollister had lost anything.—A. I think I met that man eight or ten months after his arrival here, and on his statement alone I said that.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you know whether that man is in the city now?—A. That I cannot say. It was nearly four years ago.

HENRY DEGROOT sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of our State of California?—Answer. I have been here nearly twenty-eight years.

Q. What has been your occupation during that time?—A. Mostly engaged in mining. A miner.

Q. You have been listening here during the day and have obtained a general scope of the investigation pending before the congressional committee?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. I wish you to state to the commission your views in reference to Chinese immigration and its bearing upon the mines, the labor of the mines, and such other reflections as may occur to you upon this question.—A. In regard to its effect upon the miners and the mining interest I am better qualified to speak than as to its effect upon any other industry in California, because that has been my business. I think that the effect of the presence of these people here has been very detrimental to the labor interests, and to the mining industry also. My attention was first called to this fact as long ago as 1853 or 1854, when I was acting as collector of the foreign miners' tax. I then observed the injury that this people were doing to the miners themselves from their unsystematic method of mining. At that day we had a great deal of river-bar mining, and placer-mining of every character, that would pay from three to six dollars; it would average four or five dollars a day to the man; but that was hardly considered white wages then, and the community generally was indifferent as to the presence of the Chinese, and thought it was well enough to let these people come in and work that character of mines, believing that it would not pay white labor then, and probably never would. The Chinese went on, and by their method of mining they covered up a great deal of good ground. They prevented white men from coming in, because they did not like to mine near them, and in that way a good deal of mining-ground was lost which we never will be able to work out. Subsequently they began to increase, and to be employed as laborers in the mines—that is, to be hired. This went on increasing. We thought at first they could not be employed to advantage in certain classes of mining, or in any class, but finally it was found that they could. They were hired first in placer-mining, and then in drift-digging to some extent, and finally in hydraulic mining to very great advantage, except for moving stones and working in the pit; and as they became educated to the business they greatly displaced white labor, and now we have them employed in every kind of mining as laborers at good wages. This operation is constantly going on and displacing white men. The result is that the country all through from Kern River to Shasta, a distance of five hundred miles, is full of villages in a state of decadence. It is true these villages were partially depopulated along about 1857, when the surface-placers were considerably exhausted, and a great many miners left and went to Fox River and elsewhere. Many of them returned afterward, but in the mean time Chinese labor was substituted, and when they came back they found that their claims were occupied. They found their position as laborers occupied, and they drifted away again; left the mines instead of working there, staying, and building up homes. In that way the Chinese have come in. They have taken possession and do nearly all of what is now called the river-bed washing, turning the channels of rivers and washing them. There is a class of white men residing in the mines from the first who have made it a business to take up claims

and sell them to Chinese, which is in contravention, of course, of the laws of the country, and also of the local laws of the miners; but the miners leaving, these local laws have not been enforced, and these white men who do not like, generally, to work very well have made it a business to take up claims and sell them to the Chinese. When they are once inducted into these claims, these men who sell them remain and exercise a sort of protection over them. In some places there are very large numbers of them. In the vicinity of Oroville, there are between three and four thousand Chinamen who are mining upon the public domain, who have obtained their claims in that manner.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are the Chinamen molested as a rule by the white men?—A. They are not. I never knew of a case of the kind, any more than white men are molested by each other, unless there should be some matter of contention. In former days we would not allow them to come in; but that is a long time ago. For fifteen years they have not been molested any more than whites. For that reason they have become established. As I say, white men sell them claims, and therefore they are interested and defend them. There is a large class of white men who make this a business.

Q. Is there a Chinese quarter in the mining towns?—A. There is not a single mining town in California but what has a Chinese quarter planted in the very center of it, as in San Francisco. The women are a very undesirable presence, and many of the men are gamblers.

Q. What is the condition of their buildings?—A. Their buildings are hovels such as you see here. They are very small, cheap structures put up by boards, usually without chimneys, merely an oval, plate chimney or cheap apparatus. I am satisfied, having traveled from one end of California to the other, that there is not a single mining town or a hamlet in the State of California but what has a large population of Chinese planted right on its border or right in the center of the town, wherever they happen to have squatted when they first came in. That is the case in Trinity County, in Shasta County, and it is the case everywhere. It is corrupting the youth of those towns at a fearful rate. Of course your common sense must teach you that if these women are there they must corrupt the youth of the place. You can judge as well as I can as to what the effect must be upon the youthful population of these inland towns. They are not only coming into California, but the vessels that go from Oregon to China carrying flour, grain, and lumber bring back cargoes of Chinese who go silently up Columbia River and drop into the mining regions adjacent to Oregon, and they go into Montana and Idaho. They are advised before they leave home exactly where to go, that is, where there are open placers. They go straight as a line right to those places, and seem to have a perfect system of intelligence. They drop into these mines; they begin to purchase them, and they get them by this system of sales on the part of white men, and when they are once planted in you cannot get them out.

Q. What is the sentiment of the mining community generally in reference to them, aside from those men who make money by selling them lands?—A. I never met a laboring man or a miner who did not employ labor but what was dead opposed to the Chinese. On the other hand, there is a considerable number of men in the mines in favor of their presence here. That class consists of men who are aggregating these small claims into large mining estates and employing the Chinese to run them, just as the farmers and manufacturers here do. They build

these huts right at the pit where they are boring. It will not cost $15 to put one up, and the whole of their crew will subsist there, and it is cheaper labor. We know very well that the prices of labor in the mines have been going down steadily from the first.

Q. What is the sentiment of the merchants in the mining regions about them?—A. The merchants are averse to them generally, because the Chinamen have their own merchants where there is a considerable number of them, and they do most of their trading in that way; but still, in some places, they trade with the whites to some extent.

Q. The Chinese seem to form separate communities by themselves and perform their trading among themselves?—A. They do not mingle with our people to any extent at all.

Q. Have you observed anything of the effect of the Chinese upon other industries?—A. I have. I might relate a little of my own experience. Some fifteen years ago, in consequence of sickness, I became pretty poor. My children were living in the town of Santa Clara. My boys were obliged to go out and pick berries to help me on. At that time they were making a dollar and a half picking strawberries and other berries in the vicinity of Santa Clara. At about that time they began to introduce the Chinese and employ them at this business. The wages gradually declined from that time every year from five to ten cents a year, and I think it came down to about seventy cents. This occurred seven or eight years ago. By this time the wages had become so low and the Chinese so numerous that no parents would suffer their children any longer to go into the fields and pick berries for two reasons: First, we did not consider it proper and safe to allow children, especially girls, to pick berries. They used to pick berries and make good wages. The Chinese pick all the berries to the exclusion of the girls, and they are hiring land and raising berries, and pretty soon they will monopolize the whole business, I think. In this city some years ago I had a little more experience, and as these isolated cases serve to illustrate what apply to whole classes I might relate this one. Mrs. Richards, an acquaintance of mine, whom I knew many years ago, and her son entered the Army, and she died as a nurse in the hospitals leaving three or four children, which for old acquaintance sake I felt bound to look after somewhat. This case illustrates a whole class of cases here which have come to my knowledge. It was given out here by an establishment that they would employ girls to make cigars, a business that has mostly fallen into the hands of the Chinese. This Mrs. Richards left a girl of sixteen or seventeen years old. As this place was advertised to teach the girls this business, myself and many other poor people took the girls there. After they had learned to make these cigars I went down to the Lewis brothers here to get a situation for this girl and many others. They would not employ them. They had some six or seven hundred Chinamen, and they did not think it expedient to take the girls. I went to every place in this city, and at last I got some of them employed for a short time, but only for a short time. Some of them would say, "if others will employ Chinamen we must do it, too; we cannot compete unless we all do it;" but the upshot was that these girls never got into one of the cigar-factories. I think it is the case still. They would then tell me, "if you paid me a handsome sum I would not take them in; the reason is we do not wish to change, and we can employ these Chinamen cheaper, and more satisfactorily; we can command them better; the American girls and boys are too independent; they have got too independent habits. Finding that we could not get these girls anywhere into that business, a number of them and

myself went out to Hayes Valley and endeavored to have these girls instructed to run sewing-machines, sewing boots and shoes in these large shoe-factories. After they had been employed there more or less nearly every one of them was discharged. I do not think you can get any employment for a single girl in that part of the town.

Q. Were these good girls?—A. Excellent girls.

Q. Was there any complaint made of the manner in which they did the work?—A. No, sir; only that they could hire the Chinamen a little cheaper, and they could run them with more system; and that other factories employed them, and they were obliged to do it in self-defense.

Q. Have you ever noticed this so far as other branches are concerned, for instance, the making of jewelry and things of that kind?—A. Since you speak of that, a case occurred within the last few weeks. A jeweler here had a little shop on Market street for a number of years. He was an industrious, good man, a liberal man. I met him two weeks ago and he told me that the Chinamen were manufacturing jewelry to a very large extent, and were ruining his business; that he could not compete with them. He was very much depressed. He was a very good man, indeed. This morning I opened the paper, and, to my surprise, I saw that he had committed suicide. I think it was in consequence of depression, caused by want of success in his business. But for that matter, gentlemen, you can walk from here to five hundred places in five minutes, in this city, where these facts can be verified. I can take you to a cellar where there are thirty Chinamen running sewing-machines, who eat and sleep in that cellar, and whose living does not cost them forty cents a month, apiece; not thirty cents, perhaps, so cheaply do they live. I live out in the eastward part of the town, in the neighborhood of those gardens. I pass them every day. There are fifteen or twenty acres there, being cultivated by the Chinese. It is thought they live well. Occasionally they do. They like to buy these good things; but, upon the whole, they live very poorly. At that place I have taken some pains to see how they live. Yesterday morning two large sturgeons were taken out there and dumped on the ground, and hauled into their hovels. Then comes a man with a lot of these still-fed hogs; then a little rice, and some of their own importations from China; and that constitutes the staple of their subsistence. If you go into those hovels, there is nothing there; they all bunk together; they have no furniture; they have no holidays, and you can yourself judge very well as to what they contribute in other respects as well as I can, towards the sustenance of our community. That is the way I think the bulk of them live. In the mines they live much in the same way, much more cheaply than it is possible for any white person to do.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Do their habits of life, mode of living, their mode of dress, and all that enable them to compete in wages with which it is impossible for a white man, as we have been raised or as our common laborers have been raised, to compete and live?—A. It is utterly impossible for us to compete with them and live. I have known an instance to occur which I will relate. It is a small affair, but it illustrates a principle. Three or four years ago in this city a poor woman, with the aid of some of us, started a cigar-store near the Chinese quarter. There were cigar-stores in the neighborhood run by Chinamen, who manufactured their own cigars. They ascertained the rates at which she was selling them, and immediately put up some sticks on their stands with prices a little lower than she was selling. We were led to observe the operations of these

Chinamen, and we came to find out that they met in conclave, and they made it a serious business to ruin that woman and that little business by reducing the prices constantly, meeting and considering about this matter as if it were a grave subject, until they had put the prices of cigars down so low that she was obliged to close out her little shop; and then they run their prices up again.

Q. You think that evidences a general system on their part?—A. It does. There is a combination of that kind. They do everything by system; everything is perfectly systemized. When a Chinaman comes to this country, if he is going into the mines, he knows before he leaves China where he is going; he knows where there are placers that can be opened or purchased through white men. It is a system that we know nothing about, an organization that runs through every branch of industry.

Q. If there had been no Chinese labor imported to our State from the beginning, not having invaded our mines, not having aided to develop our industries, not having helped to develop those branches of trade which some people think would not have been developed if there had been no Chinese here, what do you think would have been the relative condition of California in numbers, citizenship, wealth, and moral advancement to-day as compared with what it is?—A. In numbers, I think the white population would have been much greater than it is at present, because I have seen whole car-loads of emigrants going east within the last year, discouraged from remaining here in consequence of the presence of that people. I think that while a few men would not have been so rich, the great mass of the white people would have been a great deal better off in the absence of the Chinese. I think that morally we can hardly estimate the injury that they have inflicted upon us by degrading labor, by injury to the juvenile population, more especially in the inland counties, in the little mining-towns. That we cannot calculate. We can make no calculation of that injury.

Q. There are probably some branches of manufacturing industries that would not have been developed without the Chinese. Do you think that?—A. In the absence of that people, they would not have been developed to the same extent that they are, probably.

Q. They would have had a more healthful foundation, and a better start toward a prosperous future than with the artificial stimulus that Chinese cheap labor has given to them?—A. Yes, sir; I think so. Most of these industries have got a foot-hold here, and we are going along developing materially other industries without their aid.

Q. As to the effect upon landed property, whether or not it would have divided great landed estates that grew out of our Spanish system of claims, resulted in the division of property and the establishment of small proprietary landed interests, and their effect upon the community; give us your reflections upon that subject?—A. My opinion is that it would have had a tendency to the distribution of those large landed claims, for the reason that only by cheapened labor they have found it possible to preserve and work them. I think, in the absence of that element here, there would have been an increase of white population who would have purchased these lands, and they would have been subdivided into homesteads, and sold out to people who wished to settle upon them and improve them.

Q. And who would have made homes of the character of those of New England and the West?—A. Yes, sir; something like that. There is one thing to be considered. During our prosperous years, for the first ten or fifteen years of the occupation of the country, our people made

money, and they laid it up in savings-banks and turned it into little homesteads. For some years past they have been drawing on those little resources, and we have not felt the presence of the Chinese here so much. Our youthful population has only within the last few years arrived at that age when they would require labor, and the question of their employment has not been so serious. Now it is beginning to be one of very great moment. We have to-day in San Francisco 15,000 children between the ages of 14 and 20 who want work, who must have it, and they want this very work that the Chinamen are doing. These children are capable of doing that work. They are not capable of doing any other, because it is cheap, and it requires neither capital nor skill to do it. It is a work in every other country that is considered the right of women and children, as I understand it, and we think it ought to be their right to do it here. You cannot to-day get a boy or a girl in the business of running sewing-machines or manufacturing, making other little articles, boots and shoes, cigars, and all those things. They will not have them about; they consider it a disturbing element, and it is the same way in the country towns. They are full of children. This is a prolific country. The youthful population here are coming up in our little mining-towns. There is nothing for them to do. The Chinamen do everything there, the washing, the fruit-picking, the berries, everything else, and now it is a question what are we going to do with this large youthful population. I do not see myself what we are going to do with them; and their parents, who have been living on the little resources that they laid up before, are becoming poor in this city. The laboring population is becoming very poor here. In my neighborhood I am regarded as a friend of the Chinese, for the reason that I so often protect them. That is to say, I believe as long as they are here they should be protected from brutal treatment, and as long as they are here they must be employed. That is the way I view the matter. I have no antipathy against them.

Q. Have you anything to suggest in reference to a remedy; as to the character of legislation that is desirable in order to restrict or remove the Chinese?—A. It seems to me that we should at once find some method to check any further immigration of that people.

Q. Do you mean the laboring Chinese, those who fill menial positions?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You would not interfere with the incoming of the merchants or travelers, or those of their superior classes, who come here to see our country or to do business in it?—A. Certainly not. I have an idea that a silver dollar is not worth as much as a white woman's soul, and I would not bring them here to fight against our white people as laborers. That is what I mean.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. You said that you collected miners' taxes in early days.—A. Yes, sir; in 1853 and 1854.

Q. Did you collect from all foreigners?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you collect from European foreigners?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. From whom did you collect?—A. We collected from the Chinese. We did not collect from others.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What county was that?—A. That was in Calaveras.

Q. How many girls were employed in shoe-manufactories ten years ago here?—A. Very few.

Q. How many were employed five years ago?—A. I will tell you; I found in Hayes Valley two large establishments, one had about fifteen girls, and they employed from that number to thirty girls.

Q. How many are there now?—A. Not so many; or perhaps about the same number.

Q. You seem to be pretty well posted. How many girls are employed in the whole city in shoe-factories, in the manufacture of slippers, where women can work?—A. I can only speak from mere guess.

Q. I will refresh your memory. Miss Hayes, a very intelligent lady, says that she and her friend before coming here figured up two hundred and fifty girls working in all the shops of the city, and she said a good deal of work was taken home.—A. Probably there are about two hundred and fifty.

Q. What brought that state of affairs about, so many girls working—two hundred and fifty now—when you say there were fifteen some time ago?—A. I say from fifteen to thirty in each establishment. I do not know any other one, but in most of them I reckon there are that number.

Q. How long ago?—A. Five or six to ten, or seven or eight years ago.

Q. The census shows that only thirty were employed ten years ago?—A. Perhaps not so many were employed ten years ago. I am speaking of about seven years ago.

Q. You misunderstood my question then?—A. Yes; as to the time, perhaps.

Q. What has given the employment to 250 girls in these shops; by what process have they become engaged in that kind of work?—A. From the fact that we manufacture leather here in abundance, cheaply, and have a large market here for boots and shoes at good prices, and these factories have been built.

Q. How do we tan our leather—by what kind of labor? It has been said that there are 400 tanneries here?—A. Do you mean to say who tans the leather?

Q. Yes?—A. In most of the large tanneries Chinamen are employed.

Q. Then Chinese are employed where they have established boot and shoe shops, you state also?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you state that that is the reason why these 250 girls have found work by the establishment of these factories and the tanning of the leather?—A. We should have done this tanning in the absence of the Chinamen, I suppose; we would have employed white men.

Q. How long have we tanned our leather?—A. We have been tanning ever since 1852 or 1853.

Q. To what extent?—A. Small at first, but gradually extending from that time to this.

Q. Did we not ship pretty much all of our hides to the East six or eight years ago?—A. We shipped most of them six or eight years ago.

Q. What tannery was carried on to any extent five or six years ago?—A. At Santa Cruz, in Sacramento, over at Alameda, and in this city.

Q. Ten years ago had we tanneries here?—A. Quite a number.

Q. Where did they find sale for their leather?—A. They found sale to the harness-makers, saddle-makers, and shoe-makers. They sent some of the leather to Mexico, China, and Japan.

Q. It is a pretty good business?—A. It has been a fluctuating business; some seasons good and others poor.

Q. Does the price of leather fluctuate?—A. It fluctuates somewhat.

Q. How much?—A. I do not know.

Q. It is the same price year in and year out?—A. Two years ago the price was very much depressed, and there was a great deal of complaint.

Q. From eastern competition?—A. I do not know. Everything fluctuates, and the price of leather among the rest.

Q. We are making a considerable quantity of our boots and shoes here?—A. Yes; pretty largely now.

Q. This Chinese labor is a hardship upon boot-makers?—A. No, sir; I think the boot and shoe makers, perhaps, are getting rich out of Chinese labor.

Q. As to the workmen, is it a disadvantage to them in the way of labor?—A. Do you ask if the presence of Chinamen is a disadvantage to white laborers?

Q. Or those making shoes, the manufacturers, is that a disadvantage to the laborers?—A. I think the manufacture of boots and shoes by Chinese is a disadvantage to white laborers.

Q. Do you know that there is a co-operative boot factory here?—A. I have heard so.

Q. Do you know what their dividends are?—A. I do not.

Q. Chinese are engaged in the business of manufacturing boots and shoes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. It has been testified here that that institution pays two per cent. a month on the capital invested?—A. I hope it does.

Q. That has been testified to as a fact.—A. I am glad of it.

Q. Then it is not a depressed line of business that pays that dividend; any business that pays two per cent. a month is pretty healthy?—A. I know that the white boot and shoe makers in this city are poor and complain much of this competition of the Chinese.

Q. Do they complain for want of work?—A. Yes, sir; for want of employment in the factories, because the Chinese are employed.

Q. Do you know of any boot and shoe makers out of work to-day; can you place your memory upon one?—A. Yes, sir; a good many. I think if I should go around I could find a very large number who are very poor and very much in want of employment.

Q. Are our mechanics very poor generally?—A. Some of them are, some classes. Wherever this Chinese labor comes in competition with them, I think they are poor and growing poorer all the while.

Q. What are Chinese paid for making boots and shoes by the piece or by the day?—A. I do not know how much.

Q. Do you know it is cheap?—A. I believe it to be cheap.

Q. There are a good many white men and women engaged in these factories that the Chinese are in?—A. No, sir; comparatively very few of them.

Q. A good many, are there not?—A. You might call it a good many. You said two hundred girls and upwards. That is not large for a city having a juvenile population of some fifteen or twenty thousand who ought to have work.

Q. Would the two hundred and fifty girls have work if the Chinese could be driven from that employment to-morrow?—A. Yes, sir; 2,000, 3,000 of them.

Q. Where did we buy our boots and shoes before we commenced manufacturing them?—A. We imported them from the East, from France, and from other countries.

Q. Is it not necessary now to get these boots and shoes made so cheaply that we can compete with those people here?—A. I do not know that it is. I think we can leave that to regulate itself.

Q. Do you not know it is necessary for a man who goes into the manufacture of these articles to have the goods on the market so as to sell them as cheaply as those which are imported from the East?—A. I think it safe to allow that to regulate itself. I do not think it is safe to put a tariff upon manufactures or anything except cheap labor.

Q. What is cheap labor?—A. It is this servile labor that the citizen of the United States—the white person—cannot compete with.

Q. As to price or character?—A. I mean both price and character may make it cheap.

Q. What do you consider a cheap price?—A. I consider in any community that that is a cheap price for labor that is so low that the great class of the white people cannot live decently by pursuing that labor which they are fitted to do.

Q. Have not those who are mechanics lived decently here?—A. I have explained why they have been able to live, many of them, thus far, by drawing on the little accumulations of former years.

Q. Your acquaintances have a bank-account generally?—A. They have been exhausting that bank-account, many of them, for some years past. I have told you that the people, the laboring community, of San Francisco are poor, and growing poorer every year.

Q. I understood, by the reports of the banks, that the banking deposit was increasing all the time.—A. It makes a difference whether a man like me is a laborer and goes among laboring people, or whether he circulates in another class, and does not know of them from actual observation.

Q. Might you not be mistaken, with all your circulating among those people; may you not have formed erroneous conclusions?—A. I am speaking of what my honest impressions are.

Q. It might be that it could be proven to you that the presence of these Chinese here is a benefit to this very class that you are upholding?—A. It might be, because I am not infallible, and I may be mistaken. I am giving my experience as it has occurred to me. I know you have not much time to spare, and therefore I volunteer in this off-hand way to say what I have to say as quick as possible.

Q. Your observations, then, have been pretty extensive throughout the State?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As I was coming in you said the Chinese have worked in the old worked-out diggings in the mountains?—A. I said I found they had worked, not in worked-out diggings, but in diggings partially exhausted.

Q. Are they not generally engaged in working over old ground in mining?—A. Yes, sir; pretty extensively.

Q. That the white man would not work?—A. That a white man would be very glad to work if he had the opportunity to do it.

Q. Why does he not have the opportunity?—A. Because these grounds are occupied by the Chinese.

Q. How many Chinese are there mining?—A. There are very nearly four thousand right in the neighborhood of Oroville, just in one community.

Q. They have bought an immense tract of country?—A. They did not buy it; they bought it by white men in an illegal way selling it to them. I have found them this summer working on American River, and last summer on Trinity. I find them from one end of California to the other, even in underground mines.

Q. Did you live in El Dorado County?—A. No, sir; not in the mines.

Q. Generally they are working over abandoned diggings, except

where they have purchased ground?—A. They are working over some abandoned diggings.

Q. The same opening is there for white men?—A. If they could dispossess these Chinamen, of course.

Q. Do you think it necessary to dispossess them?—A. The Chinamen usually pick up the better class of poorer diggings that were abandoned several years ago. In 1857 there was a general emigration from this country, and the Chinese came in and took possession of those places, and have not since been dispossessed. They do what we call wing-dam and river-bed mining, and do it almost exclusively; and they do most of the sluice-mining and the rock-mining. The better places which were known to be rich are generally now occupied by the Chinese.

Q. They were known to be rich?—A. They were not remarkably rich, but the better class of those that were unoccupied the Chinese have taken.

Q. Have you found out, as a general rule, that the white miner will work in diggings that Chinamen will work?—A. Yes; they will work diggings that the Chinamen will work.

Q. Will white men work for the wages that a Chinamen will work for?—A. No.

Q. White men, then, will not work these diggings because they do not pay wages enough?—A. White men will not work for the same hire that a Chinaman does. I think it impossible to-day for white men to work so low, under the circumstances. The Chinamen are working a great deal of ground that the white men would be glad to work.

Q. They have developed that ground, probably, where it pays well, by their own industry?—A. No; it has not required much development. The river-beds do not require development, only wing-damming.

Q. Are the mines as free to the white men as to the Chinese?—A. Those that are unoccupied.

Q. Then a white man has the same privilege to go and mine where he pleases?—A. Certainly.

Q. There are not Chinamen enough in the mines to drive the white men out?—A. Not to drive them out. They have simply occupied, as I find now, up to this time a great many places that the whites would be glad to work.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are there many known unoccupied mines now?—A. No, sir; not placer-mines.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Would white men be glad now to get the diggings abandoned by themselves in 1857?—A. Yes, sir; to a great extent, they are mines they would be glad to work.

Q. If the large class of placer-mines that did not seem to justify the high wages that the white men demanded in 1857, when they went away to the Frazer River and other places, had been unoccupied from that time up to this, with the changed condition of things and the reduced price of labor, they would be very glad to come back and retake them?—A. Very glad. We could have a population of fifteen or twenty men at work there.

Q. In the mean time the mines have been very largely worked by Chinese?—A. Yes, sir; and covered up and worked by such a system as to injure them and render them difficult to work.

Q. To what extent do we get the benefit of this gold extracted from

our national domain?—A. To a very slight extent. These Chinamen purchase a few little things. Otherwise it is not expended here.

Q. They usually import what they eat and drink and wear?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. With some exceptional articles the whole product of their mining goes to China?—A. It does, in the shape, sometimes, of gold dust or coin.

Q. Then to the extent of the millions—and it must be many, many millions—that they have extracted from the country, it has gone back to China, without any appreciable advantage to the coast?—A. Undoubtedly.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How many millions?—A. I think the Chinamen are making better earnings than people generally suppose they are in the mines.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. If they strike good diggings they keep it secret?—A. It is utterly impossible to find out what they are making. You cannot ascertain that fact.

Q. The fact is that this deposit of gold that is in our mountains, which would have been the heritage of our white miners, has been and is continuing to be taken away by these Chinese without any corresponding advantage to us?—A. Yes, sir; the places where I find this kind of injury going on have been on almost every stream, more or less, especially on the forks of the American. If you have been there you must have observed it. Within the last four or five weeks I found them mining on Shirt-Tail Cañon, in Placer County, and on Indian Cañon, running their mines on to ground that would probably some day pay very well.

Q. Let me ask you in reference to the tailings and the *débris* of the mines. This working of the placer-mines, and working of the gravel-beds, sends the *débris* down into the main rivers?—A. It does.

Q. Has it or has it not proved an injury to the agricultural and the valley lands? Take, for instance, the Yuba.—A. On the Yuba and Feather Rivers, and Beaver, and some on the Cosumnes, there has been some injury, and pretty extensively on the Yuba and Beaver Rivers.

Q. So that in addition to the depreciation of the mines there has been injury to the agricultural valley lands by Chinese mining?—A. So far as they continue to send down this *débris*, it does prove an injury.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The Chinese have become very high hydraulic miners, by which they put up immense structures of pipes with a pressure of three or four hundred feet, and knock the whole mountains down into the valleys, and that floats into the rivers and injures agriculture. Is not that the fact?—A. I do not know of many Chinamen running hydraulic mines.

Q. Then the little fellow with his roller there is filling up the Yuba?—A. It is disturbing it. The tailings have lodged, and after these tailings have lodged and become considerably compact, they remain there, and if there is a considerable quantity it injures the agricultural districts. There is one Chinaman, Ah Wong, mining under Chalk Bluff.

Q. Then you find the Chinamen working on the edges of the river, on the American or its branches, and occasionally on the Beaver, and in the gulches that lead into the river in the dry season? You have seen them there? That is what you mean?—A. Yes.

Q. And then the tailings fill up the Yuba and the Feather Rivers, and destroy agriculture, caused by these little rollers that they set and dip water into?—A. As I said, they are working there, and they do send down a considerable amount of tailings, but not so much as the white miners.

Q. Do the tailings go down into the Yuba and the Feather?—A. The very fine portion of the sediment, the sand or mud, comes down; the particles lodge in the sluice, and the further down they go the finer it is, and before the time it reaches the Sacramento it is mere muddy water.

Q. Would not that be a very good fertilizer to go over the top of the land?—A. If distributed over the land it would be, but when it accumulates in the water it is injurious; there is too much of it. That is what the farmers are complaining of on those farms in the valleys.

Q. Do you not know that the blue-gravel or North Bloomfield men, with the immense hydraulic works they have there, send more tailings down to the Feather and Yuba Rivers in twenty-four hours than the Chinese send down in six months?—A. Not in that proportion, but they send much more than one company of Chinamen or half a dozen Chinamen will do.

Q. How much water are the Chinamen using there?—A. They are using five hundred inches I suppose.

Q. What is water worth an inch?—A. It varies from ten to twelve cents.

Q. Then they are using about five hundred inches a day?—A. I reckon about that.

Q. Is that the general run of water used by Chinamen?—A. O, no; there are exceptional cases where they run hydraulic mines.

Q. The Chinamen do run hydraulic mines?—A. Yes, sir; they have bought them and they run them.

THOMAS H. KING recalled.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. There has been an effort here to show that the Chinese seldom rise above laborers. In view of your former statement I will ask you to state what your observation has been in other countries where the Chinamen have immigrated as they have to this country. What has been the effect of that immigration upon Sumatra, Java, Malacca, and various countries with which I believe you are familiar?—Answer. I have a memorandum here which I will read:

To "Straits settlements," known as British, Dutch, and Malayan territories, located in the Malacca Straits, chiefly Singapore and Penang, the Chinese go under contract with Chinese as coolies same as here, but in enormously increased numbers every year, and to that extent have they swarmed over those countries that they not only monopolize the artisan as well as agricultural pursuits there, but also own, manage, and conduct nearly all tradesmen and mercantile business, as well as most all the large fleets of European style sailing and steam vessels of those ports, trading to many parts of the globe, they own.

The continued increase of Chinese to those places requires a large fleet of European sailing and steam vessels to convey them yearly, always about the same period as coming in largest numbers here, only that, owing to the absence of laws regulating there the number each vessel may carry, commonly double, or often four times that allowed by our laws are crowded on vessels employed carrying them. Chinese junks also are largely employed in carrying the coolies there besides.

To Siam also, which, lying between the straits and China, the Chinese cooly system has produced to the native population no less disastrous results. For, owing to the system of collecting the import or export or trading revenues there being farmed, or each product's revenue sold yearly, being nearly always bought and held by Chinese, the commerce and trade of all kinds, with but little exceptions of few European, has passed from the possession of the Siamese into the hands of Chinese, who own nearly all the large fleets of European style sailing and steam ships belonging to Siam, who, with Chinese crews, paid only a small part of what European or Americans can live on, monopolize, to the exclusion of natives, also the carrying trade.

The foregoing will largely apply to the other adjacent countries, as Java, Sumatra, Borneo, and Luzon, all under European governments' control, who, notwithstanding their fostering the industries of their native population, their trade has, under their nefarious cooly system, passed largely into Chinese hands.

Reference to the statistics that can be furnished by our consuls at ports of those countries will most assuredly verify the facts that wherever the cooly system is conducted, commerce, afloat and on shore, has passed to the detriment of the native population into the hands of Chinese, and that, like the increase to here, they are every year immigrating in greater numbers, and, under the most stringent and arbitrary laws there, increasing both their system and its influence.

But little or no information is ever had of difficulties arising in the conveyance to or from those places of the coolies, or but little of their difficulties for violation of their contracts, like those of very common occurrence of same class coolies to Peru or Cuba, where they frequently have captured, burned, or destroyed the ships conveying them, and murdered the crews whenever possible. But, like those coming here, to all places except Peru or Cuba, they go under contract with their own countrymen, whose guarantees or regulation, as said to exist among them here, deters the ignorant cooly, who, without knowledge of the laws or rights he may have, in slavish ignorance, submits. Consequently we hear only from Cuba, and especially Peru, frequently of violence, bloodshed, and revolts among the Chinese coolies there endeavoring to evade their contracts.

It is a fact that every attempt by Europeans or Americans who have gone to China to obtain Chinese to come here or other places, have never been able to either obtain there, unless through Chinese contractors, any coolies or laborers to come here, and that in every case where the cooly has not passed through the hands of the six companies here to whom or through whom his interest lay, has violated his contract. In many cases, such as to Hawaiian Islands, whose government a few years since sent a commission to China to induce Chinese immigration, after violating all pledges given him there by the cooly contractors, and vessels ready to convey them, they, evidently for no other reason than they could not hold the coolies under their system, wring out of him the most of his toils' reward; the commission proved futile. So also several years since when a combination of cotton-growers of our Southern States sent their deputies (one of whom was lately an editor of a paper in San Rafael in this State) to Hong-Kong, who after many months there endeavoring to make contracts with coolies direct failed to do so; and at last, through the cooly-brokers, obtained a few ship-loads, and after paying, had large portions of them desert the vessel, some drowning in the harbor doing so, evidently never intending to keep their contract, or any, not bound to do so by the fearful penalties they are said to be under with their

system both at home or abroad, where it was carried as far as among themselves. I have heard that for no other reason but these coolies not keeping their labor contracts after arrival at New Orleans, the experiment was not repeated.

In the case of these coolies their labor contract was pledged to the ship for their conveyance, so absolute was their bondage, and I have been informed and shown by both the cooly contracts in China, as also the agent of the six companies or contractors traveling to China to get coolies, that largely in sailing-vessels coming here, whose passage-money is not paid until the arrival of coolie, the contracts are pledged, and advanced upon by the six companies or agent in China to help any returning cooly here, who while at home may have been coerced, inveigled, or persuaded to sign a contract.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What kind of a contract did this gentleman make with these Chinese to take them south from Hong-Kong?—A. To New Orleans?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. He made a contract of seven dollars a month for five years.

Q. How many did he get?—A. About six hundred and fifty in all.

Q. One of those gentlemen has been on the stand here, and testified he took fifteen hundred there. How do you know they broke their contract when they got them South?—A. I am so told by the one who contracted with them.

Q. Who was the one?—A. Mr. Giff. Colonel Giff, of San Rafael, so told me in a year or two.

Q. In what manner did they break their contract?—A. They absconded.

Q. What work did they put them on?—A. Picking cotton, and other vocations.

Q. Did they put about a thousand of them on the Chattanooga Railroad?—A. I do not understand that they were hired for that purpose.

Q. Do you not know that they are still at work on cotton-plantations in the South?—A. Still? They may be.

Q. Do you not know they built the Chattanooga Railroad, and have not been paid?—A. No such labor were they put to that I know of.

Q. I want to know what you know about it?—A. Contracts were submitted to me and offered to me to carry those coolies at Hong-Kong.

Q. You say they broke their contracts and absconded?—A. I am so informed by Mr. Giff.

Q. What did Mr. Giff say?—A. That the coolies he took there and took to Tennessee, the largest portion of them, abandoned, deserted, never fulfilled their contract.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you recollect Mr. Koopmanschap?—A. I remember meeting Mr. Koopmanschap in China several times, and I have had Mr. Koopmanschap to state that all his engagements with the Chinese were much of that nature; that he could not rely upon them; that he could not engage them in China except through these cooly-contractors. I do not know of an instance where the foreigners, Americans, have gone to China and have been able to get coolies direct, for they could only contract with them through the agencies of the cooly-contractors. Referring more especially to this contract-system and the inducement offered to these coolies by the people to get them, as I say they have been inveigled or persuaded into signing contracts, as perhaps the cooly-contractor was first himself, and consequently he induced them in specula-

tion or trade into this human traffic, offered to every cooly who, having got rid fortunately of his bondage, to go under the system so secure, and do likewise, and he does it as illustrated by the increase of every branch of occupation entered into by them having their constant recruits coming along. I wish to say that I have in investigating this thing found that a large portion of them, nearly one-half, who come here are under contract to returning coolies, who, taking the result of their labors here, three, four, or five hundred dollars, are enabled to go back to China and there hire ten or a dozen under this form, this system, and, through the influence of the contractors there, the agent of the so-called companies, bring them out under contracts, which, when they get here, are enforced, and these ignorant coolies remain for years without knowing their rights under it, and consequently are forced to work at a price which our people cannot compete with, and the cooly remains in a state of semi-slavery for the years of his bondage.

Japan. Although for many years after the opening to foreigners to live, trade there, the Chinese were not allowed there except as servants of Europeans or Americans, yet they have succeeded in wresting from foreigners, who surreptitiously got them a footing there, largely its foreign import and export trade to China as well as other countries, until now it is conceded the Chinese are the most affluent so engaged there, and the streets of their largest city of foreign trade, Yokohama, ablaze with their business sign-boards at every turn, after only a few years' presence. Certainly our merchants here or in China never conceded to the Chinese superior mercantile ability, and, except where, by their ability to bring into force their cheap mode of living, whereby they can compete or afford to transact business at far less and make profits, they have attained no other advantages here as merchants than that, or handling the immense sums the coolies earn to speculate with in trading, as it is well known through them all money is sent to China. So also in China or other countries they locate where Europeans or Americans are foreigners. They have, even to the supplies used by those same Europeans and Americans, not only become importers direct, but nearly monopolized every store or channel for the disposal of such goods; and that of such class of Europeans and Americans, they are fast decreasing in China. Conclusions can only be that it is by their low mode of living and cooly system of labor that they can attain such advantages. If a domestic, as they do, labors in China for $6 or $8 a month, other occupations below less, and artisans but little above, and buy his own food, often lodgings, why cannot he do the same here, at a slight advance only, with food costing but a trifle more, which same applies to lodgings and clothes? They do it in those other countries I mention, and it is reasonable to suppose they will here before the immense profits of their cooly-contract system will be given up—perhaps possible; not so very close yet. But when every one who, having gone through the experience, on his return brings a few coolies out, the interest for the maintenance of the system it every day increases, and with the espionage, Argus-eyed vigilance, arbitrary, unfeeling system of coercion practiced by the so-called six companies, through whom every one must first pass and contribute, each one in his turn enabled to prey upon the other as he gets there, so natural to their well-established custom at home or abroad, to the extent of life or torture, we can have but little to hope, with their increased presence here, that our people can be able to live in competition. Certainly their presence in countries I have mentioned has not had the effect of elevating their lower classes, but the contrary effect on

their better classes, as our manufacturers are finding out here to their cost now.

I would reiterate my former assertion, that my statements are the result of many years' residence and experience among the Chinese, both in their own country and all of those I have mentioned, and in all my dealings with them terminated amicably. I have no interest or business with those whom I know to be influenced against their presence here; never attended nor knew any member of any society opposed to them. I am a republican in politics always. In the city of Canton for many years past there have been maintained, by British colonial immigration societies, agents who, although offering the most liberal contracts under the British laws and regulations to insure their fulfillment, that, owing to opposition of those Chinese controlling the cooly immigration there, and their inability to keep control of the cooly as here, but very few have ever been obtained, and finally, as I hear, the agency abandoned.

By Mr. PIPER:

Q. Do you think if the Chinese could only obtain the sum of $8 per month here that they would come?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you imagine that the mass of them really receive more than six or eight dollars a month here for their own personal, actual use?—A. Not until their contracts expire. The first three, four, or five years, for their personal use I do not believe that they get more than four or five dollars a month. Perhaps they may be stimulated to learn or acquire a knowledge of the work which they are put to, by which they may receive a bonus to induce them to do so. By that means they may get a little more, but not otherwise.

Q. Is it not probable that Chinese steerage-passengers may be brought here for fifteen or twenty dollars apiece?—A. I believe that a sailing-vessel, employed in carrying them both ways, can carry them profitably at fifteen dollars.

Q. And you think that $8 a month would be a great inducement for Chinese to come here?—A. I think they would come here at that rate. I know many Chinese apply to come back here at about that price, and are willing to serve three or four years after they are here.

Q. You have no doubt that they will contract to serve for $8 a month?—A. I have no doubt of it.

Q. And the number would be unlimited almost?—A. Almost unlimited.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. With a view to show whether the leading American merchants in San Francisco can compete with the leading Chinese merchants, let me call your attention to the two houses of Chy Lung & Co. and Macondray & Co. Do you know the firm of Chy Lung & Co.?—A. I know of them only by reputation.

Q. Do you know that they do a pretty large business?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that their store is on Sacramento street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. From what you know of their store, and from what you know generally of rents, what would be the monthly rental of that store itself, a three-story store, taking basement, cellar, and the two stories?—A. I know some parties owning that property, or adjacent, that get about two hundred and fifty dollars a month.

Q. The firm of Chy Lung consists of several members, who live there at their place of business?—A. I understand so.

Q. Their wives and families, if they have families, live in the upper story?—A. In the upper story.

Q. Their mercantile office is on the first floor?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And stores in the loft and the cellars?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what house do Macondray & Co. do business?—A. On Sansom street.

Q. At perhaps about the same rent or more?—A. The same or a little more.

Q. Of the firm of Macondray & Co. there was Mr. Otis, Mr. William Macondray, and any others?—A. Frederick Macondray and others.

Q. Where did Mr. Otis live?—A. On Sansom street.

Q. In what style?—A. One of the most magnificent residences in the city.

Q. The house is worth, with its grounds, how much?—A. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars, I suppose.

Q. And from the appearance of the house, demanding how many servants?—A. Half a dozen or more.

Q. And from your knowledge of such things, taking the supposed scale on which Mr. Otis lived, the number of servants he employed, the interest upon his dwelling, what would it cost him per annum to live?—A. Ten or twelve thousand dollars, perhaps fifteen thousand dollars.

Q. Do you know where Mr. William Macondray lives?—A. I do not.

Q. You know he is a man of family?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. He lives well?—A. I have so heard.

Q. And Mr. Frederick Macondray?—A. He also lives well.

Q. Would you say the probable scale of expenditure for each of those gentlemen would be at least five hundred dollars a month?—A. I should suppose so.

Q. When you consider the expenditure and mode of living of the house of Macondray & Co., can they compete as money-makers, supposing they have the same chances, the same capital, and the same mercantile genius and talent, withthe house of Chy Lung & Co.? What would be the difference in a generation of competition with a house like that?—A. I do not think Macondray & Co. can compete with them.

Q. It would be a very successful house that would be enabled to compete?—A. I do not see how they could compete.

Q. Then the competition, if I am correct, and if you in your conclusions are correct, is not only with the common laborer, but it is also with the American merchants?—A. Yes, sir; that is well illustrated by the fact that the house of Macondray & Co. in their dealings with Chinese act as simple brokers. Where they formerly chartered ships and loaded them themselves, they sell them now, except matting and a few other articles, which are solely imported by Americans. They act as brokers only for the Chinese.

Q. Is not that also true of all who were formerly leading American houses in the Chinese trade, C. Adolphe Low & Co., and houses of that character?—A. Certainly it is; yes, sir.

Q. Are not the Chinese already rivaling them in their business and driving them out of the Chinese trade?—A. Yes, sir; and they complain of it.

By Mr. COOPER:

Q. Has that house become bankrupt?—A. No, sir; not that I know of. I guess it is a fact that the business they formerly had has dwindled away very largely, owing to the Chinese competition.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do the Chinese import largely?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Through Macondray & Co.?—A. Not through Macondray & Co., that I know of.

Q. They are brokers, you say?—A. They act as brokers in chartering ships.

Q. You are familiar with the firm?—A. No, sir.

Q. You have free access to their books?—A. No, sir.

Q. Were you acquainted with Mr. Macondray?—A. No, sir.

Q. With Mr. Otis?—A. No, sir.

Q. If Mr. Macondray had gone to Europe and spent $30,000, would he have competed with Chi Lung & Co. that year?—A. I am not conversant with that, but I am conversant with the manner in which Macondray & Co. compete with the Chinese merchants here.

Q. If he had gone to Europe and gone into stocks and lost, Mr. Chi Lung would have had the best of that?—A. I do not know. I simply state that Mr. Macondray, as I know, is conducting the business for the Chinese as brokers, chartering ships for the Chinese.

Q. Are the Messrs. Macondray losing money?—A. I do not know that they are.

Q. You do not know whether they come in competition with Chi Lung at all or not?—A. I say that they formerly did the business that Chi aung is doing now.

Q. In what way do they come in competition?—A. I suppose as importers.

Q. Is there a rivalry between the two houses?—A. I should suppose there was.

Q. Were you acquainted with Mr. Otis?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long previous to his death had he retired from business?—A. I cannot say exactly. I do not know that he had retired from the business of the house of Macondray & Co. previous to his death.

Q. You do not know it?—A. No, sir.

Q. The sailing-vessel that goes to and fro from China with good freights could bring passengers pretty reasonably if they had a full cargo?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Suppose they had not any cargo to come here with, could they make it profitable to carry passengers at $15?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you been in that business as charterer between here and Hong-Kong?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you taken them at that price?—A. I never took them per capita. The Chinese would charter my vessels as they do all other sailing-vessels.

Q. I am speaking about where you were the charter-party?—A. I was the charter-party.

Q. What rate per capita did you charge them for passage-money?—A. They are not so chartered.

Q. At what rate could you have carried them and made money?—A. At $15.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. Did not the house of Macondray & Co. suspend payment some years ago?—A. I am not positive on that point.

Q. Did you not hear of that?—A. I heard they had difficulties.

Q. How is it, if that was the case at that time, that they have been able to do so much business that Mr. Otis could live in that style?—A. I do not know what led to it.

Q. Was he not during all that time competing with Chi Lung?—A. They were in the China trade and always have been.

Q. In competition during those years?—A. I suppose so.

Q. Yet Mr. Otis seems to have recovered himself and become very wealthy?—A. I do not know by what streak of fortune he did so.

Q. Did he do any other business?—A. I do not know of any other business that he did. I simply spoke of my knowledge of the house as acting brokers for the Chinese in chartering their ships to and fro.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say the Chinese are getting possession of the Javanese country?—A. I said there were large numbers there, and they are becoming a most affluent people.

Q. Which is the superior race, the Javanese or the Chinese; which do you consider the superior race?—A. I think there is but very little difference among them.

Q. You think it is an even race as to civilization between them?—A. I think so.

Q. Then the Chinese have a little more business tact if they have got hold of what they have there?—A. I think they have only obtained it perhaps through their nefarious cooly system.

Q. What do you mean by that?—A. I mean their obtaining coolies under contract and carrying them to those countries and keeping them there in slavish labor.

THOMAS W. JACKSON sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. What is your occupation?—Answer. I am a foreign commission-agent.

Q. Do you reside in San Francisco?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you been here?—A. Since 1867.

Q. Have you resided in China?—A. Yes, sir; I was in China from 1861 to 1867.

Q. In what occupation were you engaged in China, and where were you located?—A. For the first two years I was clerk in a foreign house in Ningpo, between Shanghai and Fuhchau, and after that I was a merchant on my own account in the same place. I succeeded to my employers' business.

Q. Something has been testified here with regard to Chinese education and their ability to read and write their own language, with a view to indicate their culture. What do you know upon that subject?—A. I know that there is a general impression here that the Chinese are well educated. I have seen in the reports of the evidence here in the papers that there is no Chinaman who cannot read and write. I think they are very much mistaken as to the extent of Chinese education. I reckon all of them understand a few characters, but the Chinese written language is so exceedingly intricate and abstruse that it requires a life-time to learn it, and very few Chinese know more than as many characters as particularly interest them. Thus, a carpenter, for instance, will know the characters for different kinds of wood and labor, and they all know the figures, &c. The bricklayer will know the character for bricks, and the miller will know the characters for flour and wheat. There are very few indeed of them who are able to read a letter upon any general subject, and even those who profess to have a knowledge have spent years in studying it; so that I think it is a mistake to suppose that the Chinese who can make out a few characters can read and write generally. If the Chinese require a letter to be written they go to a literary man to have it written for them. They cannot write it.

Q. Is there not a class of men in China who do this work of writing?—A. Yes, sir; the literary class, who write letters for pay. I also saw

that some gentleman testified here that the Chinese wash themselves every day from head to foot. I have been a great deal among the Chinese, and I have employed a great many Chinese in China, and I know that is not the case at all. So far from washing themselves habitually from head to foot, they do not even change their clothes generally for several months, especially in winter. Most of them do not wash themselves thoroughly more than three or four times a year. It is customary for them to sleep in their clothes, and in winter they are almost compelled to do so. They have no fires in their houses, and they fasten their windows to keep out the cold. Their cleanliness and their education I think are generally very much overestimated.

Q. How as to their morals?—A. Their morals are such that no English or American family in China having children will allow their children to come in contact with them more than is absolutely necessary. Where I was, there was a great number of American and foreign families there, and I mixed very much among them. I know they all most carefully kept their children away from the Chinese as much as it was possible to do so. Generally, one Christian woman and one or two students were admitted and the outside people were excluded as much as possible, or at least the children were not allowed to mix with them at all, for their influence was considered not only injurious but positively dangerous. The children of foreign parents are sent home to America or Europe before they have reached the age of ten or twelve years generally, partly because of their education, but mainly because of the influence that the Chinese might have upon them. The influence of these Chinese is generally bad, even with those who have been in contact with foreigners for a length of time. I have never known any Chinese who have been so completely christianized by any missionaries as to lose their nature. They are tolerably consistent Christians, but their Christianity is comparative. They are a decided improvement upon the generality of those around them, but their moral principles are not very deep and not very strong. When I was in China I had in my employ China boys from the English Episcopalian mission, from the English Baptist mission, from the English Methodist mission, and from the American Baptist and American Presbyterian missions. There is a large number of boys who have been educated by these missionaries. One of these boys, who of all others I thought most highly of, and had been to all appearances a most consistent Christian, stole a watch from a friend of mine who dined in my house, and, after he had been searched and the thing proved against him, I took him back, because I understood that it was a greater temptation than he could resist. I cannot recall more than about two Chinamen whom I should consider to be strictly and decidedly honest. In business they invariably tell lies. They invariably falsify, and, as much as possible, use false weights and measures among themselves. In the Canton trade it is not so much the case, because they have found from experience with the English dealers that honesty is the best policy. The goods they send from Canton to England are examined in English warehouses, and are generally found to come up to what they have been represented to be. In early days there was always complaint of goods falling short in quality and weight. The use of double scales and measures is very prevalent in China at the present time.

Q. You have heard the testimony here regarding the integrity of the Chinese merchants, both in China and in this country?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you think that that integrity arises entirely from moral con-

viction, or does it arise from the adage that "honesty is the best policy" in their business?—A. Entirely from the idea that honesty is the best policy.

Q. You think that is not founded in a deep moral sentiment?—A. No; they do not expect honesty among themselves. I have known of a tea-taster, or rather tea-merchant, who was detected in the most glaring falsehood in the presence of several people, and when found out he said, "Must do little lie pigeon." The whole system of foreign business in China is based almost upon the dishonest character of the Chinese people themselves. When I was in China there was only one foreign house of any consequence which did not do its business entirely with Chinese compradors, and these Chinese compradors almost invariably do the whole of the business, do the buying or selling of six or seven establishments, employ four or five house-boys, and seven or eight coolies, and make fortunes besides. They always make money, whether the foreign houses makes money or not, because they get a commission from the buyer, and a commission on the seller on everything bought; and I think they get many things which are not known to the foreign buyer generally. I had a Chinese partner for twelve months, and I knew that that Chinese partner was making more money a great deal than I was. I found it out by learning the dialect and doing much of the business myself then done by the comprador. To explain how they make the money would be too long and intricate.

Q. Explain, if you please, what are the functions of a comprador. That is a name that we do not understand.—A. When the foreign merchant first arrives in China, of course he cannot deal directly with the people because he cannot understand the language, for the language is an extremely difficult one to learn. The consequence is that he finds it more convenient to employ a Chinaman who has some knowledge of English, who is able to talk pigeon language, and who also has some little money and credit in the neighborhood. This Chinaman employs the shroffs, house-boys, and coolies, does all the buying and all the selling; so that, when the foreign merchant comes down in the morning to his office at 10 o'clock, he rings his bell, calls in the comprador, and asks him the quotation of opium, rice, shirting, &c., and if there is anything to buy, he tells him to buy it, and if there is anything to sell, he tells him to sell it, and in this way everything is done through the comprador. I have never known of but one house in Shanghai of any standing that did not employ a comprador, and the business of that house was mainly the selling of Manchester shirtings, and not the purchase of goods. In the purchasing of goods it is very difficult to dispense with the comprador, chiefly because very few foreigners understand the characters, and written contracts have to be made. I only know of three, except among the missionaries, who understand the Chinese characters at all. The honesty of the Chinese is on a very low grade, and as to their cleanliness, they are very dirty, particularly so. I know that they sleep in their clothes all the winter and wash themselves but little.

Q. It is a sort of maxim in our religion that cleanliness is next to godliness. Do you think the Chinaman's cleanliness is next to godliness?—A. It is next to his godliness. Both are on a pretty low scale. They are an extremely difficult people to understand. They are supposed to care nothing about their religion. At the same time I have known a man to burn two or three fingers over a candle for religion's sake. They are always supposed to be extremely affectionate to parents and to children. An English missionary with whom I was living for a time,

and who is now a bishop, told me he saw a father drown his child in the river in the presence of a crowd of people. Such things of corse occur very seldom, but things like that very often occur which upset one's preconceived notions of Chinese; and the missionaries themselves, who have been the greatest number of years in China, are at very much of a loss to understand them or to make them out. I used to attend missionary meetings there very frequently, at which fifteen or sixteen missionaries were present, some of whom had been seventeen or eighteen years in the country, and they would differ even upon such general subjects as the belief of the Chinese in regard to the worship of the ancestors and the adoration of the dead. The Chinese multiply so rapidly that whenever they get a foot-hold into any country, they almost take possession of it. I traveled in China after the late rebellion in towns that had been completely desolated, and saw some large towns where there had been a population of 140,000 or 150,000, where there were not more than 3,000 or 4,000 remaining, but as soon as the rebels were cleared out they began to return. Previous to the breaking out of the rebellion the population was very dense. The same course of depopulation and repopulation had occurred in the latter part of the last century in the previous rebellion.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. How does this depopulation take place—by the death of persons, or merely by their retiring?—A. By the death of persons and retiring, both.

Q. Did those who retired return, or others?—A. Many of those who retired returned. They multiply very rapidly. Polygamy, of course, is common in China. Every woman is married, and every woman produces children, and they multiply very rapidly. They are more prolific than in other countries; so much so that in all those countries—and I know those that Mr. King mentioned—where the Chinese have got a fair foot hold, in a very short number of years they become the greater part of the population. That is the case in Singapore. For instance, Singapore was only founded by Sir Stamford Raffles not many years ago; the Chinese had no footing there whatever, and now there are probably three or four Chinamen to one of the other population.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Is that Siam?—A. That is Singapore, a place where I spent some time; and that is the case generally. My strong belief is, that if they knew they had a firm foot-hold here, and were not afraid of intimidation or interference, they would very soon increase enormously. I was looking over a little pamphlet on this question, left at my office this morning, and there was a long table on the immigration of Chinese for a number of years back. I think it began with 1856 or 1857, or some date along there. I saw that in one year there were four times as many Chinese immigrants as in the former year. The next year after that there were about three times as many, and the total aggregate, I think, was 130,000 or 140,000; I do not remember now. The object of this pamphlet was to show that the immigration was not great, but rather small, and, therefore, we need not fear for the future. My strong belief is, that if the Chinese felt that they were safe, and had a firm footing here, they would come in enormous numbers, because the population of China is practically inexhaustible.

Q. What, in your opinion, would be the result if we should welcome here by invitation and make them citizens, and do away with the entire prejudice that we have against them, protect them from interference,

and throw open to them all the avenues of life and the industries of our State, and, in addition to that, give them the right of the elective franchise—what would be the result in a generation then, in your opinion?—A. The result would be that in two or three years the Chinese would outnumber the whites three or four to one. This country is much richer than their own. They can get money very much easier here than in their own country. They have constantly to work there or they must starve, because the great bulk of the population only manage to raise rice enough for the sustenance of the population by constantly manuring, and even then they have to import a large quantity of rice from Singapore and the rice-ports, and even so far off as Calcutta. The population of China is so dense that frequently in many places the poorer classes have to live off of roots, berries, grass, fish, and things that would not be thought of in this country; but in this country they are able to live far more decently than in China, and they get better wages here than in China. There is nothing to restrict the influx of Chinese in California but the notion that they have not a sure footing here. I believe they do not feel safe in coming here. I believe they are in constant dread of being driven away or something terrible happening to them. The wages in China are very much less than here. I have employed large numbers of men at from four to five dollars a month and they found themselves. Their food consists mainly of rice, which costs them about three dollars a month, and their clothing is also very cheap, and mostly home-made.

Q. And cotton?—A. And cotton. It will last them about six years. Their cotton is much more durable than any that has ever been manufactured in England. Manchester cotton-goods will last them about twelve or fifteen months, and their own home-made cotton clothes last five or six years. Really they spend extremely little on clothing, and the wealthiest of them live almost as cheaply as the poorest. Where they are in any very great numbers and feel very strong they are more dangerous to foreigners than otherwise. In the part of China where I lived they were docile and civil to foreigners generally, although the upper classes of mandarins were not always so. The worst classes of the Chinese are in the southern part, especially in Swatow and Canton, and all the Chinese who have ever come to California so far have come from the province of Canton, excepting about sixty, I believe, who once came from the neighborhood of Shanghai, some years ago, and who have all disappeared. In regard to their own notions of government, it is more of a patriarchal kind than anything else, but as to self-government, such a thing is entirely unknown there. They have nothing of the kind.

Q. They have no conception of our government or the principles that underlie it?—A. No; I never met with a Chinaman yet who had a right idea of his own on the subject of government or any idea of independence at all.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. It has been stated in evidence here that they have a kind of local government of their towns, and that they elect their elders.—A. Tautai is an office which corresponds very much to that of mayor. The tautai is appointed from Peking. The chetai and fantai and all the officers, even down to the level of mayor, are appointed. Any officers elected by the people must be very subordinate indeed. I think they are mostly honorary officers. The head of every walled town is appointed from Peking.

Q. Appointed by the Emperor?—A. Yes, sir. I might mention an instance to show how much or how little they use their own judgment when their opinion is asked. When I was at Ningpo a Scotch gentleman, a doctor, and several of the foreign residents there conceived the idea of making a road. Such a thing as a large road is quite unusual in China. The roads there are always very narrow. The land was bought up by the foreigners mainly, and shares were sold mostly to foreigners. A few Chinese were admitted as share-holders. As soon as the thing was inaugurated they had a meeting, at which six of these Chinese were present. Several questions had to be put to the meeting and carried by a vote of the majority. One question was put to the meeting, and the meeting was rather divided in its opinion on the subject. The question first was as to whether the Chinese should have votes or not. Two of the members present, the Italian consul and myself, were the only ones who objected to the Chinese having votes. An English missionary with whom I lived at once jumped on his feet and said he was surprised and astonished at least that an English liberal took such a position as I did. I made a reply that I did not profess much sentiment on the subject, but the end of the matter was just to give seven votes to one man. All the rest of the meeting considered that the Chinese had quite as good a right as I or any one else had to vote. The question was translated into Chinese, and the leading men among them, as soon as they heard of it almost, turned around to Dr. Parker and said, "What do you say, Dr. Parker?" There was a laugh all around the room. It was exactly as I said. Dr. Parker got seven votes, so that it outnumbered the rest and carried everything. Even in such a matter as that they have no opinion of their own, and no independent judgment upon a subject. They understand what it is to make money. Their whole thought and energy and the whole object of their lives is the making of money. As for governing themselves, they are never called upon to exercise any effort in the matter whatever. Whenever they are known to be making money, they are squeezed by the local authorities, and buy themselves off the best way they can—as cheaply as they can. The main reason why I came to testify here this evening was that I saw some evidence on Chinese education which I thought was utterly at variance with what was the fact.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Do you know Mr. Olmsted, of the house of Oliphant & Co.?—A. No, sir; I know him by name only.

Q. Do you know him by reputation?—A. I know him by name only.

Q. He testified here——

Senator SARGENT. What is the use of repeating the testimony of another witness? The record will show that.

Q. (Mr. BEE.) The Chinese are a dirty people?—A. They are dirty in their habits.

Q. They do not wash?—A No.

Q. Where were you located in China?—A. In Ningpo.

Q. What kind of a settlement is that?—A. It is one of the intermediate settlements, about twenty miles south of Shanghai, a place where I had better opportunities of seeing the Chinese and judging of them than in Shanghai and Hong-Kong, because there are few foreigners there and a great number of Chinese. It is a large town.

Q. The Chinese are a dishonest people?—A. They are dishonest in a certain way; I say they are honest with a qualification.

Q What qualification?—A. That they always give you a false return.

Q. False weight?—A. A false weight and a false return.

Q. Packing teas, for ins ance?—A. If there is an opportunity, they will. They are honest when well looked after, but if they are not well looked after they are not honest.

Q. Is it general for them in China to use false weights?—A. It is a general thing for them to use double weights wherever they can, though less in teas than in other things, because in teas they are more checked by the foreigners than in anything else. When you sell, for instance, a cargo of rice for three dollars you get your three dollars, and you believe that is all, and you get your money; whereas in reality it has been sold for $3.15. That practice is kept up by the Chinamen without your knowledge.

Q. What sentiment of honesty is there among them?—A. The sentiment of dishonesty is natural to them, but they often consider that honesty is the best policy.

Q. There is a sense of honor among them?—A. There is such a sense of honor, that I have known a Chinaman to commit suicide when he could not pay his debts on settling day; but the very same man will cheat the foreigners as much as he can.

Q. Where is a deeper underlying sense of honor than honesty is the best policy? You say the Chinese are governed by that and nothing else; has anybody a deeper sense of honor than that?—A. I beg your pardon, I believe the Americans and Europeans generally have a deeper sense of honor.

Q. What does that consist in?—A. I think it consists on moral principle.

Q. On what basis is that moral principle?—A. On religion.

Q. Does not that lead to honesty?—A. I think religion leads to honesty.

Q. And that, leading to honesty, it is the best policy to practice it?—A. The maxim that honesty is the best policy has nothing to do with the basis of religion, I presume.

Q. You think that the benighted region of Africa, where they worship by fetich rites, understands the same principle that you expressed yourself that the Chinese deal in? You answered Mr. Pixley's question that they merely dealt with us here honestly because honesty is the best policy, and nothing more?—A. Yes; in their transactions with foreign merchants they have learned that it is absolutely necessary for them to observe a certain amount of honesty—that otherwise they would lose their business; but nevertheless they always defraud the foreign merchant out of more than he is aware of. There are very few foreign merchants who are really aware of the amount of dishonesty of these Chinese, because they are entirely in their hands. They do all their buying and selling through the compradors, and do not know what the comprador gets. They only know what the comprador gets for them.

Q. Do the Chinese deal honestly here?—A. They cannot bring the comprador system here.

Q. They do not bring the practice of honesty is the best policy here?—A. I have had very little to do with the Chinese here.

Q. Have you read the testimony of witnesses here about the honesty of the Chinese?—A. I have not read the testimony taken here, except in one or two cases.

Q. Then you cannot testify in regard to the honesty of the Chinese here?—A. No; but I know that the Chinese here are Cantonese, and that the Cantonese have the worst character of any people in China.

Q. For dishonesty?—A. For dishonesty they have the worst character in China. The coast of China swarms with pirates, and they ar- Cantonese.

Q. Are they generally thieves who come here from Canton?—A. I believe they are dishonest where they have the power of being so.

Q. Are they as a general class thieves?—A. I know less of the Chinese here than I know of the Chinese in China.

Q. You say they come from Canton, and they are all dishonest there. Is that the class who come here?—A. Yes.

Q. Was there any agriculture carried on at Singapore before the Chinese went there?—A. Yes; there was some agriculture carried on.

Q. When was it founded?—A. I do not exactly remember, but I believe it was in 1832.

Q. Eighteen hundred and fifty-two, was it not?—A. O no, it was before that time.

Q. There was no settlement there to amount to anything—nothing but a marsh, until 1852, when the English went in? I will at least say it was founded in 1852.—A. Then I am mistaken. I was there in 1860. I thought it was founded long before that.

Q. Where is the trade of the parsees and mussulmen mostly—with the strait settlements?—A. The Chinese trade?

Q. Yes, sir.—A. All the parsees have settlements in Hong-Kong and agencies in all the open ports.

Q. Was Singapore known as a town of large export until the Chinese went there?—A. The Chinese seemed to have gone there pretty nearly as soon as it was opened.

Q. What were the imports from that island before the Chinese went there?—A. Before the Chinese were there there was no trade with the place whatever.

Q. Now, to come down to the comprádor system, how do you find out what percentage these men get?—A. I find it out by studying the dialects.

Q. You spoke the language?—A. I spoke the Ningpo dialect sufficiently for this purpose.

Q. That is different from the Shanghai dialect?—A. That is different from the Shanghai dialect. I think the written language is the same all o- er China. When I went to Ningpo I would not employ any one.

Q. Does the comprador employ servants?—A. Yes.

Q. Who pays them?—A. The comprador.

Q. He pays all the expense out of his percentage?—A. The expense is not any. They usually convey an idea to the merchant that somehow or other they have spent an immense sum of money, and they cannot tell the exact percentage.

Q. Your idea is pretty vague?—A. No; it is accurate. I can tell you exactly what percentage they make. I can tell you, because I did my own comprador's work for about twelve months, and ascertained exactly what the percentage was.

LEWIS M. FOULKE sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. How long have you resided in California?—Answer. Nearly twenty-four years.

Q. What has been your occupation during that period?—A. I have been engaged in mining about twelve years. I was two years collector of taxes of the county containing the largest number of Chinese, with one exception, in this State, and for the last six years I have been supervisor of internal revenue in San Francisco.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Have you ever been State senator?—A. Yes, sir; I was a member of the State senate at one time.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Have you any practical knowledge of the Chinese? If so, state what your observation has been with them.—A. I have a good deal of practical knowledge of the Chinese, arising from the collecting of taxes, from having had large dealings with them in selling them large amounts of pork and beef, and also in supervising the internal revenue.

Q. Do you consider Chinese labor desirable or not in the various occupations as you have heard the matter discussed here?—A. I do not consider Chinese labor desirable, for the reason that I think it has the same tendency to degrade free white labor that slave labor in the South had.

Q. Then, entertaining that view of the value and tendency of Chinese labor, would you consider it desirable to have a larger importation of Chinese to our shores?—A. No, sir; I consider it as being very far from desirable, not only for that reason, but also for the reason that a population with ideas of government so utterly foreign to those of ours in our midst I think detrimental, and the presence of a vast number of that class of people so entirely different not merely as regards color, but also in their habits of thought, their traditions, and their religion, is apt to create caste, or frequently may and probably would lead ultimately to civil war.

Q. Will you give us the result of your experience as collector of internal revenue in regard to any points bearing upon the integrity and high-mindedness of the Chinese merchant in his dealings with the Government? Does he not defraud it?—A. As supervisor of internal revenue I will state that in this city, during the five years that I had charge of this coast, over one-half of all the frauds and of all the violations of the internal-revenue law were committed by the Chinese, while the population of Chinese, as near as I can estimate it, was but about 30,000 against some 225,000 to 230,000 whites. In other portions of the Pacific coast the proportion was not quite so great, from the fact that there was more cigar-manufacturing done here than anywhere else, but still the proportion was more than double outside of this city.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Were those technical violations of law?—A. No, sir; as a rule they were actual frauds.

Q. What was the nature of them?—A. Principally in the manufacture and sale of cigars and cigarrettes without the payment of the taxes on the cigars; the re-use of stamped boxes; also in the manufacture and sale in large quantities of friction matches without paying the stamp-tax on them; and also in the manufacture of an article called samsouy, a sort of Chinese whisky which is distilled from rice. There were some few violations of special taxes, but those were not very numerous.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. How is it about the payment of the income-tax? Can you state in reference to that?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know how many Chinese paid an income-tax?—A. A very small number. It was very difficult to get any return from them in the shape of an income-tax. In fact, while the income-tax was in existence the assessors and their assistants had almost invariably to estimate it

from the best means at their command. The Chinese would usually fail to make returns.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. May not these violations of the revenue-laws have arisen from their ignorance of our laws?—A. In most cases I think not. I was very careful to look into that matter shortly after taking charge of the department, from the fact that my sympathies were rather with the Chinese from their being a weaker people. I instructed the officers on this coast very carefully, and looked into it personally, and in many instances I interceded and got them off with as light fines as possible, thinking perhaps it was from a lack of knowledge of the law; but within a month or two months we would find those same Chinamen hidden away in some garret, or in some place under the sidewalk, again manufacturing the cigars, or in some out-of-the-way place making matches and selling them without paying the tax. In fact, it was a very serious annoyance and a source of loss to the Government.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. It was also a serious matter of rivalry with those trades that did pay their just tax?—A. Yes, sir; it was very much to the injury of those legitimate business-men in the manufacture of cigars, having large capital and regular places of business, who were compelled, as a matter of course, to pay their taxes.

Q. Do you employ Chinese yourself?—A. Yes, sir; I have frequently employed Chinese in mining, and at my house. I have, however, employed many more white men than Chinese.

Q. How do you compare the two classes of laborers?—A. I prefer white labor. I have never found any difficulty in mining with white labor. I have hired for several years from 25 to 35 men in a quartz-mine in the northern part of this State. I have never found any difficulty in getting good white men. I have at various times employed Chinamen for certain portions of the work, such as assorting quartz, running carts, and light work, simply because I could get them cheaper; but I prefer the white men for various reasons. First, they generally do rather more work in the same number of hours, and I have a preference for them from the fact that they usually have their families and settle in the country.

Q. Your sympathies run with them?—A. My sympathies, in that respect, run with the white men.

Q. From the result of your observations, and contact with men, what is your judgment as to the intelligent, popular opinion of disinterested men in reference to the desirableness of restricting the Chinese immigration by just legislation?—A. Do you mean of the State or of the coast?

Q. I mean of the State of California at large.—A. I would say of the State at large—and indeed I may say of the Pacific coast, for I have traveled all over every portion of it very frequently—more than three-fourths, I think fully seven-tenths, of the intelligent people are opposed to the further immigration of Chinese, or at least are in favor of restricting the further immigration to a small number.

Q. Do you think there is a sentiment abroad in regard to those who have been invited by our treaties, and who have come so far, in favor of protecting them in their rights under the law?—A. Yes, sir; that feeling is very general.

Q. To remove them forcibly, would it or would it not, in your opinion, be calculated to disturb the industries that are now based upon their

labor, and in that respect render sudden change undesirable?—A. I think it would be undesirable to remove those who are here, forcibly, not only upon that ground, but I think it would be unjust.

Q. Unjust especially to the Chinamen and to the employers?—A. Unjust to all parties.

Q. As to your individual opinion, are you in favor of some just and well-considered system of legislation calculated to limit the influx of Chinese to this coast?—A. As to my individual opinion, I have simply to say that I am in favor, if it is possible to bring it about, of some legislation which will prevent entirely further immigration of the Chinese laboring classes to this coast, from the simple reason that the same necessity which existed for them in early days does not exist now. When the Chinese were first invited to come here the expense of getting immigrants from the East, from the New England States, or from Europe, around the Horn or across the Isthmus, was very great. These Chinese could be brought much cheaper. That difficulty has, to a great extent, been removed by the completion of the overland railroad, and probably before many years there will be another road completed, which will remove the difficulty perhaps still further. I think, from what I saw in New England and New York and Pennsylvania last year, there is a great surplus of labor there that could be brought here, and with much more profit to the future interests of the State than the introduction of any further Chinese labor.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. I understand you to say that you believe Chinese labor to have the same effect upon the white labor that the slave labor of the South had?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. To what effect do you allude?—A. I think that the effect of slave labor in the South was to lower the dignity of free white labor.

Q. Do you think the character of the laborer affects the dignity of the labor itself? Is that your opinion?—A. I think where large classes of a low grade of population perform certain kinds of labor, it does certainly affect the character of the men who are willing to work side by side with those inferior laborers. I judge of that from my own feelings, having worked for wages some in this country myself.

Q. Would that be a prejudice, then, of race?—A. I do not know whether you can call it a prejudice of race, or what you might call it.

Q. Would you designate it a prejudice of race, or otherwise?—A. No; I think it would be more a prejudice against coming in contact with servile labor.

Q. Do you consider Chinese slave labor?—A. Virtually, it is slave labor.

Q. Can there be a slave in California?—A. I think that the Chinese are virtually slaves or serfs.

Q. But there cannot be a slave here?—A. Not under the law, if the law could be fully administered; but under their system of contracts the result is the same as though they were slaves until the expiration of their contracts, as I understand it.

Q. Does not every free, intelligent man know that they are not slaves?—A. I think the Chinese do not know it.

Q. Does not the free white laborer know that they are not slaves?—A. A free white laborer knows that he is not a slave, of course.

Q. No; but does he not know that the Chinese are not slaves?—A. No, sir; the free white laborers generally consider the Chinese as coolies or slaves.

Q. Do you suppose that the free, intelligent men of California think the Chinaman is a slave under our law?—A. Virtually a slave

Q. Does he do his duty as a citizen not to free him?—A. It is very difficult to reach the point in question. It is very difficult to establish the fact from any outside proof that the Chinese are under a contract system.

Q. But all just men ought to look into it and see that he is free?—A. Yes, sir; I think every man ought to look into it.

Q. Then you are derelict in duty as citizens if you do not see that they are free?—A. To a certain extent we may be.

Q. Do you not think that that prejudice is against them on account of race more than on account of slavery?—A. No; I do not think so.

Q. There is no prejudice on account of race?—A. Yes; there is some. There is none with me; individually, I have none.

Q. Does not the prejudice you speak of exist because of race more than because of slavery?—A. No; I think it exists more on account of the contract system of labor than it does on account of race.

Q. Do you not think it exists in the South against the negro, now a freedman?—A. I cannot testify to anything that I do not know of my own personal knowledge.

Q. You testified as to the effect of slavery upon free labor. Did you ever live in the South?—A. I never lived in the South. I have traveled through the South.

Q. Then what knowledge have you as to the effect of slavery upon free labor there?—A. Simply from my observation. I traveled through the South before I came to this coat.

Q. Did you ever see in all your travels a free laborer refuse to work because a slave worked?—A. I cannot say that I have; but I have seen a great many laborers from the Northern States who have refused to go South because of coming in competition with slavery.

Q. But did you ever see a free laborer there refuse to work because of slavery?—A. I cannot say that I have.

Q. Then what effect did it have upon the free laborer there, independent of immigration?—A. I know just what effect it would have upon me.

Q. Ah; but I am speaking of your observation upon free laboring men.—A. My observation is not extensive enough to answer the question intelligently.

Q. Then you had not sufficient knowledge of the effect of slavery upon free labor in its midst?—A. No; I simply stated my belief.

Q. And that was from information?—A. Not altogether from information, not from observation in the South, but from the effect in parts of the Northern States in which I lived before I came to this coast. There were very many laborers whom I heard frequently refuse to go South on that account.

Q. That may have been for want of information, may it not?—A. Possibly.

Q. They may have lacked the information?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say they refuse here to labor with the Chinamen. There are free Chinamen, are there not?—A. Yes, sir; I presume there are, and in fact after their contracts expire they are all free.

Q. Would the same effect exist still?—A. I beg your pardon; I did not say the whites refuse to labor with the Chinamen, but I said that there was a feeling against them.

Q. The effect would be the same. The introduction of this alien or foreign race, you say, affects labor by the refusal of our people to labor

because of their antagonism to the Chinaman?—A. I do not think it is antagonism to the Chinaman particularly as a Chinaman, but the antagonism is more to the class of labor as it is generally understood by them to be. The antagonism arises greatly from the lower rates of wages for which these Chinamen can afford to work than the whites can.

Q. Then if you would remove all idea of their being under labor-contracts and the idea of slavery in your midst, do you think the immigration would be hurtful?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why?—A. Because I think they are a people who, from their traditions, their education, and their habits of thought, never can become good citizens, because they cannot assimilate to our institutions. That is the reason.

Q. That would be a reason why they would not be good citizens. Would it be any reason why they would not make good laborers?—A. I will go further. I hold that no great class of people, even as laborers, is desirable in any community, unless they can become citizens.

Q. Then to make them citizens would remove that difficulty?—A. I do not think they ought to be made citizens, from the fact that they do not understand our government nor our institutions, and have no desire to understand them.

Q. Do you think they are a higher or a lower order of manhood than the negro?—A. I do not want to express an opinion on that score.

Q. Still it is important, as you are drawing comparisons between the two.—A. No; I think I am simply testifying as to facts.

Q. Certainly. I am only asking your opinion.—A. I would not express an opinion as to whether they were a higher or lower order. I think the Chinese, in their own estimation, in their own belief, consider their system of civilization the most perfect in the world. In fact there are many Chinese whom I have known in this State for fifteen and twenty years who are very excellent men. They are among the higher grades of the Chinamen. My business relations have been more intimate with them, but I have never found one of them yet, no matter how long he remained here, but what in conversation always maintained the superiority of the Chineses civilization to American civilization.

Q. You do not believe that, do you?—A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. You have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that our civilization is the best?—A. I certainly have not.

Q. Have you no opinion as to the grade between the two races, the Chinese and the negro?—A. In what respect do you mean?

Q. Intellectually, morally, and everything.—A. As to becoming citizens?

Q. I mean intellectually, morally, and every way.—A. I think the negro morally——

Q. I am speaking of the negro in his native state, and the Chinese at home.—A. I know nothing about the negro in his native state nor the Chinese in China. I simply know them as I see them here.

Q. Then comparing them here, what is your opinion?—A. The negro here is far superior to the Chinaman.

Q. Do you think that is because of his intellectual ability or because of his contact with the white race?—A. I suppose it comes partly from contact, or principally from contact; with the white race.

Q. Would not the same contact elevate the Chinaman?—A. No; not for many generations.

Q. Why not?—A. Because they are a people who believe so firmly in their traditions and pass those traditions from father to son. They are

people of an entirely different religion, of entirely different habits of thought and customs from the negroes.

Q. So was the negro before he came in contact with the whites.—A. No; I think it would be much easier to assimilate the negroes than the Chinese.

Q. You base that opinion upon your knowledge of the negroes now?—A. Of the negroes and the Chinese here in this State.

Q. You have never seen the Chinese with the same experiment that the negro had, coming in contact with the whites?—A. No; only so far as it has existed in California.

Q. How many years is that?—A. Twenty-three or twenty-four years.

Q. The negroes, as you know, have been here for centuries.—A. Some of them; but I suppose all of them have not been here so long.

Q. There have been no late importations, I believe, not for 90 or 100 years?—A. About 90 years.

Q. The negroes you have seen here are natives and have grown up here?—A. Most of them.

Q. You have not seen the Chinese under the same circumstances?—A. I have seen some who have grown up here, but very few of them.

Q. What effect do you think it would have to elevate the Chinaman to the rank of a voter—upon this prejudice that exists with the laboring classes?—A. I think the effect of elevating the Chinaman to a voter would be fraught with such great dangers that it is not to be taken into consideration for a moment.

Q. I am speaking of the effect of this prejudice of the laboring classes against the Chinese?—A. I do not think it would have any particular effect one way or the other.

Q. You do not think it would lessen that prejudice?—A. I do not think it would.

Q. Do you think it was lessened by the elevation of the negro?—A. I do not know whether it was or not.

Q. Then if it would be unjust to the laboring man here to elevate the Chinaman, what would be the effect upon the laboring man to elevate the negro, the same prejudice existing?—A. I cannot see that there is a sufficient similarity between the circumstances to make a fair comparison.

Q. Do you think the negro could ever be elevated or was elevated by slavery? Do you think he would ever have risen any higher in the institution of slavery? Was it not calculated to depress him?—A. I think many of the negroes as slaves did become somewhat attached to our country; they did certainly become to a greater or less extent of our religious way of belief; they certainly endeavored to acquire a knowledge of our institutions; all of which the Chinese do not, further than simply as may be an advantage to them in a business point of view.

Q. Then you think that the negro was elevated even by the institution of slavery, or under the institution of slavery, from his original condition?—A. I think that is very probable, not knowing what his original condition was from my own knowledge.

Q. You have information?—A. Only from reading.

Q. You have read about the negroes in Africa?—A. Yes; I think the negroes as slaves were elevated above their normal condition in Africa.

Q. Even under the institution of slavery?—A. Yes.

Q. If the negro had been a free man he would have been elevated more rapidly?—A. In all probability he would.

Q. So with the Chinaman. The institution of slavery does not tend to his elevation, in your opinion?—A. If the Chinaman was a free and independent man, I think the probability is that he would be elevated more rapidly; but I do not think that the Chinaman can ever, under any condition of circumstances, so far forget or lose sight of his traditions, or of the religion of his forefathers, and of the habits of thought of his ancestors, as to make a good American citizen. That is my candid judgment.

Q. You do not think American civilization would have any effect upon him?—A. Very little, from my observation; not so much as it would upon any other race of people.

Q. Will not error always go down before truth?—A. It generally will in the end, but sometimes it takes a very great while for it to go down.

Q. But it will, will it not?—A. It may in the end, ultimately; but it may take many centuries for it to go down.

Q. But it will, will it not?—A. I think in the end it would.

Q. Then which do you believe is the true religion, ours or the Chinese?—A. I believe ours is.

Q. Then in the end ours would prevail, would it not, even over the Chinese?—A. It might in the course of many centuries.

Q. Yes; it might take centuries, but it would ultimately, would it not?—A. I think it would, ultimately.

JOSEPH G. CADIZ sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You reside in California?—Answer. Yes, sir; I came here in 1849 and remained until 1854, when I left and returned in 1865.

Q. You have remained here since?—A. Ever since.

Q. Where were you during that interval?—A. I went from here in 1854 East, and then I proceeded to South America, and from Buenos Ayres I went to Chili. After that I resided in Peru. Before that time I had been in Peru from the middle part of 1840 to the end of 1842, when slavery existed there. When I returned to Peru there was no slavery there; slavery had been done away with, and they were importing Chinese to supply the want of slavery.

Q. State what was the character of that semi-slavery.—A. These Chinamen were imported there under contract at Hong-Kong. These men went there for a certain consideration, under parties purchasing them and taking them to Peru. When they arrived at Peru, they were sold by one, or in lots of tens, twenties, fifties, hundreds, and so on. There were several lines of sailing-vessels bringing them out continually, the ships being overcrowded; and on many occasions there had been revolutions on board, risings and mutinies among them. These coolies were sold at $350 to $400 apiece. When conveyed, or we may say deeded, to a party, whatever the number might be, one, or fifty, or a hundred, they were taken in a mass, and the price varied from $350 to $400. This lease or sale was for a term of eight years.

Q. You are now describing the cooly system, or the peonage of Peru?—A. Yes, sir; the same kind of Chinamen who are imported in California. These men, or these slaves, were bound over for that amount of money, and the buyer was to pay each one of them four dollars a month, of their currency, and find him in his clothing and victuals.

Q. Then the fact is that those peons, or slaves, were slaves?—A. They were slaves.

Q. Bought and sold as slaves?—A. Yes, sir; and recognized by the laws of the country.

Q. That is the government of Peru?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. State whether that is the same class of people who come here.—A. They went from Hong Kong to Peru then, the same as they come from Hong-Kong to California now.

Q. The Cantonese, as they are called?—A. Yes, sir; besides, in Costa Rica, between 1871 and 1872, the government tried the experiment of a cargo of 800 of them. They were purchased at Hong-Kong and taken there and sold. There is a party living here, a respectable person, who holds yet 64 of them that he purchased at the rate of four dollars a piece.

Q. He paid that bonus for each of them?—A. For each of them.

Q. To serve out a term of eight years?—A. Yes, sir; serving at the rate of four dollars per month.

Q. Then, as to the practical result of their contract in China and under Peruvian laws they are undoubtedly slaves?—A. Undoubtedly; and they are so considered. When the time is up they remain in that same stupidity as when they were imported.

Q. You said that these are the same character of people here?—A. Exactly.

Q. From the same district in China?—A. Exactly the same.

Q. What is the reason that they are here under different conditions from what they were taken to Peru?—A. Because our system would prohibit that kind of traffic, under that name, but those people are shrewd, and they change it in a different way so as to make it appear a different system.

Q. Then, in your opinion, we have substantially the same system here, but under a different guise and form?—A. I am perfectly convinced of it. Besides, some eight years ago I applied to Mr. Koopmanschap to contract to take a certain number of them to Peru, as I have some connections there, and was expecting to make a good result from it, but Mr. Koopmanschap was too high in his demand and I dropped it. Then there was an interruption on account of some reports that had been sent from Peru to Hong-Kong about the bad treatment they were giving these slaves.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. You say these coolies that were shipped to Peru came from Hong-Kong?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How do you know it?—A. I know it by the ships coming directly from Hong Kong.

Q. How do you know the ships came directly from there?—A. Because the captains by their logs so reported.

Q. What colony is Hong-Kong?—A. It is a place under the English rule. I have never been there, and so I cannot give you a description of the place.

Q. We want to get at your geography. Where did these coolies that you had in Peru come from?—A. The coolies here and the coolies there are brought from Hong-Kong, to the best of my knowledge.

Q. They do not come from Amoy?—A. I cannot say. There may be a place belonging to Hong-Kong there. I am not particularly acquainted with those ports.

Q. You are under oath and testifying now?—A. I am testifying under oath and truthfully.

Q. Do you know of any ship clearing from Hong-Kong with coolies

for Peru?—A. Yes, sir; there were a great many while I was there. I was there two years, and they were arriving continually while I was there.

Q. Name one ship.—A. I cannot tell the names of the ships.

Q. Do the English very generally favor the cooly-trade from its ports?—A. I suppose so, when that traffic was allowed and is yet allowed.

Q. From Hong-Kong?—A. From Hong-Kong.

Q. Then the cooly-trade is active now?—A. Very active, and no doubt it is very active in Peru.

Q. Now?—A. At the present time; yes, sir.

Q. Have there been any taken there within two years?—A. O, yes, sir; there are coolies taken there now.

Q. They are engaged in bringing coolies to Peru?—A. Yes, sir; the same kind as come here.

Q. Where do you get your information?—A. From the consul himself.

Q. How late?—A. A few days ago. Mr. Lafuente.

Q. What is your name?—A. Cadiz. I am a citizen of the United State, born in the United States.

Q. What part of the United States?—A. New York.

By Senator SARGENT:

What is your age?—A. Seventy years.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. The English colony of Hong-Kong is now engaged in the cooly trade with Peru?

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Q. Let me ask the witness if it is not true that the ships fit out at Hong-Kong, and then go from there to Amoy, where they take on their cargo and pass on?—A. I suppose it would be so. I am not particular about that quarter, but where they go to I know perfectly well.

Q. You are giving your information as a resident of Peru, not having been to China?—A. No, sir; I never was in Hong-Kong. Those ships are fitted out in Peru and sent there expressly. That has been carried on for many years.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. And is being carried on now?—A. Yes, sir; as I understand it. They want that class of people because the population there is very small for a large tract of land.

Q. The cooly-trade is active between Hong-Kong and San Francisco now, is it not?—A. It appears to me that there are not many arriving now. I have not seen many.

Q. The Pacific Mail Steamship Company's ships are bringing coolies here, are they not?—A. I suppose so.

Q. Under a contract?—A. I suppose so.

Q. Four hundred dollars is the sum, is it?—A. I am speaking of it in Peru; from $350 to $400, according to the labor.

Q. Did you not say that the same system prevails in bringing them here?—A. The same system, but I did not fix the price.

Q. What is the price?—A. I do not know the price, but I know that they are brought here by companies that have them imported.

Q. As coolies?—A. Call them whatever you like, they are dependent upon them. They are a class of men that cannot come otherwise than to be sold by their relatives, and they cannot but be purchased. They

do not know what they do. Not one of them knows what they are about.

Q. They are crazy people?—A. They are ignorant and stupid. I consider them so. I have had that conviction for many years.

Q. Dishonest people?—A. Very.

Q. Thieves?—A. It is their disposition, only they have a certain way of thieving rather disguised.

Q. They do not wash themselves very much?—A. I understand that they do not; I am told they do not.

Q. They wear their clothes several months without changing them?—A. I have not examined their persons so closely as that.

Q. Have they generally swindled our merchants who have dealt with them?—A. I cannot tell you about that.

Q. This is bringing home this fact.—A. You are making it out your own way; I cannot agree with you.

Q. You find them here, all around here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That class which you have been describing?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. They are a bad class of men?—A. They are, in my opinion, the most inferior race that there is existing.

Q. Physically and morally?—A. I do believe it is so with that class of people. There may be a more respectable class of people among them—undoubtedly there is; but that respectable class of people do not come here. We do not see them. We are speaking about the class of people, that is all. I am referring to this class of people here. I do not speak of China. I am speaking of the class of people that they are bringing here, who are not coming here of their own will.

Q. That is what we are talking about. If a reputable, good citizen should come before this commission and swear that these men were honest, that he dealt with them by hundreds of thousands of dollars without losing a dollar, and that, as a class, he found them strictly honest and found them cleanly in their bodies, what would you say of that man's oath?—A. I would doubt it.

JAMES M. BASSETT sworn and examined.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You are an old resident of California?—Answer. I have been here twenty-five years.

Q. You are of the editorial profession?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Connected with country and city journals?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what portion of the country has been your recent engagement?—A. For the past two years and a half, until the last two months, I have been editing the Los Angeles Herald.

Q. You understand the general scope of this investigation. Suppose you state your views upon the desirableness of Chinese immigration, the effect upon the country, and whether it would be advisable by some judicious law to inhibit some of them from coming to the country.—A. My observation has been that the labor of the Chinese who are here now and are coming here tends to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. That has been the general effect, I believe. Chinese labor, undoubtedly, has been beneficial to a few people and injurious to the masses.

Q. It has enabled some industries to flourish that would not otherwise have flourished, and some men to become rich?—A. Yes, sir; some great enterprises have been pushed forward more rapidly than they could have been without the assistance of some such labor as the Chinese. Generally, however, in the common occupations of life, I think Chinese

labor has been a disadvantage to the people. I think that opinion is generally understood by the masses.

Q. What effect does it have in tending to the elevation or degradation of white labor?—A. I think it tends to degrade white labor, for the reason that a general impression prevails among the laboring classes that the Chinaman who is brought here is in some degree a slave. Whether this is true or not, that impression prevails with the laboring man, and he feels that to come in competition with Chinese labor here is somewhat degrading. Another reason is that the Chinaman works for a great deal less wages than the white man can afford to work for, and he can live for a great deal less than the white man, especially the white man who has a family. I know that in the southern part of this State, and especially about Los Angeles, the gardening has been almost exclusively monopolized by the Chinese. I have on several occasions spoken to men who own land for gardening in the vicinity of the city and asked them why they did not go into business for themselves, and invariably the answer has been that they cannot compete with the Chinamen.

Q. You have heard this matter discussed for years. What, in your judgment, is the intelligent popular opinion on this question in our State, eliminating from that class those men who, of course, are directly interested in money-making by the Chinese? I speak now of the intelligent, disinterested middle class of society.—A. I think if the question was put to the public in this way, that those Chinamen who are already here should be protected the same as any other person who is living here, who comes here and relies upon the laws of the country for protection—that public opinion would be in favor of extending to those Chinamen that protection, and preventing any further immigration of Chinese. I think, perhaps, nine out of ten men in the State, outside of the few who are benefited largely by the Chinese labor would entertain that opinion. I think if the matter was put to a vote it would come out somehow that way now.

Q. What is your own individual opinion as to the comparative value of Chinese immigration or white immigration, in regard to the ultimate future of the State in its political and moral aspects?—A. Politically, it depends a great deal upon what power the Chinamen here possess. If the Chinaman ultimately becomes a voter, he will hold the balance of power in a very short time, if they continue to come. Morally, I think the effect is bad. I think that that is conceded all over the State. I think every man who has a family will concede that.

Q. If he were given the right of the elective franchise to-day, is it not probable that if he should be invested at once with the franchise, the adult Chinese in this town could outvote the white population? The vote at our recent election was 41,600. Are there not periods when there are over 41,600 adult Chinese in this city?—A. As I understand it, from several years' residence in this city, the average Chinese population is about 30,000. At certain seasons of the year, especially in the winter and spring, when the Chinamen cannot find employment outside, perhaps the actual adult population, supposing they had a vote in San Francisco, would exceed that of the whites.

Q. Then, practically, it would be to turn over this municipal government to Chinese rule?—A. That would be the effect soon, if not immediately.

Q. And in the State as well? In the process of a very brief period, not looking to the distant future, with the invitation to come here as citizens, they would have the political power of this State?—A. I think

they would. I think they would hold the balance of power now, and in a short time I think they would control the government of the State entirely.

Q. It is stated that there are about one hundred thousand adult Chinamen in this State, taking out thirteen thousand for minors and women?—A. It does not matter whether they could do it or not; if the inducement was held out for them to come here, and giving them the same rights that we give any other foreign-born person who wishes to come here and become a citizen, it would be but a short time before they would come here and outnumber and outvote us.

Q. Would it not be as soon as they could come here, under existing naturalization laws, and become citizens?—A. I see no reason why it should not be so.

By Senator COOPER:

Q. That is not desirable?—A. I think not. I do not care to see that state of affairs brought about.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Why did they not get naturalized when they had the chance, before Congress took up the question at the last session?—A. I suppose that they did not know it.

Q. Then, is there any danger of their knowing it?—A. Perhaps if we had had this investigation first, and had had some able advocate here to make the facts known, they would have been naturalized. I think very few people in the State knew it.

Q. Have you lived in Los Angeles long?—A. I went down there two years ago last April.

Q. Were you there when the Los Angeles massacre took place?—A. No, sir; that occurred two or three years ago.

Q. Do you know the particulars of it?—A. No, sir; only what I have heard.

Q. What did you hear?—A. I heard that they hung a lot of Chinamen.

Q. Who hung them?—A. That I do not know. I never heard.

Q. Did the sheriff hang them?—A. No, sir; I do not think he did.

Q. How large a lot?—A. I do not remember the number; some fourteen or fifteen; I think thirteen.

Q. Are there a good many farmers on small ranches around Los Angeles?—A. Around in the immediate vicinity of Los Angeles there are a great many small ranches, gardens, &c.

Q. Cut up generally into small farms?—A. No, sir; not generally.

Q. Is there any difficulty in getting a small farm there?—A. Not if a man has money enough to buy it.

Q. Do they have to pay cash there when they buy a farm?—A. That depends on circumstances. Some men would have to pay cash, and others would not.

Q. Has there been a large immigration there?—A. The last two years a considerable immigration has come to Los Angeles and the other southern counties.

Q. Is it increasing?—A. Yes, sir; it is increasing.

Q. By land and sea?—A. Yes, sir; slightly, both ways.

Q. There are a great many Chinamen down there?—A. I do not know the number of Chinese in the county, nor how many there are in the town. There is a considerable number almost in the center of the town, very near the business center.

Q. Do the farmers employ them?—A. I do not think they do. I never saw a Chinaman at work on a farm in the valley.

Q. What do the Chinese do?—A. They lease pieces of ground in the vicinity of the city, and garden. They work gardens elsewhere the same as they do here.

Q. Do they interfere with white labor much?—A. I have heard they do. There is an anti-Chinese organization there which probably has two or three hundred members. What is said there or what they believe I do not know. I am not a member of it, and never heard anything about it particularly.

Q. Are there any manufactories there in which they are engaged?—A. They are employed a great deal in the gathering of grapes for the manufacture of wine.

Q. Is there any manufacturing establishment carried on there, boots and shoes, woolen-mills?—A. There is a woolen-mill there, but I cannot tell you whether they employ Chinese in it or not. The factory has been shut up for some time, I think.

Q. Was it ever run?—A. Yes, sir; it has been run.

Q. By what kind of labor?—A. That I do not know.

Q. Could they gather the grape crop, and such things, down there without this Chinese labor?—A. I presume they could. They certainly could if all the men were to work who talk about wanting work.

Q. Is that generally the case?—A. That I cannot tell you. I am not supposed to know whether a man wants work or not when he says he does.

Q. You have not had any experience that way?—A. No, sir; never had any.

Q. What is the experience of your neighbors in that line?—A. I never heard them express an opinion.

Q. You say there is danger, if these 30,000 men should become citizens and vote here, that they would demand of the municipal government all the contracts, sewerage and street contracts, &c., if they had the power.—A. That is a question in advance of the transaction. I cannot tell you.

Q. In case they should get hold of this government, as you state, by having the franchise given to them, I want to know what they would do.—A. I did not state that they would get hold of the government; I said it seemed to me probable they would.

Q. And if that probability should become a fact, from what you know of them would they demand all these contracts?—A. I think that the republican party has generally held all the contracts, and they have had the power. If the Chinamen had the power, I think it likely they would do the same. They are all human beings.

Q. Are the republicans in power here?—A. Not in this city.

Q. Then the republicans do not hold the contracts?—A. I am speaking of the State and nation.

Q. Do you think they would demand all the rights that the dominant party does if they succeed?—A. Naturally, I suppose they would. Would you not if you were a Chinaman and had the power?

Q. As a matter of course I would. I want to know what you think.—A. I think, if I were a Chinaman, I would do pretty much as the Chinamen would.

Q. If the school-money would not suit you, you would have it distributed among the sectarian schools?—A. I do not think they are much interested in school laws.

Q. I am supposing if they had the power.—A. I do not think they take much interest in our education.

MICHAEL A. SMITH recalled.

By Mr. PIXLEY:

Question. You heard the testimony some few days ago of Mr. Gray, of the custom-house?—Answer. Yes, sir.

Q. In which he explains how Chinese women were permitted to pass the consulate at Hong-Kong, and what class of questions were asked and answered with a view to establish a respectability, and that the woman was coming here for a virtuous calling, to become a wife, or to be engaged in some respectable position in California, and that schedule of questions and answers was accompanied by photographs to identify the women?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it was testified that they were respectable people, and came here for the pursuit of a respectable vocation?—A. Yes, sir; I so understand.

Q. Did you examine that list of photographs?—A. I got forty-eight altogether at that time.

Q. What is the result of your investigation as to their present business, and what are they doing, these respectable Chinese ladies?—A. [Producing photographs.] Here are some twelve of them that I have picked out. Some of them may not at present reside in houses of prostitution, but those have been at times residing in houses of prostitution within the last six months.

Q. In other words, twelve out of forty-eight are prostitutes?—A. They reside in houses of prostitution. There are some of them that I have arrested and brought to the City Hall, and they were convicted of being prostitutes. Some of them there are the pictures of women who have children with them that I arrested.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. These are the women? [Exhibing photographs.]—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you say they are all prostitutes?—A. I do not know that they all are prostitutes, but I have arrested several of them out of houses of prostitution.

Q. Identify them, please?—A. [Indicating a picture.] There is one.

Q. That middle woman?—A. Yes, sir. [Indicating a photograph.] There is another picture of a woman who has been arrested and fined. [Indicating a photograph.] There is another also who has been fined. There are two [indicating] who have been residing in Chinese houses of prostitution, that I have seen there, but who have never been arrested that I know of. I think I could take you up to-night and show them to you. [Indicating.] Here is also another one. This little girl is a servant-girl in one of the houses of prostitution. There is another girl. Here is an old lady who is looked on as the boss of a house, but the house at the present time is not running. She was there some time ago.

Q. How long has she been here?—A. I cannot say; it may be that she has been here a year or two, but I know I saw her this summer when I first went up into the Chinese quarters. The house is in Bartlett alley, about the middle of the alley.

Q. These women, then, you have discovered within a few months?—A. I was not particularly engaged in the Chinese business until the administration of Chief Ellis, when I went up there.

Q. How long has this woman been a prostitute here, to your knowledge?—A. I cannot swear to that. I know that she resides in the alley on that side of the street. [Indicating.] There are nothing else but prostitutes along there.

Q. I see she left Hong-Kong January 18?—A. I did not go up to that quarter until about that time.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. You are a police-officer?—A. Yes, sir; I am a police-officer. Understand when we go in and arrest a house that way, we arraign all the women who are in there. We cannot sometimes tell whether these women live there or not. We charge them with visiting these houses. They are generally convicted under the ordinance against visiting houses of prostitution.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. They might not be prostitutes?—A. Well, I do not know.

Q. You are not so sure about these houses?—A. I have seen these others. [Exhibiting photographs.] Here is a woman I know you can find almost any time in Sullivan's alley.

Q. Out of how many did you examine these photographs?—A. Forty-eight, I believe, altogether.

Q. And twelve of them you find are doubtful?—A. Yes, sir; I have not had time to look them out thoroughly nor to look right through Chinatown.

Q. How long have you been on the police?—A. Two years and ten months.

Q. Do you know white women, who you once knew to be respectable, who turn out as prostitutes after getting here?—A. I do not know about them after they get here, but I have known women who I supposed were respectable once to become prostitutes.

Q. They were respectable enough once to pass the United States consul as you heard the way it was done the other day?—A. I have known ladies that were supposed to be respectable in this city at one time to live in houses of prostitution afterward.

Q. It is not an uncommon occurrence to have some women turning out as prostitutes who hitherto had been considered respectable women?—A. There are a great many such cases.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Do you think there are as many cases as twelve out of forty-eight?—A. No, sir; I do not think so.

Q. You have had something to do with enforcing the cubic-air ordinance?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you describe some of the rooms and the condition in which you found Chinese whom you arrested under that ordinance?—A. I have often gone into a house at night where there would be room probably for two men, and there might be ten there, sometimes six, sometimes twelve.

Q. How close would they be together?—A. There would be a partition right by there like a false floor, [illustrating,] and they would lie as thick nearly as they could in there.

Q. On both floors?—A. No, sir; on the lower floor generally in places of that kind. They use it as a workshop, or something of that kind.

Q. How did you find them under the sidewalks or other places than in chambers?—A. We find them very thick right under the sidewalks and under basements. We would pass right along a sidewalk this way, [illustrating,] and they would have a room under that, and a great many men would be sleeping right under the sidewalk.

Q. In mere holes?—A. Yes, sir; they were the poorer class of Chinese.

Q. How would the atmosphere be in such places?—A. Very bad.

Q. Bad in what respect?—A. In places the stench would be from water or drainage, or perhaps the privies would be overflowing. Sometimes, I suppose, it would come more from the drainage than anything else.

Q. A Stifling atmosphere?—A. Yes, sir; the atmosphere is stifling in these quarters.

Q. Does that atmosphere penetrate to the street?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How would the streets smell in the vicinity of these dense, overcrowded places?—A. It would smell very bad, I should judge.

Q. Did you notice that?—A. It did smell badly to me.

Q. Does this attempt of the city to prevent that overcrowding succeed?—A. It has done a great deal of good here. I know houses that used to be crowded pretty badly have thinned out, and there are not near as many lodging there; but we have often arrested a house, and we would come back in a week again and find just as many as when we had arrested them.

Q. By continually enforcing the ordinance, do you manage to reduce the overcrowding, as a whole?—A. Yes, sir; in these large lodging-houses we do, but in factories, and under these sidewalks, and such places we do not. I think that they get in there pretty nearly as quick as we get them out. There are eight blocks there that we just keep working at all the time. I do not know the number that we have arrested, but I suppose it is on the books. I guess there have been all of a thousand five hundred or a thousand. I could not tell the number now.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Have not the grand juries repeatedly reported the horrible condition of the cells here in the prisons?—A. Yes, sir; there has been a good deal of talk about our city prison.

Q. Has not almost every grand jury done that?—A. Yes, sir; almost every grand jury has something to say about it.

Q. Is it a horrible place—so represented?—A. Yes, sir; nearly every grand jury has something to say in regard to the city prison.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is the city now building another city prison?—A. Yes, sir; it is building a city hall, and also there will be a new prison out there.

Q. Will that prison be ample?—A. Yes, sir; I think it will when it is finished.

Q. Is it airy?—A. I do not know about that. I think it ought to be.

Q. Does the number of Chinese arrests tend to crowd our city prison?—A. There are two cells mostly for the Chinese. The rest are for the whites. Nearly all the Chinese who have been arrested have been put in those two cells.

Q. Is the city doing the best it can under the accommodations it now has?—A. Yes, sir.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. What is the size of those cells?—A. I could not tell. I never measured one of them.

Q. They are small cells, about what size?—A. They are not very large cells.

Q. How large?—A. I would judge about 14 feet square; perhaps 16 feet; I cannot say.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. How many people could you put in there of a night?—A. I could not tell without the prison-keeper's books.

Q. Do you know how many you have arrested of a night?—A. I have seen thirty put in these two cells in one night.

Q. How is it with the county jail? Is that very much overcrowded?—A. At times; sometimes it is not very much crowded.

Q. How many people are there in it?—A. At the present time I could not tell.

Q. How many do you know?—A. Between three and four hundred; very close on to four hundred, I believe.

Q. What is the size of that county jail?—A. I do not know.

Q. How large are the cells?—A. I could not tell that. I do not know that I have been more than a few times to the county jail.

Q. How many cells are there?—A. That I could not tell.

Q. You have no idea how large those cells are?—A. Some of them are perhaps about 6 by 8 or 10—6 by 10, probably; but I cannot tell what the size exactly of them is.

Q. Could you not tell whether there were a dozen cells or two dozen?—A. There are more than a dozen cells. There are more than forty cells in the county jail.

Q. How many stories are there?—A. Two stories.

Q. Is the second story occupied by ordinary prisoners or by females?—A. The females are all out at what they call the branch jail at the present time, over at the North Beach.

Q. Do you think there are thirty-five cells there?—A. I should judge so, and more, too.

Q. How many cells are there?—A. I cannot tell. These men who are employed in the county jail could tell you. I never was employed in the county jail and cannot tell.

Q. How do you recognize these women?—A. I am acquainted with some of them.

Q. They are not so much alike but what you can tell one from another?—A. I can tell Chinese pretty well.

Q. How many of them have you seen since these photographs were put in evidence here?—A. Some eight or nine of them.

Q. You recognize them?—A. Yes, sir. I think I have seen seven of them since I have got these photographs. The rest are women that I know without going into houses at all to see them.

Q. Is there any thing in this class of women by which you can distinguish them?—A. How do you mean?

Q. Can you distinguish prostitutes from respectable women?—A. When a man claims to marry a woman he generally takes her off, and does not allow her to go to these houses.

Q. One of the witnesses here testified that there was no difficulty in the consul distinguishing the one class from the other without any assistance, even by his own opinion; that a person living in China any length of time could distinguish one class from another. I want to know whether you are able to distinguish one class from the other here?—A. No, sir? I cannot tell one class from the other on the street. I can tell by being constantly in Chinatown and going among the Chinese quarters and in the houses of prostitution.

Q. You only know by the manner in which they live?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. By the appearance of the persons themselves you could not distinguish them?—A. No, sir; not until I got acquainted with them. I will state that in the last six months the Chinese houses of prostitution

for white men are not carried on so much as they used to be. I do not think there are as many of that kind of women here as there were formerly. I know there are not. But when these young girls come from China a great many of them go to these houses of prostitution for Chinamen.

Q. In your observations do you think it is true that the consul can distinguish the classes?—A. I do not know how he can. I do not see any difference so far as the looks of the women are concerned.

Q. I have heard it stated that the prostitute class in China dress differently. Do you know anything of that?—A. They do not dress any differently here.

Q. I have heard that there is a difference in the coloring of the lining of the sleeves of the gowns, and that they are distinguished by different costumes?—A. I have never noticed that at all. I have never examined their costume at all.

Q. Is there any such distinction here?—A. I have never examined their costume at all. I have only seen them going along the street, and I have never noticed any difference in their costume on the street.

Q. Nothing that you could see without careful examination?—A. No, sir. I have had Chinamen tell me of something of that kind.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. In these places where the Chinamen are underground, under the sidewalks, and in the factories that you referred to, are there places left open so that there is a free circulation of air?—A. No, sir. Let a Chinaman take this room and have all those windows open, when they go to sleep at night they will close up every window. Officer Bethel is here, and I think he would state the same thing. You never find a window open in a Chinese lodging-house.

Q. How is it about the windows in those cells 14 by 16 in the city hall? Do the officers keep those open when prisoners are there?—A. There are upward of five or six inches of bars in the front.

Q. Leaving a free access of air?—A. Yes, sir. That is from the corridor.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. Is there no outside opening?—A. No, sir.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Is there any opening from the outside into the corridors?—A. Some windows. There is a very foul smell there. It is underground.

Q. Is the smell as foul as in the places from which they are taken?—A. At times. Sometimes the smell in the city prison is very strong.

Q. You think it would be a good idea if the city would hurry up the new building?—A. I think so.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. When do you think that will be finished, from present appearances?—A. Somebody else can tell.

By Senator SARGENT:

Q. Are not the contracts given out, and are they not going on with the work?—A. Yes, sir; they are going on with the work at the present time.

APPENDIX A.

A comparative table (prepared by Louis A. La Grange, statistical clerk in the custom-house) showing aggregate values of the commerce between China and the port of San Francisco during three years and six months, from January 1, 1873, to June 30, 1876.

(Presented by Mr. Pixley.)

Year.	Imports from China.		Exports to China.	
	Commodities.	Value.	Commodities.	Value.
1873	Sugar	$547,434	Flour, (wheat)	$629,455
	Opium	858,073	Gold and silver	6,335,353
	Rice	753,079	Ginseng	398,672
	Tea	1,529,130	Quicksilver	91,347
	Coffee	6,560	Miscellaneous	449,593
	Miscellaneous	3,392,258		
	Total	7,086,535		7,904,420
1874	Sugar	481,273	Flour, (wheat)	692,942
	Opium	236,632	Gold and silver	6,161,633
	Rice	812,261	Ginseng	414,937
	Tea	1,096,480	Quicksilver	90,117
	Coffee	151,585	Miscellaneous	465,226
	Miscellaneous	1,837,431		
	Total	4,615,662		7,824,855
1875	Sugar	183,656	Flour, (wheat)	571,271
	Opium	757,640	Gold and silver	5,674,907
	Rice	1,141,462	Ginseng	577,109
	Tea	518,926	Quicksilver	912,522
	Coffee	162,823	Miscellaneous	806,911
	Miscellaneous	1,924,289		
	Total	4,688,796		8,542,720
1876, (1st six months)	Sugar	172,112	Flour, (wheat)	460,141
	Opium	253,178	Gold and silver	3,125,521
	Rice	468,489	Ginseng	286,655
	Tea	144,416	Quicksilver	417,280
	Coffee	73,829	Miscellaneous	243,298
	Miscellaneous	884,272		
	Total	1,996,296		4,532,895
	NOTE.—All tea and coffee free of duty.		NOTE.—Foreign merchandise exported not included in this table.	

APPENDIX B.—EXHIBIT 1.

(See testimony of Ezekiel B. Vreeland, p. 173.)

To the master, owner, or consignee:

You are hereby notified not to land within this State any person who is not a citizen of the United States without an examination and inspection of such person by the commissioner of immigration.

Your attention is called to the following sections of the penal and political codes of this State:

SEC. 173. Every captain, master of a vessel, or other person who willfully imports, brings, or sends, or causes or procures to be brought or sent, into this State any person who is a foreign convict of any crime which if committed within this State would be punishable therein, (treason and misprision of treason excepted,) or who is delivered or sent to him from any prison or place of confinement in any place without this State, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

SEC. 174. Every person bringing to or landing within this State any person born either in the empire of China or Japan, or the islands adjacent to the empire of China, without first presenting to the commissioner of immigration evidence satisfactory to such commissioner that such person desires voluntarily to come into this State, and is a person of good character, and obtaining from such commissioner a permit describing such person and authorizing the landing, is punishable by a fine of not less than one

nor more than five thousand dollars, or by imprisonment in the county jail not less than two nor more than twelve months.

SEC. 175. Every individual person of the classes referred to in the two preceding sections brought or landed within this State contrary to the provisions of such sections, renders the person bringing or landing liable to a separate prosecution and penalty.

Section 2949 of the political code makes it the duty of every master of a vessel arriving at any port in this State, bringing passengers from any place out of this State, to make an oath to the commissioner of immigration at such port, within twenty-four hours after such arrival, a written report, stating the name, place of birth, last residence, age, and occupation of all such passengers who are not citizens; also, whether any of the passengers so reported are lunatics, idiotic, deaf, dumb, blind, crippled, or infirm, and not accompanied by any relatives able to support them, or are lewd and abandoned women; also, the name and residence of the owner of such vessel.

_____, _____,
Commissioner of Immigration.

Report of the S. S. Alaska; master, Edward Van Sice; owner, P. M. S. S. Co.; owners' residence, N. Y.; from Hong-Kong, via Yokohama; arrived 15th February; consigned to P. M. S. S. Co.; number of passengers not citizens of the United States, 801.

I, Edward Van Sice, master of the steamship Alaska, from Hong-Kong, being duly smorn, do depose and say that the facts and statements made and contained in the within report are, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true; that I arrived at this port on the 16th day of February, 1875; and that I brought 801 passengers not citizens; and that this report is in full compliance with the several laws of the State of California in regard to the arrival of passengers and immigrants.

EDW. VAN SICE, *Master.*

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 17th day of February, 1875.

R. K. PIOTOWSKI,
Commissioner of Immigration,
By E. B. VREELAND,
Deputy.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, Edward Vance Sice, master, arrived at the port of San Francisco on the 15th day of February, A. D. 1875, being a statement of the persons or passengers landed at the port of San Francisco, not being natives of the United States, and who have, within the last preceding twelve months, arrived from any country out of the United States at any place within the United States, as required by the laws of the State of California.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Chung Ping	Oelang, Gow Tan	30	Laborer	Male	China
Chung Long	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chung Heng	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chung Long	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chung Yow	do	14	do	do	Do.
Chung Hew	do	23	do	do	Do.
Chung Fock	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Chung Che	do	11	do	do	Do.
Chung Seck	do	10	do	do	Do.
Chung Ping	do	27	Laborer	do	Do.
Chung Chon	do	41	do	do	Do.
Chow Tin	do	38	do	do	Do.
Kwan Chan	do	21	do	do	Do.
Kwan Yong	do	35	do	do	Do.
Kwan Mock	do	17	do	do	Do.
Hung Ham	do	27	do	do	Do.
Hung Hue	do	29	do	do	Do.
Hung Chong	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chow Chung	do	27	do	do	Do.
Fong Tock	do	20	do	do	Do.
Che Leng	Numal, Kow Kong	30	do	do	Do.
Le Tong	do	28	do	do	Do.
Mue Kwan	do	32	do	do	Do.
Pon Hang	do	25	do	do	Do.
Hung Hang	do	24	do	do	Do.
Hung Tick	do	28	do	do	Do.
Meng Fong	do	25	do	do	Do.
Kwan Kye	do	30	do	do	Do.
Low Chan	do	27	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Le Hew	Numal, Kow Kong	25	Laborer	Male	China.
Kun Nam	do	28	do	do	Do.
Low Moon	do	22	do	do	Do.
Wong Chan	Sung Hing, Ping Ow	38	do	do	Do.
Wong Seng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Se Pon	do	30	do	do	Do.
Wong Chow	do	20	do	do	Do.
Low Soo	do	33	do	do	Do.
Tam Choo	do	18	do	do	Do.
Tam Hang	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wong Mue	do	35	do	do	Do.
Wong He	do	23	do	do	Do.
Se Chan	do	24	do	do	Do.
Low Seng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Low Pue	do	35	do	do	Do.
Tam Chan	do	16	do	do	Do.
Wong Yock	do	24	do	do	Do.
Wong Son	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Hon	do	19	do	do	Do.
Low Ming	do	23	do	do	Do.
Tam Hin	do	31	do	do	Do.
Tam Wa	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Chong	do	27	do	do	Do.
Wong Heng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wong Keng	do	21	do	do	Do.
Low Sam	do	24	do	do	Do.
Tam Man	do	19	do	do	Do.
Tam Wo	do	22	do	do	Do.
Le Seng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Le Poon	do	34	do	do	Do.
Wong Weng	do	9	Student	do	Do.
Le Sin	do	35	Laborer	do	Do.
Chung Hong	do	30	do	do	Do.
Hin Hip	do	37	do	do	Do.
Wong Kat	do	35	do	do	Do.
Le Wan	Oc San, San Sue	24	do	do	Do.
Le Pew	do	24	do	do	Do.
Le Lang	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Foon	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Mon	do	28	do	do	Do.
Le Tong	do	28	do	do	Do.
Le Hong	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Long	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Che	do	20	do	do	Do.
Le Yong	do	20	do	do	Do.
Le Wung	do	22	do	do	Do.
Le Hon	do	22	do	do	Do.
Hip Yong	Sun Heng, Ha Chin	27	do	do	Do.
Hip How	do	16	do	do	Do.
Mack Low	Sun On, Sai Loo	18	do	do	Do.
Mack Wo	do	22	do	do	Do.
Mack Po	do	19	do	do	Do.
Mack Wan	do	25	do	do	Do.
Mack Meng	do	53	do	do	Do.
Chan Heng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Ho Teng	Ta Hin, Seong Chin	27	do	do	Do.
Lon Ke	do	22	do	do	Do.
Hip Kwon	Sun Meng, Ping Ha	35	do	do	Do.
Hip Se	do	29	do	do	Do.
Hip Kwan	do	25	do	do	Do.
Hip Chon	do	22	do	do	Do.
Hip Lon	do	27	do	do	Do.
Hip He	do	32	do	do	Do.
Kweng Lan	do	47	do	do	Do.
Kwa Chow	do	45	do	do	Do.
Kwa Lam	do	46	do	do	Do.
Yock Veng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Ken Son	do	48	do	do	Do.
Se Fong	do	23	do	do	Do.
Keng Sae	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chow Chin	do	19	do	do	Do.
Keng Hap	do	39	do	do	Do.
Man Seng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Seng Yat	do	23	do	do	Do.
Hen Kwan	do	22	do	do	Do.
Ken Chon	do	29	do	do	Do.
Poen Kue	Numal, Ha Fong	42	do	do	Do.
Lung Yan	do	40	do	do	Do.
Nam Too	Sun Tack, Ping Pon	22	do	do	Do.
Kwan Kin	Numal, Kow Kong	28	do	do	Do.
Kwan Sam	do	25	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Lye Low	Numal, Kew Kong	22	Laborer	Male	China.
Kwan Che	do	20	do	do	Do.
Low Choe	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Chong	do	30	do	do	Do.
Tang Lam	do	26	do	do	Do.
Lung Choe	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chau Che	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Sam	do	19	do	do	Do.
Wong Che	Sun Hing, Hachin	18	do	do	Do.
Kwan Che	do	19	do	do	Do.
Lam Chon	do	17	do	do	Do.
Se How	do	18	do	do	Do.
Le Kwan	do	22	do	do	Do.
Wong Fu	do	23	do	do	Do.
King Chung	Sun Heng, Koen Tin	20	do	do	Do.
King Wing	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wong Hau	do	46	do	do	Do.
Wong Lin	do	26	do	do	Do.
Wong Chung	do	32	do	do	Do.
Wong Moon	do	16	do	do	Do.
Weng Hu	do	23	do	do	Do.
Wong Se	do	18	do	do	Do.
Le Lan	Sun Hu, Non Len	25	do	do	Do.
Chan Mow	do	30	do	do	Do.
Wong Man	Sun Hing, Ping On	30	do	do	Do.
Wong Son	do	21	do	do	Do.
Wong He	do	16	do	do	Do.
Le Long	do	30	do	do	Do.
Lung Pue	Sun Tack, San Chin	38	do	do	Do.
Lu Fong	do	22	do	do	Do.
Lu Moon	do	28	do	do	Do.
Lye Hip	do	37	do	do	Do.
Chan Le	do	27	do	do	Do.
Lam Leck	Sun Hui, Tong Chin	23	do	do	Do.
Nam Ping	Sun Hue, Lung Chin	23	do	do	Do.
Nan Seong	do	38	do	do	Do.
Ma Sung	Sun Heng, Pong How	27	do	do	Do.
Ma Choe	do	23	do	do	Do.
Ma Lin	do	25	do	do	Do.
Ma Sow	do	23	do	do	Do.
Chan Yam	do	28	do	do	Do.
Wong Hin	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wong Yam	do	30	do	do	Do.
Wong Ke	do	24	do	do	Do.
Le Wo	do	33	do	do	Do.
He Hin	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chan Chow	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wong Chon	do	26	do	do	Do.
Wong Hin	do	35	do	do	Do.
Wong Yam	do	31	do	do	Do.
Wong Pu	do	31	do	do	Do.
Wong Kin	do	30	do	do	Do.
Wong Seong	do	36	do	do	Do.
Wong Se	do	21	do	do	Do.
Wong Wong	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Che	do	15	do	do	Do.
Chung Kwae	Mow Chow, Leong He	21	do	do	Do.
Hung Choe	Sun Mung, Kwan Hoe	50	do	do	Do.
Hung How	do	21	do	do	Do.
Hung Chip	do	34	do	do	Do.
Hung Tap	do	27	do	do	Do.
Hung Hap	do	21	do	do	Do.
Wong Hap	do	26	do	do	Do.
Wong Chong	do	17	do	do	Do.
Chow Lam	do	17	do	do	Do.
Hung Hit	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chan San	do	30	do	do	Do.
Hung Seng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Hung Weng	do	24	do	do	Do.
Hung Hap	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Wong Yon	Sung Hing, Kwong Hoe	33	Laborer	do	Do.
Wong Hon	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chan Kwan	do	39	do	do	Do.
Chan Chon	do	28	do	do	Do.
Hung Hong	do	33	do	do	Do.
Hung Gae	do	31	do	do	Do.
Hung Yan	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Lung	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Wong Chock	do	29	Laborer	do	Do.
Wong Yock	do	22	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Mackwa	Sung Hing, Kwong Hoe	25	Laborer	Male	China.
Hung Wo	do	21	do	do	Do.
Chew Chon	King Shan, Tow Moon	35	do	do	Do.
Mack Tye	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chow Hu	do	26	do	do	Do.
Wong Pang	do	27	do	do	Do.
Low Yow	do	29	do	do	Do.
Lam Kam	do	22	do	do	Do.
Kwock Soe	do	28	do	do	Do.
Hung Sin	do	42	do	do	Do.
Choe Kit	do	24	do	do	Do.
Wong He	do	18	do	do	Do.
Meek Pue	do	20	do	do	Do.
Kwock Yow	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Meng	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le He	do	31	do	do	Do.
Wong Kwon	do	28	do	do	Do.
Wong Taek	do	20	do	do	Do.
Che Tim	Numal, Kow Kong	25	do	do	Do.
Tang Kwan	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chew Kan	Chang Sing, Tai Ping	30	do	do	Do.
Hung Sing	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hung See	do	16	do	do	Do.
Hung Kwon	do	34	do	do	Do.
Kwan Paek	do	25	do	do	Do.
Kwan Kwae	do	26	do	do	Do.
Kwan Chack	Chang Sing, Qai Ping	28	do	do	Do.
Tong Che	do	30	do	do	Do.
Wong Yow	do	27	do	do	Do.
Sew Fye	do	20	do	do	Do.
Law Pue	do	24	do	do	Do.
Low Chye	do	22	do	do	Do.
He Seng	do	23	do	do	Do.
Chow Chon	do	29	do	do	Do.
Chon Wa	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chow Yen	do	17	do	do	Do.
Chow He	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chow Lye	do	21	do	do	Do.
Chow Seng	do	23	do	do	Do.
Chow Che	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wong Chon	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chan Hang	do	20	do	do	Do.
Soo Fock	do	31	do	do	Do.
Soo Lock	do	32	do	do	Do.
Soo Sow	do	34	do	do	Do.
Soo Chin	do	32	do	do	Do.
Soo Moon	do	35	do	do	Do.
Soo Tong	do	20	do	do	Do.
Soo Kat	do	20	do	do	Do.
Soo Heng	do	24	do	do	Do.
Hon Ye	do	36	do	do	Do.
Low Se	do	33	do	do	Do.
Chan Pack	do	29	do	do	Do.
Chan Seng	do	26	do	do	Do.
Low Hu	do	37	do	do	Do.
Choe Cho	Sun Hing, Qai Ping	25	do	do	Do.
Choe Seng	do	21	do	do	Do.
Low Lam	do	23	do	do	Do.
Le Kwae	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Choe	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Sat	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Fock	do	28	do	do	Do.
Le Chow	do	23	do	do	Do.
Le Fye	do	32	do	do	Do.
Le Chung	do	20	do	do	Do.
Le Cheng	do	32	do	do	Do.
Le Long	do	27	do	do	Do.
Le Seng	do	29	do	do	Do.
Le Son	do	21	do	do	Do.
Le Kow	do	24	do	do	Do.
Low Pon	Sun Heng, Yow Tong	22	do	do	Do.
Low Son	do	20	do	do	Do.
Low Son	do	20	do	do	Do.
Low Kat	do	20	do	do	Do.
Low Chap	do	20	do	do	Do.
Low Tim	do	20	do	do	Do.
Lock Weng	Hing Shon, Tai Gon	25	do	do	Do.
Jam Leck	do	19	do	do	Do.
Ho Sow	do	29	do	do	Do.
Ho Ha	do	38	do	do	Do.
Ho Pue	do	25	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Le Kow	Hing Shon, Tai Gon	25	Laborer	Male	China.
Lye Hong	Oepang, Yock Teng	38	do	do	Do.
Chung On	Sun Mue, Soe How	44	do	do	Do.
Chung Weng	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chong Ho	do	22	do	do	Do.
Hip Sung	Sun Hing, Seong Chun	35	do	do	Do.
Hip Foon	do	27	do	do	Do.
Hip Yeng	do	29	do	do	Do.
Hip Chon	do	34	do	do	Do.
Hip Kam	do	30	do	do	Do.
Hip Che	do	20	do	do	Do.
Le Chon	do	14	do	do	Do.
Le Lue	do	19	do	do	Do.
Le Chye	do	18	do	do	Do.
Le Fun	do	24	do	do	Do.
Lee Poo	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Jack	do	31	do	do	Do.
Le Wan	do	26	do	do	Do.
Hung Chan	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Jim	do	22	do	do	Do.
Hung Tack	do	19	do	do	Do.
Hung Wye	do	24	do	do	Do.
Nam Wan	do	22	do	do	Do.
Le Kan	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Soe	do	15	do	do	Do.
Le Kock	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Choe	do	31	do	do	Do.
Le Yan	do	38	do	do	Do.
Le Hong	do	29	do	do	Do.
Le Lin	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Chung	do	24	do	do	Do.
Le Chung	do	23	do	do	Do.
Le Hong	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Lon	do	40	do	do	Do.
Le Kam	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chan Wo	do	24	do	do	Do.
Hong Chong	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hung Fock	do	29	do	do	Do.
Hung Hock	do	18	do	do	Do.
Lue Sow	do	30	do	do	Do.
Lam Leng	do	24	do	do	Do.
Le He	do	31	do	do	Do.
Le Chan	do	35	do	do	Do.
Le Pan	do	19	do	do	Do.
Le Chow	do	18	do	do	Do.
Le Pon	do	24	do	do	Do.
Le Hong	do	27	do	do	Do.
Le Chon	do	22	do	do	Do.
Le Wang	do	28	do	do	Do.
Le Lan	do	31	do	do	Do.
Le Chow	do	34	do	do	Do.
Le Kwae	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Chong	do	19	do	do	Do.
Tong Kat	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Kwen	do	19	do	do	Do.
Hung Ke	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Yeng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Nam Chung	do	29	do	do	Do.
He He	Oe Pang, York Teng	36	do	do	Do.
Le Che	do	23	do	do	Do.
Law Foon	do	24	do	do	Do.
Nam Sock	do	23	do	do	Do.
Nam Lit	do	35	do	do	Do.
Mack Heng	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chow Tye	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chow Leck	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chew Yau	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chew Chon	do	17	do	do	Do.
Chew Yon	do	18	do	do	Do.
Chew Chong	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chew Meng	do	18	do	do	Do.
Chew Song	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chew Wan	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chew Lan	do	23	do	do	Do.
Chew Chow	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chew Chew	do	18	do	do	Do.
Tong Chong	do	37	do	do	Do.
Pong Hung	do	29	do	do	Do.
Ho Heng	do	19	do	do	Do.
Ho Hin	do	19	do	do	Do.
Ho Long	do	22	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Ho Che	Oe Pang, York Teng	18	Laborer	Male	China.
Kin Yan	do	33	do	do	Do.
Yan Ke	do	38	do	do	Do.
Wye Check	do	26	do	do	Do.
Fong Hun	do	29	do	do	Do.
Yan Chin	do	29	do	do	Do.
Ho Yon	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Yock Hoon	do	22	Laborer	do	Do.
Ho Lin	Oe Pang, Yock Tong	28	do	do	Do.
Ho Song	do	18	do	do	Do.
Chow Seng	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chow Hit	do	25	do	do	Do.
Wung Chan	do	28	do	do	Do.
Wung Chock	do	29	do	do	Do.
Se Fat	do	30	do	do	Do.
Se Kit	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Hop	do	28	do	do	Do.
Se Soo	do	19	do	do	Do.
Se Chat	do	22	do	do	Do.
Se Chan	do	21	do	do	Do.
Se On	do	26	do	do	Do.
Se Kwae	do	21	do	do	Do.
Se Hin	do	22	do	do	Do.
Se Son	do	34	do	do	Do.
Ten Wan	do	28	do	do	Do.
Kin Tack	do	28	do	do	Do.
Che Ke	Lun Heng, King Oe	38	do	do	Do.
Hung Hung	do	36	do	do	Do.
Leng Wye	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chan Seng	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chew He	do	30	do	do	Do.
Nam Hong	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chew Foon	do	15	do	do	Do.
Chu Foo	do	15	do	do	Do.
Kock Son	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chew Long	do	14	do	do	Do.
He Hong	do	32	do	do	Do.
Kwan Sew	do	29	do	do	Do.
Nam Long	do	27	do	do	Do.
Nam Kwae	do	21	do	do	Do.
Chan King	do	24	do	do	Do.
Wang Chung	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hip Wan	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chou Chan	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chau Tick	Sun Hung, Kong Oe	25	do	do	Do.
Chan Seik	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chew Yow	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chew Lung	do	21	do	do	Do.
Chew Hock	do	13	do	do	Do.
Chew Foon	do	14	do	do	Do.
Chew Kam	do	13	do	do	Do.
Chew Ken	do	18	do	do	Do.
Chen Teng	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chen Kock	Sun Taik, Quai Son	17	do	do	Do.
Ho Kwong	Sun Taek, Sa Kwo	38	do	do	Do.
Chang Neu	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chang Nim	Sun Hing, Neckoe	32	do	do	Do.
Hue Kat	do	32	do	do	Do.
Hue Heu	do	12	Student	do	Do.
Hue Sun	do	11	do	do	Do.
Yan Moon	do	25	Laborer	do	Do.
Yan Pue	do	28	do	do	Do.
Yau Tin	do	20	do	do	Do.
Choe Chow	do	20	do	do	Do.
He Yue	do	24	do	do	Do.
Yau Ting	do	38	do	do	Do.
Poon Pon	Oe Pang, Yock Tang	18	do	do	Do.
Poon Lin	do	16	do	do	Do.
Ho Hin	do	32	do	do	Do.
Yong Tack	do	35	do	do	Do.
Le Tong	do	27	do	do	Do.
Le Seng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chung Ke	do	38	do	do	Do.
Chung Yow	do	29	do	do	Do.
Chung Hing	do	36	do	do	Do.
Chung Hing	do	40	do	do	Do.
Ha Choe	Oe Pang, Yoe Chun	45	do	do	Do.
Wong Chung	do	20	do	do	Do.
Yon Sen	do	26	do	do	Do.
Ha Kin	do	38	do	do	Do.
Ha Chin	Oe Pang, Goe Chin	26	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Male.	Last place of residence.
Ha Cheng	Oe Pang, Yoe Chin	18	Laborer	Male	China.
Hu Tong	do	28	do	do	Do.
Lu Chong	do	28	do	do	Do.
Gon Kwong	do	44	do	do	Do.
Kwan Fat	do	20	do	do	Do.
Ho Seck	do	33	do	do	Do.
Ho Me	do	40	do	do	Do.
Hu Kam	do	24	do	do	Do.
Hu Wan	do	35	do	do	Do.
Hu Chye	do	25	do	do	Do.
Lon Him	do	29	do	do	Do.
Ho Hew	do	43	do	do	Do.
Warg Chong	do	40	do	do	Do.
Hu Hong	do	40	do	do	Do.
Hu Tack	do	26	do	do	Do.
Hu Yow	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hu Mye	do	16	do	do	Do.
Hu Hon	do	19	do	do	Do.
Hu Hing	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Seng	do	19	do	do	Do.
Wong Hin	do	35	do	do	Do.
Ha Chung	do	28	do	do	Do.
Hu Foon	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hu Seng	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hu Yon	do	30	do	do	Do.
Hu Kow	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chau Chan	Sun Hung, King Oe	20	do	do	Do.
Chau Kam	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chau Lock	do	32	do	do	Do.
Hoo Se	do	22	do	do	Do.
Kung Check	do	22	do	do	Do.
Lue Veng	do	33	do	do	Do.
Hung Hin	do	24	do	do	Do.
Hung Sen	do	19	do	do	Do.
Hung Chye	do	17	do	do	Do.
Hung Seung	do	15	do	do	Do.
Kwan Kan	do	16	do	do	Do.
Chen Tow	do	17	do	do	Do.
Chew Yon	do	22	do	do	Do.
Ho Pang	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chen Seeng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chen Koe	do	15	do	do	Do.
He Tin	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chau Tack	do	21	do	do	Do.
Chung Cho	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chung Hin	do	22	do	do	Do.
Fong Fock	do	21	do	do	Do.
Tong Choe	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chun Guin	Hong Shan, Sew Chin	42	do	do	Do.
Fye Heng	do	29	do	do	Do.
Chap Fue	do	41	do	do	Do.
Hye Seng	do	40	do	do	Do.
Wong Goe	do	18	do	do	Do.
Ho Cheock	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chuy Weng	do	23	do	do	Do.
Kye Lan	do	50	do	do	Do.
Ho Long	do	24	do	do	Do.
Ho Choe	do	23	do	do	Do.
Mack Kit	Sun Heng, Semg Chin	24	do	do	Do.
Mack Koon	do	14	do	do	Do.
Mack Seng	do	28	do	do	Do.
Mack Hen	do	26	do	do	Do.
Tom He	do	20	do	do	Do.
Ku Song	Sun Hue, Ha Fock	31	do	do	Do.
Kong Tyne	do	23	do	do	Do.
Kang Kang	do	27	do	do	Do.
King Sam	do	18	do	do	Do.
King Fye	do	23	do	do	Do.
King Sam	do	18	do	do	Do.
Se King	Sun Heng, Ha Chin	20	do	do	Do.
Le Hung	do	40	do	do	Do.
Le He	do	22	do	do	Do.
Le Sang	do	26	do	do	Do.
Le Chum	do	35	do	do	Do.
Le Yow	do	17	do	do	Do.
Le Chan	do	13	do	do	Do.
Le Gon	do	15	do	do	Do.
Le Koon	do	13	do	do	Do.
Chau Kwae	do	12	do	do	Do.
Chau Se	Sun Heng, Kong Oe	36	do	do	Do.
Hip Chung	do	32	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.	Age.	Occupation.	Male.	Last place of residence.
Chau Kock	Sun Heng, Kong Oe	32	Laborer	Male	China.
Chau Seek	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Hock	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chau Hing	do	24	do	do	Do.
Mack Chung	do	29	do	do	Do.
Hip Seng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chung Lam	do	22	do	do	Do.
Wong Yow	do	26	do	do	Do.
Hip Chung	do	38	do	do	Do.
Chau Sew	do	32	do	do	Do.
Chau Sap	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chau Ha	do	12	do	do	Do.
Chau Moon	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chau Wye	do	33	do	do	Do.
Chau Wa	do	22	do	do	Do.
Wong Man	do	28	do	do	Do.
He Chung	do	31	do	do	Do.
He Chuck	do	26	do	do	Do.
He Chow	do	32	do	do	Do.
He Heng	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chau Kit	do	20	do	do	Do.
Ma Kwong	do	25	do	do	Do.
Heong Fock	do	19	do	do	Do.
Heong Tip	do	33	do	do	Do.
Heong Yeng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chau Keng	do	22	do	do	Do.
Yan Yeck	Sun Heng, Koen Hung	31	do	do	Do.
Yan Teng	do	26	do	do	Do.
Yan Kweng	do	30	do	do	Do.
Hip Yeng	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chau Tuk	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chau Hung	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Fock	do	28	do	do	Do.
Le Tack	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chau Heng	do	21	do	do	Do.
Hip Seng	do	28	do	do	Do.
Wong Chow	do	15	do	do	Do.
Wong Kong	do	12	do	do	Do.
Ha Hip	Sun Heng, Ou Chun	32	do	do	Do.
Hu Fan	do	28	do	do	Do.
Hu Yow	do	28	do	do	Do.
Hu Fu	do	25	do	do	Do.
Hu Leong	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chew Ke	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chew Sae	do	22	do	do	Do.
Heong Seng	do	36	do	do	Do.
Hung Choe	do	18	do	do	Do.
Hu Sow	do	12	do	do	Do.
Hu Cheong	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Hu Fock	do	10	do	do	Do.
Ma Chon	do	8	do	do	Do.
Hu Leng	do	8	do	do	Do.
Tam Kam	Oe Peng, Sau Chin	24	Laborer	do	Do.
Tam Chock	do	22	do	do	Do.
Tam Chong	do	28	do	do	Do.
Tam Hop	do	21	do	do	Do.
Tung King	do	32	do	do	Do.
Chau Lung	do	36	do	do	Do.
Chau Tack	do	18	do	do	Do.
Tam Chung	do	12	do	do	Do.
Wong Fu	do	25	do	do	Do.
Tong He	do	23	do	do	Do.
Tang Chung	Ve Peng, Sau Chin	30	do	do	Do.
Fock King	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chau Che	do	23	do	do	Do.
He Mow	Sun Heng, Kuo Taw	24	do	do	Do.
He Ka	do	14	do	do	Do.
He Yam	do	39	do	do	Do.
He Peng	do	18	do	do	Do.
He Sam	do	32	do	do	Do.
He Lam	do	15	do	do	Do.
He Knock	do	17	do	do	Do.
He Sung	Lun Hue, Sam Ka	28	do	do	Do.
He Sam	do	24	do	do	Do.
He Chang	do	20	do	do	Do.
He Lang	do	16	do	do	Do.
Wong He	do	29	do	do	Do.
Wong Chang	do	19	do	do	Do.
Wong Hang	do	22	do	do	Do.
Wong Lam	do	23	do	do	Do.
Wong Man	do	24	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Wong Peng	Lun Hue, Sam Ka	30	Laborer	Male	China.
Chwe Lon	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chew Lung	do	28	do	do	Do.
Fong Kwae	do	30	do	do	Do.
Fong Chung	do	34	do	do	Do.
Le Hang	Sun Nue, Sam Ka	20	do	do	Do.
Le Ha	Sun Hue, Ga Kong	43	do	do	Do.
Chan King	do	35	do	do	Do.
Chan Le	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Kong	do	18	do	do	Do.
Chan Fock	do	40	do	do	Do.
Chan Ten	do	34	do	do	Do.
Kwan Wan	Num Oe, Kwo Keng	18	do	do	Do.
Lock Weng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Choe Kye	do	22	do	do	Do.
Choe Ho	do	24	do	do	Do.
Choe Wan	do	30	do	do	Do.
Tong Kan	Sun Hue, Ga Kong	28	do	do	Do.
Pon Ho	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chau Kwan	Num Oe, Koo King	24	do	do	Do.
Chau Yan	Poon Ghe, San Chin	26	do	do	Do.
Chau Kam	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chon Chong	do	32	do	do	Do.
Wong Kwan	do	22	do	do	Do.
Wong Chow	do	25	do	do	Do.
Mack Man	do	32	do	do	Do.
Low Weng	Sun Hue, Ha Chin	30	do	do	Do.
Low Heng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Fong Chin	do	23	do	do	Do.
Low Wa	do	16	do	do	Do.
Hung Yo	do	22	do	do	Do.
Tong Koe	do	25	do	do	Do.
Check Mue	Poon Ghe, Check Chin	42	do	do	Do.
Ha Chung	Sun Heng, Lai Peng	20	do	do	Do.
Hu Seng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Chung	do	16	do	do	Do.
Wong Keng	do	18	do	do	Do.
Tam Wye	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chow Meng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chow Seng	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chou San	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chau Se	do	18	do	do	Do.
Wong Pu	do	21	do	do	Do.
Wong Hung	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Wa	do	16	do	do	Do.
Chong Wye	do	18	do	do	Do.
Chen Long	do	34	do	do	Do.
Kwan Leng	do	23	do	do	Do.
Kwan Chong	do	25	do	do	Do.
Lam Fat	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Wong Chung	do	10	do	do	Do.
Chon Cheng	do	11	do	do	Do.
Chun Hin	do	9	do	do	Do.
Chon Wan	do	9	do	do	Do.
Chan Hin	do	24	Laborer	do	Do.
Mack Chung	Sun On, Sae Loo	28	do	do	Do.
Mack Fat	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chau Kung	Sun Heng, Lai Peng	22	do	do	Do.
Chew San	Pun Heng, Fu Kop	14	do	do	Do.
Chew Peng	do	12	do	do	Do.
Chew Choe	do	14	do	do	Do.
Chew Chew	do	14	do	do	Do.
Chew Sing	do	13	do	do	Do.
Fong Tim	do	23	do	do	Do.
Wye Sin	do	25	do	do	Do.
Kwan Fo	do	20	do	do	Do.
Kwan Se	do	22	do	do	Do.
Cheu Chung	Sun Heng, Lai Keng	14	do	do	Do.
Chung Che	do	35	do	do	Do.
Le Chung	do	30	do	do	Do.
He He	do	22	do	do	Do.
Lung Hoy	do	28	do	do	Do.
Che Kam	do	24	do	do	Do.
Tong Chung	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chan Seng	do	24	do	do	Do.
Tam Knock	Sun Heng, Tai Peng	36	do	do	Do.
Lock Kin	do	24	do	do	Do.
Le Weng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Tang Ock	do	22	do	do	Do.
Tang Kin	Oe San, Peng On	24	do	do	Do.
Kwan Hoe	Sun Heng, Ton Kock	35	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Male.	Last place of residence.
Lam Pack	Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	27	Laborer	Male	China.
Weng Chan	do	24	do	do	Do.
Chan Loe	do	30	do	do	Do.
Fong Choe	do	35	do	do	Do.
Hen Kwan	Heng Shan, Tai Son	28	do	do	Do.
Chan Wye	Sun Tack, Lai Peng	28	do	do	Do.
Tai Lock	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chau Seng	Sun Heng, Gow Long	32	do	do	Do.
Chow Chow	Tong Koon, Chow Chin	42	do	do	Do.
Chan King	Sun Hue, Chan Chung	25	do	do	Do.
Chan Kue	do	22	do	do	Do.
Chan Peng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chan Cheng	do	28	do	do	Do.
Hu Fan	Sun Heng, Sae San	42	do	do	Do.
Wong Teng	do	25	do	do	Do.
Chung Sin	do	44	do	do	Do.
Tang Choe	do	19	do	do	Do.
Chun Sung	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chun Ching	do	14	do	do	Do.
Chun Chuock	do	15	do	do	Do.
Chun Yock	do	15	do	do	Do.
Chan Che	do	9	do	do	Do.
Chou Kwan	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chan Hoe	do	29	do	do	Do.
Hip Chow	do	36	do	do	Do.
Hip Chin	do	30	do	do	Do,
Lock On	do	28	do	do	Do.
Chon Sung	do	16	do	do	Do.
Chan Peng	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Luo Knock	do	10	do	do	Do.
Chung Chang	do	30	Laborer	do	Do.
Hew Tang	do	18	do	do	Do.
Keng Tack	do	40	do	do	Do.
Kong Kwan	do	10	Student	do	Do.
Chan Kin	Sun On, Chan Chin	31	Laborer	do	Do.
Chan Seng	do	27	do	do	Do.
Chan Kwan	do	24	do	do	Do.
Gang Yan	Sun Heng, Ping Ou	27	do	do	Do.
He Wo	do	18	do	do	Do.
He Sung	do	37	do	do	Do.
He Cheng	do	37	do	do	Do.
He Tack	do	21	do	do	Do.
He Mow	do	17	do	do	Do.
He Pow	do	16	do	do	Do.
He Chan	do	12	do	do	Do.
He Weng	do	17	do	do	Do.
He Foon	do	18	do	do	Do.
Tam Knock	do	14	do	do	Do.
He Hin	do	18	do	do	Do.
He Loe	do	16	do	do	Do.
He Fue	do	19	do	do	Do.
Tang Chung	do	40	do	do	Do.
He Chan	do	21	do	do	Do.
He Heng	do	26	do	do	Do.
He Weng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Chau Mong	do	35	do	do	Do.
He Koe	do	22	do	do	Do.
Ho Heng	Hang Shan, Peng Sang	30	do	do	Do.
Ho Ku	do	32	do	do	Do.
He Me	do	28	do	do	Do.
Ho Lon	do	20	do	do	Do.
Ho San	do	31	do	do	Do.
Ho Kit	do	22	do	do	Do.
Ho Chun	do	25	do	do	Do.
Ho Tack	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Le Seng	Sun Heng, Chung Pun	22	Laborer	do	Do.
Chan Hin	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Yow	Sun Heng, Lai Yen	13	do	do	Do.
Lam Kwan	Sun Hue, Lo Ha	32	do	do	Do.
Wong Long	Sam Soe, Sam Shin	12	do	do	Do.
Chan Wa	Sun Heng, Sang Hop	28	do	do	Do.
Yong Yow	Sun Heng, King Ha	21	do	do	Do.
Lock Yong	Ta Hun, Hin Ting	22	do	do	Do.
Le Che	Oe Sam, Ping Chin	21	do	do	Do.
Leong Seng	do	35	do	do	Do.
Le Long	do	25	do	do	Do.
Le Se	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Tye	Poon He, San Chin	38	do	do	Do.
Ho Sang	Sun On, Ha Chin	27	do	do	Do.
Mack Che	Sun On, Hap Soe	25	do	do	Do.
Pu Lung	Sun On, Haye Soe	17	do	do	Do.

Report for the commissioner of immigration of the steamship Alaska, &c.—Continued.

Name.	Place of birth, (village and district.)	Age.	Occupation.	Sex.	Last place of residence.
Ku Sung	Sun Hue, La Fock	15	Laborer	Male	China.
Chau Chew	Chan Peng, San Chin	30	do	do	Do.
Ku Long	Sun Hue, San Chun	40	do	do	Do.
Ho Mock	Oe San, Lock Chin	25	do	do	Do.
Hung Ke	Sun Heng, Zai Peng	32	do	do	Do.
Hung Seng	do	24	do	do	Do.
Wong Che	do	40	do	do	Do.
Ma Weng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Hung Jack	do	20	do	do	Do.
Wong Chye	do	30	do	do	Do.
Ma Weng	do	20	do	do	Do.
Weng Pun	do	17	do	do	Do.
Wong Heng	do	15	do	do	Do.
Ma Che	do	17	do	do	Do.
Kwaan Foon	do	19	do	do	Do.
Se Che	do	16	do	do	Do.
Leng Seng	do	21	do	do	Do.
Kwan Seng	do	26	do	do	Do.
Sue Pack	Sun Heng, Lung Chun	17	do	do	Do.
Hue Foo	do	11	Student	do	Do.
Hue Son	do	12	do	do	Do.
Lue Hin	do	12	do	do	Do.
Lue Sin	do	25	Laborer	do	Do.
Leu Ke	Sun Hing, Lung Chun	25	do	do	Do.
He Fong	Oe Peng, Lock Teng	30	do	do	Do.
Ho Kye	do	10	Student	do	Do.
Peck He	do	12	do	do	Do.
Ho Chung	do	19	Laborer	do	Do.
Lu Mow	do	26	do	do	Do.
Yong Yan	Poon He, San Chin	25	do	do	Do.
Yong Chon	do	30	do	do	Do.
Le Kam	do	42	do	do	Do.
Ku Chung	do	31	do	do	Do.
Yong Che	do	28	do	do	Do.
Cheng Kit	do	26	do	do	Do.
Chung Me	Poon Ghe, San Chin	25	do	do	Do.
Hue Kin	Sun Heng, Chung Poon	22	do	do	Do.
Lu Su	do	22	do	do	Do.
Tang Teng	Nusmol, Kew Kong	30	do	do	Do.
Kwan Pat	do	30	do	do	Do.
Chow Chin	Sun Heng, Mock Chin	35	do	do	Do.
Hung Keng	Hung Shan, Nam Moon	31	do	do	Do.
Hung He	do	28	do	do	Do.

APPENDIX B.—EXHIBIT 2.

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT HONG-KONG.

I, the undersigned, consul of the United States for the island of Hong-Kong and the dependencies thereof, do hereby certify that the within-named persons, being inhabitants and subjects of China, to the number of one hundred and ninety-one male passengers and one female passenger, are, each and all of them, free and voluntary emigrants, going hence to San Francisco, in the United States of America, on board the steamship Gaelic, of Liverpool, and that I am personally satisfied by evidence produced of the truth of the facts herein mentioned.

Done in conformity with the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to prohibit the cooly trade," approved February 19, 1862; and "An act supplementary to the acts in relation to immigration," approved March 3, 1875.

Given under my hand and the seal of this consulate this 1st day of August, A. D. 1876.

[SEAL.]

D. H. BAILEY,
United States Consul,
Per M. HARLAN.

Number.	Place of embarkation.	Names and surnames of passengers.	Age.		Profession, occupation, or calling of passengers.	Native place, village, and district.	Port at which the passengers have contracted to land.	Whether free or hired emigrants.
			Male.	Female.				
1	Kong-Kong	Le Wai	23		Laborer	Sun Neng, Sun Chin	San Francisco	Free.
2	do	Wong Wan	29		do	do	do	Do.
3	do	Wong Chai	30		do	do	do	Do
4	do	Chong Hew	34		do	do	do	Do.
5	do	Fong Wong	14		do	do	do	Do.
6	do	Fong Tye	24		do	do	do	Do.
7	do	Wong How	34		do	do	do	Do.
8	do	Wong Hock	35		do	do	do	Do.
9	do	Wong Po	39		do	do	do	Do.
10	do	Chan Yan	28		do	do	do	Do.
11	do	Yue Lock	30		do	do	do	Do.
12	do	Le Po	30		do	do	do	Do.
13	do	Yip Kui	30		do	do	do	Do.
14	do	Wong Fook	30		do	do	do	Do.
15	do	Ng Cheong	16		do	do	do	Do.
16	do	Fong Gho	28		do	Hion Shan, Sak Ki	do	Do.
17	do	Low Chuck	30		do	do	do	Do.
18	do	Tang Ka	35		do	do	do	Do.
19	do	Wai Son	33		do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
20	do	Wai Mong	32		do	do	do	Do.
21	do	Yue Yuck	28		do	do	do	Do.
22	do	Yue On	40		do	do	do	Do.
23	do	Yue Chong	28		do	do	do	Do.
24	do	Yue Hew	22		do	do	do	Do.
25	do	Wong Sow	18		do	do	do	Do.
26	do	Ng Chan	20		do	do	do	Do.
27	do	Ng Chon	30		do	do	do	Do.
28	do	Ching Lan	40		do	Hion Shan, Nam Long	do	Do,
29	do	Ching Hang	35		do	do	do	Do.
30	do	Yip Fat	28		do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
31	do	Yip Lee	32		do	Sun Hue, Wa Chin	do	Do.
32	do	Le Tu	40		do	do	do	Do.
33	do	Le Fong	28		do	do	do	Do.
34	do	Le Hun	20		do	do	do	Do.
35	do	Tang Hun	24		do	do	do	Do.
36	do	Clung Wa	30		do	do	do	Do.
37	do	Le Kwan	30		do	do	do	Do.
38	do	Chan Chon	20		do	do	do	Do.
39	do	Ng Hock	32		do	Sun Neng, Seong Chin	do	Do.
40	do	Lue Kang	38		do	do	do	Do.
41	do	Lue Sing	27		do	do	do	Do.
42	do	Lue Sun	30		do	do	do	Do.
43	do	Lue Choy	17		do	do	do	Do.
44	do	Lue Gho	18		do	do	do	Do

Number.	Place of embarkation.	Names and surnames of passengers.	Age. Male.	Age. Female.	Profession, occupation, or calling of passengers.	Native place, village, and district.	Port at which the passengers have contracted to land.	Whether free or hired emigrants.
45	Hong-Kong	Lue Chung	18		Laborer	Sun Neng, Seong Chin	San Francisco	Free.
46	do	Lue Kwong	22		do	do	do	Do.
47	do	Lue Po	40		do	do	do	Do.
48	do	Lue Hiu	34		do	do	do	Do.
49	do	Chan Kwan	25		do	do	do	Do.
50	do	Chan Tack	31		do	do	do	Do.
51	do	Chan Slung	32		do	do	do	Do.
52	do	Chue Sing	15		do	do	do	Do.
53	do	Le Po	25		do	do	do	Do.
54	do	Le Chow	28		do	Hun Shan, Tak Ke	do	Do.
55	do	Wong Sam	40		do	do	do	Do.
56	do	Choy Wong	36		do	Nam Oi, Tai Chew	do	Do.
57	de	Tang Kun	40		do	do	do	Do.
58	do	Lung Nam	33		do	do	do	Do.
59	do	Chan Yong	30		do	do	do	Do.
60	do	Tang Chow	30		do	do	do	Do.
61	do	Sang Hing	23		do	do	do	Do.
62	do	Tang Che	15		do	do	do	Do.
63	do	Chen Fook	32		do	do	do	Do.
64	do	Yung Tack	35		do	do	do	Do.
65	do	Yick Sing	22		do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
66	do	Yick Cho	20		do	do	do	Do.
67	do	Lam Choy	24		do	do	do	Do.
68	do	Chan Hang	45		do	do	do	Do.
69	do	Yue Mow	36		do	do	do	Do.
70	do	Yue He	24		do	do	do	Do.
71	do	Yue Hip	32		do	do	do	Do.
72	do	Yue Cheong	17		do	do	do	Do.
73	do	Yue Nip	24		do	do	do	Do.
74	do	Yue Hui	32		do	do	do	Do.
75	do	Yue Chuck	17		do	do	do	Do.
76	do	Yue Chick	33		do	do	do	Do.
77	do	Yue Chan	32		do	do	do	Do.
78	do	Yue Tang	24		do	do	do	Do.
79	do	Yue On	26		do	do	do	Do.
80	do	Chau Chau	43		do	do	do	Do.
81	do	Cha Yan	41		do	do	do	Do.
82	do	Cha Ying	32		do	do	do	Do.
83	do	Cha Chon	20		do	do	do	Do.
84	do	Ng Cheong	22		do	do	do	Do.
85	do	Ng Hoon	33		do	do	do	Do.
86	do	Cha Hing	17		do	do	do	Do.
87	do	Ng Hing	25		do	do	do	Do.
88	do	Ng Fook	30		do	do	do	Do.

89	do	Ng Yue	34	do	do	do	Do.
90	do	Ng Hang	32	do	do	do	Do.
91	do	Ng Yow	28	do	do	do	Do.
92	do	Hue Fook	22	do	Hun Shan, Sak Ki	do	Do.
93	do	Hin Ping	27	do	Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	do	Do.
94	do	He Se	27	do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
95	do	Kwon On	45	do	do	do	Do.
96	do	Chau Fo	20	do	do	do	Do.
97	do	Chong Kang	25	do	do	do	Do.
98	do	Chong Po	35	do	do	do	Do.
99	do	Le Chuen	32	do	Sun Neng, Sing Chin	do	Do.
100	do	Le Mon	31	do	do	do	Do.
101	do	Le Chong	22	do	do	do	Do.
102	do	Lee Yee	24	do	do	do	Do.
103	do	Le Pui	20	do	do	do	Do.
104	do	Le Sun	19	do	do	do	Do.
105	do	Le Sam	18	do	do	do	Do.
106	do	Le Sow	20	do	do	do	Do.
107	do	Le Tye	22	do	do	do	Do.
108	do	Le Hot	17	do	do	do	Do.
109	do	Le How	35	do	do	do	Do.
110	do	Le Kat	23	do	do	do	Do.
111	do	Le Sue	30	do	do	do	Do.
112	do	Le Naur	28	do	do	do	Do.
113	do	Le Muo	28	do	do	do	Do.
114	do	Chau Pui	22	do	do	do	Do.
115	do	Le Hoon	22	do	Hion Shan, Nam Long	do	Do.
116	do	Chin Ko	40	do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
117	do	Hue Chow	25	do	Hion Shan, Nam Long	do	Do.
118	do	Yue Chung	28	do	do	do	Do.
119	do	Yue Che	28	do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
120	do	Yue Po	15	do	do	do	Do.
121	do	Yue Mo	28	do	do	do	Do.
122	do	Yue Son	26	do	Sun Neng, Wai Chin	do	Do.
123	do	Leong How	30	do	do	do	Do.
124	do	Ma Lam	28	do	do	do	Do.
125	do	Kweng Ng	27	do	do	do	Do.
126	do	Ching Nin	25	do	do	do 4	Do.
127	do	War Sow	32	do	Nion Shem, Nam Long	do	Do.
128	do	Leong Chung	36	do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
129	do	Son Fat	28	do	Nam Oi, La Wan	do	Do.
130	do	Chung Yune	40	do	Hion Shan, Sak Ki	do	Do.
131	do	Tav Ting	36	do	Sun Hue, Ha Chin	do	Do.
132	do	Chong Kin	35	do	do	do	Do.
133	do	Hong Cheong	19	do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
134	do	Chung Low	18	do	do	do	Do.
135	do	Chong Tack	28	do	do	do	Do.
136	do	Le Choy	38	do	do	do	Do.
137	do	Yip Pui	40		Hion Shan, Sak Ki	do	Do.
138	do	Low Hoon	32		Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	do	Do.
139	do	Yeong Hin	32		Hion Shan, Nam Long	do	Do.
140	do	Sun Yeong	30		do	do	Do.
					Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.

Number.	Place of embarkation.	Names and surnames of passengers.	Age. Male.	Age. Female.	Profession, occupation, or calling of passengers.	Native place, village, and district.	Port at which the passengers have contracted to land.	Whether free or hired emigrants.
141	Hong-Kong	Yon Cheong	11			Sun Neng, Ha Chin	San Francisco	Free.
142	do	Hue Tack	30			do	do	Do.
143	do	Low Che	20			do	do	Do.
144	do	Le Sum	20			do	do	Do.
145	do	Le Chong	28			do	do	Do.
146	do	Tam Chun	40			do	do	Do.
147	do	Leong Chong	32			Sun Neng, Kwong Chin	do	Do.
148	do	Leon Tack	18			do	do	Do.
149	do	Leong Sing	25			do	do	Do.
150	do	Owa Hin	40			Hion Shan, Sak Ki	do	Do.
151	do	Chew Sue	25		Laborer	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
152	do	Chew Yue	20		do	do	do	Do.
153	do	Chan Weng	22		do	do	do	Do.
154	do	Tam Chon	32		do	Oe Pang, Seong Chin	do	Do.
155	do	Tam Ping	27		do	do	do	Do.
156	do	Leong Lai		30	Married woman	Hong-Kong, Aberdeen	do	Do.
157	do	Tam Chew	29		Laborer	Oe Pang, Seong Chin	do	Do.
158	do	Tam Pun	28		do	do	do	Do.
159	do	Tam Ynew	31		do	do	do	Do.
160	do	Tam Choy	32		do	do	do	Do.
161	do	Tam Sang	25		do	do	do	Do.
162	do	Tam Che	20		do	do	do	Do.
163	do	Tam Ki	25		do	do	do	Do.
164	do	Tam Lam	40		do	do	do	Do.
165	do	Le Tong	26		do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
166	do	Yue Se	42		do	do	do	Do.
167	do	Leong Kwai	26		do	do	do	Do.
168	do	Leong Fat	22		do	do	do	Do.
169	do	Yeong Seng	22		do	do	do	Do.
170	do	Yeong Wing	30		do	Sun Hue, Ha Chin	do	Do.
171	do	Chan On	35		do	Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	do	Do.
172	do	Chan Moon	25		do	Nam Oe, Sa Chin	do	Do.
173	do	Chan Chun	25		do	Sun Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
174	do	Chan Yat	22		do	do	do	Do.
175	do	Chan Chung	32		do	do	do	Do.
176	do	Chan Kang	35		do	do	do	Do.
177	do	Chan Sik	31		do	do	do	Do.
178	do	Wong Chan	27		do	Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	do	Do.
179	do	Cha Seng	21		do	do	do	Do.
180	do	Lai Pun	22		do	do	do	Do.
181	do	Lai Yeong	20		Laborer	Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	do	Do.
182	do	Ho Lap	36		do	Sun Hue, Kong Moon	do	Do.
183	do	Leong Yow	25		do	do	do	Do.

184	do	Wang Yang	22	do	do	do	do	Do.
185	do	Ho Kong	30	do	do	do	do	Do.
186	do	Ho Chan	35	do	do	do	do	Do.
187	do	Leong Ow	28	do	do	do	do	Do.
188	do	Wong Man	24	do	do	do	do	Do.
189	do	Ho Choy	25	do	do	do	do	Do.
190	do	Leong Choy	34	do	do	do	do	Do.
191	do	Leong Fat	26	do	do	do	do	Do.
192	do	Ho Wo	28	do	do	do	do	Do.
193	do	Ho Hoon	22	do	do	do	do	Do.
194	do	Lue Sun	23	do	do	do	do	Do.
195	do	Lue Fat	30	do	do	Sem Neng, Ha Chin	do	Do.
196	do	Lue Ming	24	do	do	do	do	Do.
197	do	Lue Lan	28	do	do	do	do	Do.
198	do	Lo Hock	20	do	do	do	do	Do.
1	do	Yue Hem	10	do	Student	do	do	Do.
2	do	Mock Kow	5	do	With its mother	Poon Ghe, Ha Chin	do	Do

APPENDIX B.—EXHIBIT 3.

Emigration officer's certificate.

I hereby authorize the Chinese passenger-ship Gaelic, S. S., to proceed to sea for the port of San Francisco, in California, United States of America, and I certify that the said ship can legally carry 679 adults, and that there are on board 192 passengers, making in all 191 adults, viz., 189 men, 1 woman, 2 male children, and — female children, such children being between the ages of 1 and 12 years. That the space set apart and to be kept clear for the use of such emigrants is as follows: On the upper deck, 8,856 superficial feet, being for exercise; and in the between-deck and hospital 8,155 superficial feet, being for berths; that the ship is properly manned and fitted, and that the means of ventilating the part of the between-decks appropriated to passengers are as follows: Windsails, ventilators, and hatchways; that the ship is furnished with a proper quantity of good provisions, fuel, and water for 44 days' issues to the passengers, according to the annexed dietary scale, and with a proper quantity of medicines, instruments, and medical comforts according to the annexed scale of medical necessaries. To the best of my belief, none of these emigrants are under contract of service whatever; that no fraud appears to have been practiced in collecting the emigrants; and that there are on board one surgeon and one interpreter approved by me, and designated respectively Dr. Alexander J. Younger, surgeon; Hing On, interpreter.

The master of the ship is to put into Yokohama for water, coals, and fresh vegetables.

[SEAL.]

A. T. THOMPSON,
Emigration Officer, &c.

Dated at Hong-Kong this 1st day of August, 1876.

Note.—This ship is provided with 8 life-boats.

Attached to this certificate are—

1. Passenger-list as supplied by ship-master.
2. Schedule A of the Chinese passenger's act, 1855.
3. Port clearance.

APPENDIX C.

(See testimony of E. B. Vreeland, p. 177.)

Chy Lung, plaintiff in error, *vs.* J. H. Freeman, R. K. Plotrowski, commissioner of immigration, and William McKibbin, sheriff of the city and county of San Francisco, Cal. In error to the supreme court of the State of California.

Mr. Justice Miller delivered the opinion of the court:

While this case presents for our consideration the same class of State statutes considered in the Henderson *et al. v.* Mayor of the city of New York *et al.*, and Commissioners of Immigration *v.* North German Lloyd, *supra*, p. 259, it differs from them in two very important points.

These are, first, the plaintiff in error was a passenger on a vessel from China, being a subject of the Emperor of China, and is held a prisoner because the owner or master of the vessel who brought her over refused to give a bond in the sum of five hundred dollars in gold, conditioned to indemnify all the counties, towns, and cities of California against liability for her support or maintenance for two years.

Secondly, the statute of California, unlike those of New York and Louisiana, does not require a bond for *all* passengers landing from a foreign country, but only for classes of passengers specifically described, among which are "lewd and debauched women," to which class it is alleged plaintiff belongs.

The plaintiff, with some twenty other women, on the arrival of the steamer Japan from China, was singled out by the commissioner of immigration, an officer of the State of California, as belonging to that class, and the master of the vessel required to give the bond prescribed by law before he permitted them to land. This he refused to do, and detained them on board. They sued out a writ of *habeas corpus*, which, by regular proceedings, resulted in their committal, by order of the supreme court of the State, to the custody of the sheriff of the county and city of San Francisco, to await the return of the Japan, which had left the port pending the progress of the case; the order being to remand them to that vessel on her return, to be removed from the State.

All of plaintiff's companions were released from the custody of the sheriff on a writ of *habeas corpus* issued by Mr. Justice Field, of this court. But plaintiff, by a writ of error, brings the judgment of the supreme court of California to this court for the purpose, as we suppose, of testing the constitutionality of the act under which she is held a prisoner. We regret very much that while the Attorney-General of the United States has deemed the matter of such importance as to argue it in person, there has been no argument in behalf of the State of California, the commissioner of immigration, or the sheriff of San Francisco, in support of the authority by which plaintiff is

held a prisoner, nor have we been furnished even with a brief in support of the statue of that State.

It is a most extraordinary statute. It provides that the commissioner of immigration " is to satisfy himself whether or not any passenger who shall arrive in the State by vessels from any foreign port or place (who is not a citizen of the United States) is lunatic, idiotic, deaf, dumb, blind, crippled, or infirm, and is not accompanied by relatives who are able and willing to support him, or is likely to become a public charge, or has been a pauper in any other country, or is, from sickness or disease, existing either at the time of sailing from the port of departure, or at the time of his arrival in the State, a public charge, or likely soon to become so, or is a convicted criminal, or a lewd or debauched woman ;" and no such person shall be permitted to land from the vessel, unless the master or owner or consignee shall give a separate bond in each case, conditioned to save harmless every county, city, and town of the State against any expense incurred for the relief, support, or care of such person for two years thereafter. The commissioner is authorized to charge the sum of seventy-five cents for every examination of a passenger made by him, which sum he may collect of the master, owner, or consignee, or of the vessel by attachment.

The bonds are to be prepared by the commissioner, and two sureties are required to each bond, and for preparing the bond the commissioner is allowed to charge and collect a fee of three dollars; and for each oath administered to a surety, concerning his sufficiency as such, he may charge one dollar. It is expressly provided that there shall be a separate bond for each passenger; that there shall be two sureties on each bond, and that the same sureties must not be on more than one bond, and they must in all cases be residents of the State.

If the shipmaster or owner prefers, he may commute for these bonds by paying such a sum of money as the commissioner may in each case think proper to exact; and after retaining twenty per cent. of the commutation money for his services, the commissioner is required once a month to deposit the balance with the treasurer of the State. (See chapter I, article VII, of the Political Code of California, as modified by section 70 of the amendments of 1873, 1874.)

It is hardly possible to conceive a statute more skillfully framed, to place in the hands of a single man the power to prevent, entirely, vessels engaged in a foreign trade, say with China, from carrying passengers, or to compel them to submit to systematic extortion of the grossest kind.

The commissioner has but to go aboard a vessel filled with passengers ignorant of our language and our laws, and without trial or hearing or evidence, but from the external appearances of persons with whose former habits he is unfamiliar, to point with his finger to twenty, as in this case, or a hundred if he chooses, and say to the master, " these are idiots, these are paupers, these are convicted criminals, these are lewd women, and these others are debauched women. I have here a hundred blank forms of bonds printed. I require you to fill me up and sign each of these for $500 in gold, and that you furnish me two hundred different men, residents of this State, and of sufficient means, as sureties on these bonds. I charge you five dollars in each case for preparing the bond and swearing your sureties, and I charge you seventy-five cents each for examining these passengers, and all others you have on board. If you don't do this you are forbidden to land your passengers under a heavy penalty. But I have the power to commute with you for all this for any sum I may choose to take in cash. I am open to an offer; for you must remember that 20 per cent. of all I can get out of you goes into my own pocket, and the remainder into the treasury of California.

If, as we have endeavored to show in the opinion in the preceding cases, we are at liberty to look to the effect of a statute for the test of its constitutionality, the argument need go no further.

But we have thus far only considered the effect of the statute on the owner of the vessel.

As regards the passengers, section 2963 declares that consuls, ministers, agents, or other public functionaries of any foreign government, arriving in this State in their *official capacity*, are exempt from the provisions of this chapter.

All other passengers are subject to the order of the commissioner of immigration.

Individual foreigners, however distinguished at home for their social, their literary, or their political character, are helpless in the presence of this potent commissioner. Such a person may offer to furnish any amount of surety on his own bond, or deposit any sum of money, but the law of California takes no note of him. It is the master, owner, or consignee of the vessel alone whose bond can be accepted. And so a silly, an obstinate, or a wicked commissioner may bring disgrace upon the whole country, the enmity of a powerful nation, or the loss of an equally powerful friend.

While the occurrence of the hypothetical case just stated may be highly improbable, we venture the assertion that if citizens of our own Government were treated by any foreign nation as subjects of the Emperor of China have been actually treated under this law, no administration could withstand the call for a demand on such government for redress.

Or, if this plaintiff and her twenty companions had been subjects of the Queen of Great Britain, can any one doubt that this matter would have been the subject of international inquiry, if not of a direct claim for redress? Upon whom would such a claim be made? Not upon the State of California, for by our Constitution she can hold no exterior relations with other nations. It would be made upon the Government of the United States. If that Government should get into a difficulty which would lead to war or to the suspension of intercourse, would California alone suffer, or all the Union? If we should conclude that a pecuniary indemnity was proper as a satisfaction for the injury, would California pay it, or the Federal Government? If that Government has forbidden the States to hold negotiations with any foreign nations, or to declare war, and has taken the whole subject of those relations upon herself, has the Constitution, which provides for this, done so foolish a thing as to leave it in the power of the States to pass laws whose enforcement renders the General Government liable to just reclamations which it must answer, while it does not prohibit to the State the acts for which it is held responsible?

The Constitution of the United States is no such instrument. The passage of laws which concern the admission of citizens and subjects of foreign nations to our shores belongs to Congress and not to the States. It has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations; the responsibility for the character of those regulations, and for the manner of their execution, belongs solely to the national Government. If it be otherwise, a single State can, at her pleasure, embroil us in disastrous quarrels with other nations.

We are not called upon by this statute to decide for or against the right of a State, in the absence of legislation by Congress, to protect herself by necessary and proper laws against paupers and convicted criminals from abroad, nor to lay down the definite limit of such right, if it exist. Such a right can only arise from a vital necessity for its exercise, and cannot be carried beyond the scope of that necessity. When a State statute, limited to provisions necessary and appropriate to the object alone, shall in a proper controversy come before us, it will be time enough to decide that question. The statute of California goes so far beyond what is necessary or even appropriate for this purpose, as to be wholly without any sound definition of the right under which it is supposed to be justified. Its manifest purpose, as we have already said, is not to obtain indemnity, but money.

The amount to be taken is left in every case to the discretion of an officer, whose cupidity is stimulated by a reward of one-fifth of all he can obtain.

The money when paid does not go to any fund for the benefit of immigrants, but is paid into the general treasury of the State and devoted to the use of all her indigent citizens. The blind, or the deaf or the dumb passenger, is subject to contribution, whether he be a rich man or a pauper. The patriot seeking our shores, after an unsuccessful struggle against despotism in Europe or Asia, may be kept out because there his resistance has been adjudged a crime. The woman, whose error has been repaired by a happy marriage and numerous children, and whose loving husband brings her with his wealth to a new home, may be told she must pay a round sum before she can land, because it is alleged that she was debauched by her husband before marriage. Whether a young woman's manners are such as to justify the commissioner in calling her lewd may be made to depend on the sum she will pay for the privilege of landing in San Francisco.

It is idle to pursue the criticism. In any view which we can take of this statute it is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and therefore void.

Judgment reversed, and the case remanded with directions to make an order discharging the prisoner from custody.

APPENDIX D.

(See testimony of Frederick A. Gibbs, p. 201.)

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
NO. 4 SECOND FLOOR, CITY HALL,
San Francisco, October 25, 1876.

Order No. 1291, amending section 8 of chapter 2 of order No. 697, providing punishment for prisoners who refuse to labor on the public works, and for the cutting of the hair on male prisoners' heads to a uniform length.

The people of the city and county of San Francisco do ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 8 of chapter 2 of order No. 697 is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

[Providing punishment for prisoners who refuse to labor on the public works.]

SEC. 8. Any person undergoing or serving out a term of imprisonment in the county jail of this city and county, under a judgment of imprisonment rendered in a criminal action or proceeding, who refuses to labor or does not labor on the public works or ways, when so required, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

The sheriff is hereby empowered and required to feed any refractory prisoner or prisoners on a diet of bread and water during the time that such prisoner or prisoners refuse to labor or does not labor on said public works when required, or otherwise violate the discipline of the jail, and to inflict upon such prisoner or prisoners such other and additional punishment by solitary confinement as may be deemed necessary and proper in the judgment of the committee on health and police, during the time that such prisoner or prisoners remain refractory.

Each and every male prisoner incarcerated or imprisoned in the county jail of this city and county, under and pursuant to a judgment or conviction had by any court having jurisdiction of criminal cases in this city and county, shall, immediately upon their arrival at said county jail, under and pursuant to a judgment or sentence as aforesaid, have the hair of their head cut or clipped to a uniform length of one inch from the scalp thereof. It shall be and is hereby made the duty of the sheriff to have enforced the provisions of this order.

In board of supervisors, San Francisco, June 12, 1876, after having been published five successive days, according to law, taken up and passed by the following vote:

Ayes—Supervisors Drucker, Edwards, Bryan, Wise, Shine, Eaton, Hayes, Roberts, Gibbs, Macdonald.

Noes—Supervisors Strother, Boyce.

JNO. A. RUSSELL, *Clerk.*

Approved, San Francisco, June 14, 1876.

A. J. BRYANT,
Mayor, and ex-officio President Board of Supervisors.

A true and correct copy of Order No. 1291 of the board of supervisors.

JNO. A. RUSSELL, *Clerk.*

APPENDIX E.

(See testimony of James R. Rogers, p. 231.)

GENTLEMEN: In compliance with the instructions received from your honorable committee, I have endeavored, in the limited time in which I was engaged in the matter, (six days,) to obtain and collect for your information details relative to the different industrial pursuits which are either monopolized by the Chinese or are fast becoming so. From the fact that this class of our community have reduced the prices to what would be almost starvation to our white men and women, thereby showing the cause, in a great measure, of the lack of employment in our city, and the prolific cause of our young men growing up in idleness, and our women, in very many instances, driven to the last resort, of which our city will furnish abundant proof, these are matters of the most serious consideration. It would require, as will be apparent to your committee, considerably more time to collect for your information reliable and thoroughly accurate data regarding the inroads made upon the different avocations whereby our citizens are gaining their livelihood; but, as before stated, the extremely limited time allowed me must be my excuse for giving the general summary which I have the honor to offer for your consideration.

CIGAR-MAKING.

There are about three thousand three hundred Chinese employed in the business of cigar-making, earning from forty to ninety cents, and perhaps in some instances one dollar per day. There are in the vicinity of two hundred and sixty places where cigars are manufactured, the larger proportion of which are carried on by Chinese, and a very small number where Chinese and white labor are employed conjointly. The number of cigars manufactured in the first congressional district of California during the last twelve months, nine-tenths of which have been made in the city and county of San Francisco and by Chinese labor, amounts to one hundred and twenty million five hundred and ninety-eight thousand. This includes about six million cigaritos. Deduct six million made by white labor, and the balance, one hundred and fourteen million five hundred and ninety-eight thousand, remains. Many of the cigaritos are manufactured from the butts of cigars picked up from the street, in front of cellars and bar-rooms, as can be seen gathered by Chinamen every morning on our public streets. These are again manufactured into material for smoking, and sold at the different Chinese depots at the rate of five cents per package, made up in the form of cigaritos.

OF LAUNDRIES

there are about three hundred scattered throughout the city, averaging five men each. Some of these establishments employ double sets of hands and run day and night. It may safely be said there are fifteen hundred men employed, exclusively Chinese, in Chinese wash-houses in this city, while as many more are employed at the larger establishments of the same nature which are carried on by white management. Not less than three thousand men are employed in this business alone.

PEDDLING.

About three hundred are engaged in peddling fruit, vegetables, and fish, while many others are engaged in going from house to house selling laces, tape, needles, pins, matches, cigars, and human hair, which our ladies use to adorn their heads; in fact, almost all the material sold in our small retail dry-goods stores can be procured from Chinamen at your door, and at prices which those who are doing a legitimate business cannot possibly compete with.

CLOTHING.

There are about thirty manufactories of men's clothing carried on by Chinese, the men doing the main portion of the work, while the women do the light finishing.

SLIPPER-MANUFACTORIES.

Of these there are eleven, where large quantities of this article are made, the main work being done by men at the shop, and the finishing by Chinese women at their homes during the day; in fact, nearly all of this article is from Chinese labor.

SHOES AND GAITERS.

A very large number of men are employed and an immense amount of material manufactured into merchandise of this nature, of which my limited time does not allow me to give you the full details, but there is no doubt but what eight-tenths of the ladies' and children's gaiters and shoes made in this city are of Chinese manufacture.

Shirts, night-dresses, chemises—in fact, every article of such nature—are being made up in large quantities by Chinamen and Chinese women; this to the dismay of our sewing-girls, who vainly attempt to compete with Chinese labor. In very many of our retail stores where such merchandise as ladies' underwear is displayed for sale, the articles are the production and handiwork of a Chinaman, to the exclusion of the white girl, who, up to the present time, has made an honorable living by her needle.

LODGING-HOUSES.

There are about thirty known as such, where Chinese herd in large numbers, while there are very many more places of a similar nature. Very few of the domestics employed in families but what sleep in the Chinese quarter, sleeping in rooms containing from six men to twenty and forty, and even one hundred have been known to occupy a single apartment. Closed at all points, the atmosphere, upon entering one of these places in the morning, is beyond description. As a sanitary measure, this is a matter that should and has engaged the attention of the authorities; and the law known as the "pure-air law" was passed by our legislature as a purely sanitary measure, and for the protection of our citizens and the prevention of an epidemic. This law is being enforced by the police department.

DOMESTICS.

There are about five thousand Chinese employed as cooks, nurses, dish-washers, bed-makers, and waiters. These are employed by families, lodging-houses, &c.

HOUSES OF ILL-FAME

have been principally confined to the small streets and alleys in the Chinese quarter of this city, and comprise in number between one hundred and fifty and two hundred. These are occupied by a class of inmates brought to this country for the purpose of serving a term of years as prostitutes. During the day these women, as far as practicable, are employed at the various branches of industry, as working on shirts, slippers,

men's clothing, women's underwear, &c. As this class of operatives do not receive pay for this extra work, it must naturally work a fearful injury to the honest white girl who depends upon her needle for her support. I need not describe in detail these places, or their disastrous tendencies upon our community, as the public press, from time to time, have fully advised you in all matters connected with this branch of our Chinese quarter.

THE MANUFACTURE OF SHIRTS

of every description has been largely engaged in and is being carried on extensively by Chinese, giving employment to both men and this class of women.

OPIUM-SMOKING.

This habit had formerly been practiced by the Chinese almost exclusively, every Chinese house being provided with the drug, together with all the implements for using the article. Regular depots are also established, where opium is smoked at regular and stated prices, where parties smoke until insensible, then sleep off the deadly effects. While this was practiced among the Chinese alone, no particular attention was given the subject, but very recently not less than eight places have been started, furnished with opium-pipes, beds for sleeping off the fumes, &c. These latter places were conducted by Chinamen, and patronized by both white men and women, who visited these dens at all hours of the day and night, the habit and its deadly results becoming so extensive as to call for action on the part of the authorities, and an ordinance was passed which had the effect of breaking up those places, but the practice, deeply rooted, still continues. The department of police, in enforcing the law with regard to this matter, have found white women and Chinamen side by side under the effects of this drug—a humiliating sight to any one who has anything left of manhood.

THE PRACTICE OF GAMBLING

has been carried on very extensively in all its various branches. The many places where this vice has been carried on are now being kept closed by order of the chief of police, as far as practicable.

THE DIFFERENT ASSOCIATIONS,

such as brokers, butchers, carpenters, employment offices, jewelers, watchmakers, pawn-shops, tinsmiths, barbers, joss-houses, and, in fact, very many other matters connected with this class of our community, had I the time, I should be glad to give you the details; but, as before stated, the excuse must be given for this short report which I offer you.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES R. ROGERS.

APPENDIX F.

(See testimony of Cameron H. King, p. 262.)

Constitution and by-laws of the Anti-Chinese Union of San Francisco.

OFFICERS.

President—Cameron H. King, 207 Sansome street.
Vice-presidents—John Sratman, P. J. Grimes.
Recording secretary—Walter Gallagher, 564 Mission street.
Corresponding secretary—C. D. Douglass, corner First avenue and Sixteenth street.
Treasurer—Joseph Monaghan, Mission street, near First.
Committee on constitution and by-laws—C. H. King, P. J. Grimes, Barney Rosenblatt, J. Gilbraith, J. K. Warren, C. D. Douglass, J. Mulvey, A. Candan.
Honorary vice-presidents—A. A. Sargent, Newton Booth, W. A. Piper, J. K. Luttrell, H. F. Page, H. D. Wigginton, William Irwin, Thomas Beck, W. B. C. Brown, J. G. Estudillo, Peter Donohue, John M. Days, F. McCoppin, Robert Howe, P. A. Roach, F. Pixley, F. F. Strother, D. A. McDonald, C. B. Edwards, Thomas Bryan, John H. Wise, John P. Shine, Frederick W. Eaton, George W. Hayes, W. H. L. Barnes, M. M. Estee, August Drucker, J. H. O'Reiley, John Harrold, James Glynn, O. H. Lagrange, Miles D. Sweeney, Timothy G. Phelps, Timothy McCarthy, R. B. Woodward, E. W. Casey, J. J. Kelley, B. F. Swan, J. R. Forbes, Abram Block, Barclay Henley, J. C. Mitchell, E. Casserly, James A. Johnson, James Coey, M. McDonald, T. P. Ryan, William Blanding, Thomas

Boyce, J. C. Roberts, F. A. Gibbs, A. J. Bryant, William Dunphy, George Hewston, T. B. Shannon, Robert Ferral, J. G. Downey, John S. Mears, J. C. Shorb, J. B. Felton, J. D. Byers, J. W. McBride, E. J. Lewis, John Boggs, D. W. McCallum, Leon Freer, Major Briggs, M. P. O'Connor, C. T. Ryland, Irving M. Scott, William Watt, J. M. Coghlan, M. J. Donovan, George S. Evans, Robert McGarvey, James A. Murphy, W. J. Tinnen, Jo. Hamilton, J. C. Bradley, George Berry, Henry Larkin, Charles Gildea, William Minnis, James T. Farley, W. H. Stowers, D. J. Oullahan, Thomas Fowler, Chalmers Scott, A. Craig, Clarence Upton, General Winn.

Constitution of the Anti-Chinese Union.

ARTICLE I.

NAME

SECTION 1. This association shall be called "THE ANTI-CHINESE UNION."

ARTICLE II.

OBJECTS.

SECTION 1. Its objects are to protect the people of the United States from the degrading influences of Chinese labor in any form; to discourage and stop any further Chinese immigration; to compel the Chinese living in the United States to withdraw from the country; and to unite, centralize, and direct the Anti-Chinese strength of our country to the end that good order and harmony may prevail, that no law may be violated, and the great objects herein enumerated may be fully accomplished by the use of lawful means.

ARTICLE III.

SECTION 1. This association shall be composed of the officers of, and five (5) delegates from, each anti-Chinese club in this State, which shall adopt a constitution in harmony with the constitution of this association.

SEC. 2. Each anti-Chinese club in this State, desiring representation in this association hereafter, shall adopt a constitution which shall, among other things, contain the following provisions:

1. That each member of that club shall pledge himself to abide by and obey the constitution and by-laws of that club, and not to employ Chinese labor, not to purchase any goods from any person who employs Chinese labor, and not in any manner to sustain, foster, or encourage either the Chinese or those who employ them.

2. That measures shall be taken by that club to ascertain and publish the names of persons and corporations employing Chinese, and when so officially announced by that club, or by any other regular anti-Chinese club belonging to this association, as a supporter of Chinese labor, no member shall thereafter purchase any article or commodities from such person or corporation, or bestow patronage upon such person or corporation in any form whatever. No member shall vote for any Chinese employer for any office whatever.

3. That any member of that club violating his pledge may be fined in an amount to be fixed by the club, or if the offense is a grave one, such member may, in the discretion of the club, be expelled. If a member be so expelled, the various clubs belonging to this association shall be notified thereof. No member of that club shall recognize or hold any intercourse, social or otherwise, with any person so expelled from any club belonging to this organization.

4. That only lawful means shall be used in the suppression of Chinese immigration and the expulsion of the Chinese from the United States. The club shall not arm its members, nor organize itself into a military company.

5. That the club, and each member thereof, will refrain from molesting, abusing, or maltreating Chinamen, and discourage and prevent, as far as possible, all unprovoked assaults upon Chinese residents.

SEC. 3. The Anti-Chinese Union will not hereafter recognize any anti-Chinese club until such club shall have adopted a constitution in accordance herewith.

ARTICLE IV.

SECTION 1. Any person aggrieved by the action of any club belonging to this association shall have the right to appeal from the decision of such club to this association; and the decision of this association shall be final, and each club belonging hereto shall respect and enforce such decision.

ARTICLE V.

SECTION 1. Questions of a political, partisan character, or incompatible with the true aim of this association, shall not be allowed for debate; nor shall politics ever be discussed in this association, or in the clubs which compose it, except as it may be connected with the true objects and interests of this association and the principles which it espouses.

ARTICLE VI.

SECTION 1. This constitution can only be amended by giving one week's notice of intention so to do to the secretary, at a regular meeting, stating the nature and form of the amendment.

ARTICLE VII.

SECTION 1. The officers of this association shall consist of one president, two vice-presidents, and such a number of honorary vice-presidents as the club shall elect, a recording secretary, a corresponding secretary and a treasurer, and an executive committee consisting of five (5) members elected by the club.

SEC. 2. The duties of the several officers shall be such as usually appertain to the office, and also such as this association may hereafter prescribe.

SEC. 3. The officers shall be elected immediately upon the adoption of this constitution, and every six months thereafter.

By-laws.

ARTICLE I.

RULES.

1. The regular meetings of this union shall be on 1st and 3d Mondays of each month, at 8 o'clock p. m.

2. Twenty members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

3. Any member who in debate becomes unruly, or uses any unparliamentary language, or refuses to take his seat when directed by the president, may be fined in any sum not exceeding one dollar, ($1.00,) and shall not be permitted to vote or speak until such sum is paid.

4. Any officer failing to attend any regularly-called meeting of the club, or any member of committee failing to attend committee-meetings duly called, will be fined fifty (50) cents; any chairman of a committee failing to make his report at the prescribed time, shall be liable for the fines of all members composing the committee.

5. There shall be elected by the club such a number of honorary members as the union may deem proper. They shall be called honorary vice-presidents. They shall not be entitled to any vote. On their acceptance after election they shall be assessed each the sum of ten dollars, ($10.)

6. Each club represented in this union shall pay a quarterly assessment of ten dollars, ($10,) which shall be due on the first Mondays in July, October, January, and April of each year.

7. No club shall be entitled to a voice in this union after the first Monday in July, 1876, unless its dues are paid.

8. The president, recording and corresponding secretaries shall constitute a committee on credentials, and shall decide upon the eligibility of delegates, and all contests on credentials.

9. Cushing's Manual shall be recognized as authority in the parliamentary management of all meetings of the club. No member shall speak more than once upon any subject until others desiring to speak have addressed the club, except by permission of the president of the club.

10. If a delegate is absent from any meeting without sufficient excuse, he shall be fined twenty-five (25) cents the first time, and fifty (50) cents each successive meeting; and if absent more than three (3) successive meetings, he may be suspended, and his club notified thereof.

11. The treasurer shall give bonds in the sum of five hundred dollars ($500.)

12. There shall be a finance committee consisting of the president, recording secretary, treasurer, and four (4) members to be elected by the club. They shall audit all bills.

13. Each club shall file with the recording secretary a copy of their constitution and by-laws, the names of their officers, and the number and names of their members.

14. This union may at any time go into an executive session for the consideration of business, and at such session none but delegates and members shall be permitted to be present.

15. Each member shall as he addresses the chair announce his name and the name of his club.

16. Any delegate regularly appointed by an Anti-Chinese club may be represented in this union by proxy.

APPENDIX G.

(See the testimony of William Vinton, p. 308.)

Presented on behalf of the Labor Union of San José, California.

To the honorable members of the United States congressional Committee on Chinese Immigration:

GENTLEMEN: As our association is composed mostly of workingmen, fathers of families, for whose welfare in the future we naturally have a deep interest as regards their ability to make an honest livelihood, we have taken the privilege of presenting a few items to your honorable body as regards the Chinese in Santa Clara County. First as to numbers: There are, as near as we can ascertain, between three and four thousand in the county. In the city of San José there are between thirteen and fourteen hundred resident Chinese, if we may use that term in regard to them; that is the number usually here. As to their morality, the items regarding Chinatown will explain for itself, and the statistics from the police-court will show the almost impossibility of convicting of crime from the unreliability of evidence. Chinatown occupies about a block, almost in the center of town; it contains about 1,000 Chinese, 28 places of prostitution, 143 prostitutes, 38 gambling-dens. Number of opium-rooms we cannot ascertain, but there are a great many of them, and, sad to relate, many white people are rapidly learning the fearful vice. There is also two lottery-drawings daily, at 10.30 a. m. and 2 p. m.

Chinatown has about 1,000, of whom over 400 never do a day's work; they live by trading, stealing, and gambling, the two latter largely predominating. From Saturday evening until Sunday evening is their harvest, and at that time large numbers come into town and spend their time and money; and between prostitutes, thieves, and gamblers they get cleaned out. Such is the morals of Chinatown. We had nearly forgotten to mention the existence of a secret order of thieves, numbering from 90 to 100. As to their habits and cleanliness, language would utterly fail to describe, and it must be seen to be believed, or otherwise any statement would be discredited.

Do they prevent white immigration? We know that most assuredly they do, as of our personal knowledge we know numbers of laboring-men during the past year that have come to the coast, and have had to leave the coast for lack of employment, in consequence of their inability to compete with Mongolians, and thus sustains a loss, through their influence, when they return to their old homes, not yet cursed by the presence of the Chinese. As to its effects on labor, we know that it degrades labor to a fearful extent and closes up about all the avenues of employment to our boys and girls, thus leaving our rising generation in a fearful condition, in fact so fearful that we shrink with horror from the contemplation of what must be the final result of the evil unless we obtain some relief.

Submitting these few items for your consideration, and any further information you may desire will be furnished by our delegate to your honorable commission, we remain, yours, obediently, the Anti-Cooly and Workingmen's Protective Association of San José.

J. J. McDANIEL,
President.

APPENDIX H.

(See the testimony of Rev. Augustus W. Loomis, p. 454.)

Presbyterian mission, members of the church, (86 have been received)	69
Methodist mission	45
First Congregational Church, Oakland	17
Baptist Church, Oakland	7
Baptist Church, San Francisco	5
Presbyterian Church, Oakland	14
Presbyterian Church, Santa Barbara	5
Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles	8

Presbyterian Church, Sacramento	8
Presbyterian Church, San José	9
Presbyterian Church, San Leandro	13
Presbyterian Church, Marysville	3
Congregational Church, San Francisco	28
Congregational Church, in other places	15
	246

Many have united with the church in Portland.

Rev. W. C. Pond gave the number of Chinese professing Christians in California several months ago as 312. Several have been added since then. He says that in connection with the American Missionary Association there have been baptized 135.

APPENDIX I.

(See the testimony of Rev. Augustus W. Loomis, p. 458.)

PACIFIC GROVE RETREAT, MONTEREY BAY,
San Francisco, October 12, 1876.

DEAR BROTHER: The Chinese who have been baptized and received into the church in connection with this mission will compare quite favorably, on the whole, with the members of Methodist churches composed of other nationalities, as to steadfastness, consistency, advance in knowledge, and growth in grace.

They are apparently sincere, and I think few, if any, have joined the church from selfish motives.

Some of them make considerable sacrifice for Christ's sake, and some have endured persecution even to blows.

Of the forty-five baptized by me, one woman has been turned out of the church, because she married a man who has a wife living in China.

One man returned to China, and by his friends and relatives was enticed or forced to deny the faith, and has been expelled. One man living in a Roman Catholic family was induced to leave us, and professed to become a Roman Catholic, but in about one year's time he came back with tears of hearty contrition and asked to be re-admitted. He was received.

One or two of the members of my church are worldly, and give me much anxiety and trouble. One woman, whose husband is not a Christian, has been induced to attend the theater once or twice.

With these exceptions, the Chinese members of my church are making commendable progress in Christian knowledge and experience.

Yours, truly,

O. GIBSON.

Rev. Dr. LOOMIS.

SAN FRANCISCO, *October* 13, 1876.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 11th reached me to-day. As to the capacity of our pupils and their proficiency, I may say that we attempt only the very rudiments of English education in our schools. Some are very bright, and get on rapidly. In respect to deportment, diligence, and success, our pupils will, on the average, considering the difficulties in their way, compare very favorably with any that I have ever known.

About 135 have become Christians in connection with our labors. They give better evidence, on the average, of genuine conversion than an equal number of church-members of our own race, taken at random, would give. That they are not all hypocrites I know by the best of proof—the fruits.

Some of those who have returned to China we are unable to know anything about, except as we believe in the promises of God, as fulfilled in their case. Concerning others we know, through the testimony of such a man as Rev. Dr. Happer, for example. They are all anxious to take with them some certificate of Christian character, in order, if they are thrown among Christian people, to become identified with them.

I believe that I have thus answered your inquiries. As to my experience, my reports, which I think you have, will tell the story better than I could do it in the time now at my command. I grow more impressed with the promise and the preciousness of this missionary work with every month of service in it.

Yours, truly,

WM. C. POND.

Rev. A. W. LOOMIS, D. D.

SAN LEANDRO, CAL., *October* 16, 1876.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 11th instant was promptly received, but the multiplicity of labors at the close of the week have prevented an earlier answer. I am glad to answer your interrogatories, and also hope after the congressional Chinese commission arrive to meet them personally, as all sides of the question should be presented.

To question first. In intelligence, proficiency, and general deportment, I never had charge of a class of young men of any nationality superior to them. I was at the head of a high school three years in Ohio, with a hundred pupils, and consequently some experience. My class of 20 are all very intelligent house-servants, and all promising, save one or two, and studying to be teachers of their race. For the time they study they make rapid progress, are very studious, cleanly, orderly, quiet, of keen perceptions, and all the instincts of true gentlemanliness.

Question second. They are highly susceptible of moral and religious impressions, have abjured idolatry, have abandoned all vicious habits. Thirteen are undoubted Christians, all are naturally religious, and they are the most devoted and consistent Christians I have in my church, (Presbyterian.) The evidence of their conversion is in enduring persecution patiently, in prayerfulness, in self-denial to do others good, in unbounded gratitude, in refusing large wages in irreligious families and taking half wages in Christian families, in honesty, truthfulness, and candor, and by every test we apply to the white race. They will give their last cent to any good object appealing to them.

Question third. They do not profess religion from worldly motives by proofs stated above. They endure persecution from our own and their race with true heroism and patience, and without repining.

Question fourth. In comparison with other nationalities, they are more eager to know and do the truth. Their faith is simple, child-like, and absolute, and attended with no doubts. As fast as they become acquainted with the Christian religion they embrace it cordially.

Question fifth. As to their gratitude, it is simply unbounded. I have never met with such affecting instances in a life-time as among my boys. It is universal among them.

Question sixth. My Chinese church-members are the best and the most consistent of any. They keep the Sabbath conscientiously, always attend the church-services, and in their daily walk compel men to say, "Well, indeed, they are living Christians." They always take part in prayer-meeting when called upon, are never forward and obtrusive, and generous to a fault for any church object.

I have not told the half. If every church on the coast had such a class, (and they could have,) it would soften some of the terrible aspects of the case, and not a doubt remains on my mind that if the Christian churches will do their duties to the Chinese, the terror of their flood would be greatly abated.

Yours, very truly,

J. M. OVIATT,
Pastor Presbyterian Church.

Rev. Dr. LOOMIS.

SACRAMENTO, CAL., *October* 19, 1876.

DEAR SIR: Both of your letters have come duly to hand. I have talked with the two candidates for baptism from the Chinese mission, and had them for prayer in my study. I am pleased with their appearance, and as you seem to think it will be proper, I will bring them, after further conference, before our session. Our trustees have appropriated three dollars to purchase Chinese translations of the Articles of Faith, which I sent you. This, with the money received from brethren at synod, will make seven dollars and a half. So that the way is clear for you to send to China and have at least as many printed as can be bought for that amount. But I think others would like some after a time, and would it not pay for the mission to have a larger quantity struck off and kept on hand in San Francisco for sale? After the types are set up the expense of printing additional copies is not large. Still do not go beyond the seven dollars and a half, unless you think it wise.

In regard to the questions asked me in your first letter, I will say what I can from my short experience of less than two years with the Chinese in California. Taking the points in order as suggested by you:

I have found the Chinese susceptible of good impressions, and they seem, as a rule, grateful for instruction. We have in our church eight Chinese members, in whom the session have as much confidence as in the other members, and their examination was quite as satisfactory. Others are seeking to be baptized.

The Christian Chinamen give evidence of their conversion in carefully studying the Bible, in habitual prayer, in solicitude for the salvation of their acquaintances, in quietly enduring persecution and ridicule for Christ's sake, and in general improvement of their life.

As a mark of growth in grace, I have noticed *humility* most simple and genuine, both as regards personal attainments and as regards the means of doing Christian work.

I cannot compare them with immigrants from other countries, as my experience is not wide enough; but usually Chinamen must be judged as all men are judged.

As to general deportment and progress, scholars in our evening school are models worthy to be copied.

The habits and traditions of life in China obstruct them greatly, but they succeed well in overcoming the prejudices of their nation.

I think I have touched upon all the points mentioned in your letter. What I have said I give as testimony; perhaps too briefly.

Sincerely, yours,

HENRY H. RICE.

Rev. Dr. LOOMIS.

P. S.—We should like very much to have Tam Hing or some colporteur come up for a while and help us.—H. H. R.

OAKLAND, *October* 20, 1876.

DEAR SIR: I can speak of only five years' acquaintance with the Chinese. During the two past years my Bible class has interested me most, and brought me into close relations with Christian Chinamen. This class was started with eight young converts, to which were added Christians and truth-seekers, until it has reached an average of forty-three. These gather with no other object than Bible study, and that is the only book used. They will not receive the truth until it has been fully investigated, and when thus received, it has a controlling power over them. I have had Bible students in class much of the time for thirty years, but the Chinese excel all others in patient investigation and a manifest desire to know the truth. I cannot recall a case of decided inattention. The Christian young men I find truthful, honest, and reliable, obeying the commands of Christ as nearly as any nationality. They are not hypercritics or mote-seekers, are not tale-bearers; they go and tell Jesus their own sins and ask help to amend. They abound in that charity that thinketh no evil.

The new converts labor with zeal for their countrymen, and even with our own ungodly people, and this through severe persecutions. There is none of that easy-going, half-hearted, nominal Christianity among them.

To me the Chinese Christian presents the best evidence of the power of the Holy Spirit to new-create men and make them Christlike.

Very truly, yours,

E. H. HYDE.

Rev. Dr. LOOMIS.

SANTA BARBARA, *October* 25, 1876.

DEAR BROTHER: I answer questions as per numbers:

1. I have taught and labored with them here for three years.

2. They surprise me with their capacity and desire for information of all kinds. It is more pleasant to teach Chinese than any other people I have ever had anything to do with. Their progress is simply astonishing and their behavior always good.

3. I have five boys as members in my own church. I can trust them about as far as any member of the church; and their efforts to grow shame many of their fellow-Christians. The progress is slow, of course, but they are anxious and earnest.

4. They are always in their places in the church and Sunday-school, when it is at all possible.

5. I think the Chinese are the most hopeful people in the world in the matter of evangelistical work.

Neither time nor labor can be bestowed to better purpose than in teaching and christianizing this interesting people.

I left word with Shearer to ask you to get up for our Sunday-school (American) two copies of the Creed, in stencil, in large letters, to hang on the wall. Has he given you the order? He said your boys were accustomed to do the like of this neatly. Please send them by mail or express, and I shall remit at once.

Truly, yours,

E. GRAHAM.

OAKLAND, CAL., *November* 1, 1876.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Yours of October 12 was handed me by Mr. Hyde last evening.

In reply, am happy to state with reference to our Chinese church-members—of whom we have seventeen, some of whom have been members six years—that we have no doubt whatever of their sincerity; their whole course of life, so far as known to us, attesting it. I think I can answer affirmatively all the questions propounded in your letter of inquiry. I should say that no seventeen persons of our membership, of equal age in the Christian life, show greater intelligence respecting the duties of their

calling and the truths of the Bible, or make more marked advancement in all those things which constitute Christian living.

So far as I know, all the officers of our church, and the others who have the means of knowing about these Chinese members, feel the same confidence about them which I feel, and the same encouragement toward bringing the Chinese in large masses under the transforming and purifying influences of our holy Christian religion. We regard them as no farther away from that holiness of heart and life which is requisite to make men of any race acceptable to God than the other people for whom we have occasion to labor; and our experience leads us to believe that effort for them is quite as encouraging as the same degree and kind of effort would be in any other direction.

I am, fraternally, yours,

I. K. McLEAN.

Rev. A. W. Loomis, D. D.

816 Fourteenth Street.

Dear Brother: Yours of the 12th, asking for a statement of my experience with our Chinese church-members, is before me.

Seven of the members of the First Baptist Church of Oakland are Chinese. More than half of this number have sustained this relation for nearly two years. To their reception I never knew of any opposition, and they remain most welcome members. I see no fault in them that I do not discover in other members, and no complaint respecting them has ever reached me. Instead of being "examples of hypocrisy and insincerity," they are the very reverse. In their support of the church none of our members are more liberal. The chairman of our board of trustees recently said to me, "If all our members were Chinese we would have no delinquent pew-rents." Not only do they aid in the support of the gospel at home, but they are doing something to sustain the gospel in China. Recently I called them to meet me, purposing to induce them to form a foreign missionary society, but, to my joy and astonishment, I found they already had entered uponthis very work, and then had collected for it some forty dollars. If all Baptists in America were as consistent in their lives as these Chinese brethren, I should greatly rejoice; if all gave as liberally for church-work at home and for missions abroad, the coming kingdom would be nearer. I watch their growth in Christian graces with great satisfaction, and am proud to have such in the flock of which I am overseer.

Yours, very truly,

B. S. McLAFFERTY,
Pastor First Baptist Church, Oakland

Rev. A. W. Loomis.

APPENDIX K

(See the testimony of Rev. Augustus W. Loomis, p. 459.)

ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES.

Total arrivals and departures since 1852.—*Compiled from the custom-house records.*

Date.	Arrived.	Departed.	Date.	Arrived.	Departed.
1852	20,026	1,768	1866	2,242	3,111
1853	4,270	4,421	1867	4,280	4,475
1854	16,084	2,339	1868	11,081	4,210
1855	3,329	3,473	1869	14,990	4,805
1856	4,807	3,028	1870	10,870	4,230
1857	5,924	1,938	1871	5,540	3,260
1858	5,427	2,542	1872	9,770	4,890
1859	3,175	2,450	1873	17,075	6,805
1860	7,341	2,090	1874	16,085	7,810
1861	8,430	3,580	1875	18,021	6,805
1862	8,175	2,792	1876 (1st quarter)	5,065	625
1863	6,432	2,494			
1864	2,682	3,910			
1865	3,095	2,295	Total	214,226	90,089

Excess of arrivals over departures	124,137
Possible number in California before this record began to be kept, (as a guess)	10,000
Would give, without deducting	134,137
Deduct possible deaths	24,000
Now in the United States	110,137

APPENDIX L.

(See testimony of Rev. Augustus W. Loomis, p. 459.)

Annual report of the misssion of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church to the Chinese in California for 1874.

MISSIONARIES.—Rev. A. W. Loomis, Rev. I. M. Condit, Mrs. M. A. Loomis, and Mrs. S. D. Condit. Miss S. M. N. Cummings, employed by the Woman's Mission Society, Philadelphia; Mr. Tam Ching, assistant; Mrs. Tam Ching, Bible reader; Mr. I. A. Merrill, Rev. W. C. Powell, and Miss Anna H. Jordan, teachers; Kung Mung Chung, Chinese teacher; Mrs. M. S. Carey, teacher at San José; Miss E. McCleerey, teacher at Sacramento.

REPORT.

All the departments of missionary labor have been continued as they were reported a year ago, and others have been added.

THE MISSION CHURCH.

This has increased in number; 18 having been added since February 1, 1874, of whom 17 were received on profession of faith. Besides those received into the church in San Francisco, four, the fruits of the branch mission in Sacramento, were baptized and enrolled as members of the Presbyterian church in that city; also, in San José four were baptized and received into membership in the Presbyterian church in that place, the fruits of our branch mission there. In Marysville, one was baptized by one of the missionaries while on a visit to that city, and two by the pastor of the Presbyterian church of that place. They are enrolled as members of that church. These, with one formerly baptized at North San Juan, are fruits of missionary labor and of colporteur work in that portion of the State.

The annual collection of this church for the general mission fund for 1874 was $70. The monthly-concert collections amount to $71.80.

There have also been many special collections to aid individuals, and to encourage their brethren in other places in efforts to teach and christianize their countrymen.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES.

The chapel services have been continued without interruption, viz, public services morning and evening on the Sabbath and on Wednesday evening. More Chinese women have attended public worship than in former years. There is also a meeting exclusively for women on Thursday of each month. The monthly conference of prayer for missions is observed on the first Wednesday evening of each month, and the Saturday evening prayer-meeting is never omitted. Following the public worship in the chapel on Sabbath and Wednesday evenings, a large company gather in the rooms of the Young Men's Christian Association, where another religious service is held, conducted by members of the association. All the services are in the Chinese language, and they are well attended. On Sabbath evenings the audience cannot be comfortably seated in the chapel. More and more each year we feel the necessity of larger accommodations for all branches of our work.

SABBATH-SCHOOLS.

Two schools each Sabbath are held in the chapel—one after the morning service and one preceding the evening service. The house is well filled at the evening school, and so has it always been in the afternoon school, when we have been able to

secure a sufficient number of permanent teachers. On Wednesday evening, preceding the religious service, a school is held similar to those of the Sabbath. The teaching is in English, with general exercises in both English and Chinese, which consist of singing, repeating texts and portions of Scripture, questions in the Catechism, the Creed, Ten Commandments, Lord's Prayer, &c.

PREACHING FROM HOUSE TO HOUSE.

The early forenoon of the Sabbath is devoted to preaching in boarding and lodging houses, to many or to few, as we may find them; also, in the afternoon of the week-days, one or the other of the missionaries, and not unfrequently both, are engaged in visiting and preaching in work-shops or in lodging-houses, or to large companies of newly-arrived immigrants. Occasionally the same work is done in the evening, at which time we find many at leisure who are occupied during the day. Our audiences on these occasions are generally respectful and attentive, and in this way much of the good seed has been sown. In these preaching visits we are frequently accompanied by the assistant, and sometimes by other members of our Chinese church, who thus have opportunity for learning more of the doctrine themselves, and also are encouraged to speak a few words of exhortation to their countrymen.

ITINERATING IN THE COUNTRY.

Two obstacles are in the way of doing as much of this kind of missionary labor as we would be glad to do. One is the constant demand for our care and labor at home; the other is the high rate of fares and hotel bills when traveling.

The Chinese in San Mateo, Redwood, Santa Clara, Gilroy, San Rafael, Petaluma, amongst the railroad laborers on the coast above Bodega, and at Marysville—wherever it has been practicable—have been gathered into halls or churches, where religious services have been held in their language. Frequent visits are made to Oakland and Brooklyn and to the suburbs of the city. There is a loud call for much more of this kind of labor.

BRANCH MISSIONS.

The missions at San José and Sacramento consume some of the funds of the board and demand much attention, but they yield fruit.

Five pupils of the school in Sacramento have made profession of their faith in Christ, and there are others who seem not far from the kingdom. The teachers have been faithful. Miss Hyndman continued in charge of the Sacramento school until August 1, when she was succeeded by Miss McCleerey. During the last six months there have been from 45 to 55 in attendance nearly every evening. A portion of each evening is devoted to singing and to some religious exercises. One or other of the colporteurs makes this city his headquarters, and the school-room is used as a chapel on the Sabbath. A Young Men's Christian Association has been formed in connection with this work. The pastor, elders, and members of the Presbyterian church have recently expressed much interest in this mission. The Chinese sabbath-school in this church is large and flourishing, and gives promise of great usefulness.

The school at San José is taught by a devoted lady, Mrs. Carey. Another colporteur makes this his headquarters most of the time. The attendance varies from 20 to 30. Much religious instruction is imparted to the scholars every evening after their other lessons are finished. Mrs. Carey also conducts the Chinese Sabbath-school in the room where her evening school is held, and hitherto with very meager aid from the Christian people of the place; but we may expect that the recent revival in San José will prove its genuineness by awakening a missionary spirit, so that the doors of the church may be opened to the Chinese Sabbath-school with as many teachers as the work demands. Eight members of this school have made profession of their faith in Christ, and many more have renounced their trust in idols and in the religion of their fathers.

EVENING-SCHOOL IN SAN FRANCISCO.

Besides the missionaries and their wives, three teachers are employed. The average attendance has been about 90. Many scholars have continued to attend the school for two, three, and four years, and their improvement is highly gratifying. All of the scholars are closely occupied in business or labor during the day, and hurry to the school in the evening when their work is done, some of them getting only an hour for study, and several not even that.

There are classes in geography, grammar, arithmetic, and history, while all attend to reading and spelling, and some to writing and composition. A large class spend the early part of the evening studying the Bible in the Chinese language with the

assistants, and another large class remains after the school is dismissed to read the Chinese classics under the instruction of the Chinese teacher. Our scholars of former years are to be found everywhere in California and in the Territories, and engaged in various occupations. Not a few of them are useful as interpreters, and some even as teachers of English among their countrymen. We have children in the schools, and also men of 30 and 40 years of age; but the larger portion of our scholars are bright lads and young men full of vigor and enterprise, wide awake to catch new ideas, with minds in a condition to be molded by the teachers into whose hands they may fall; therefore, being conscious of the opportunities afforded us, we endeavor to be on the alert to improve them. Christianity is taught, directly or indirectly, all the time, and we are cheered in seeing the greater portion of our scholars gradually losing their respect for idols; many openly avowing their disbelief in the superstitions of their countrymen, and some becoming the true followers of Jesus. At the present time there is an increasing religious interest in all our schools.

CHINESE ASSISTANT.

Mr. Tam Ching is an eloquent preacher, blest with a quick perception and retentive memory, and understanding how to choose themes suited to the capacity of his hearers, and to improve passing events and local circumstances. He not only assists in the chapel exercises, but is expected to visit throughout the Chinese portion of the town, to teach, exhort, and explain the Scriptures, to many or to few, as opportunity may be afforded. He makes frequent visits to Oakland, and sometimes is sent to neighboring cities.

COLPORTEURS.

Lo Kwong Wan, aged about 45, was once employed as catechist by the London Missionary Society near Hong-Kong. He has been employed by this mission during the past year, and most of this time in the Santa Clara Valley; San José, Santa Clara, Gilroy, with the settlements and ranches adjacent, being the field assigned to him.

Another, Qwan Loi, is a young man of earnest piety, and of great zeal in the work which he has chosen. He sacrificed much in worldly prospects in order that he might devote himself wholly to service for his Master in efforts to turn his countrymen from idolatry to the worship of the one true God. After spending a few months of preparation in San Francisco, going with us in our missionary visits and practicing his gifts occasionally, he was stationed at Sacramento, where he is doing great good. He talks to crowds on the streets, visits in shops and boarding-houses, distributes tracts through the cars to Chinese passengers on the arrival of the trains, assists in the evening-school, turns the school-room into a chapel on the Sabbath, teaches and explains the doctrines to those who call at his room, and when at leisure he may himself always be found diligently studying the Bible and Christian books in order to become better prepared to communicate instruction.

WORK AMONG CHINESE WOMEN.

We have a few Chinese women and children present at nearly all our public services. The Thursday afternoon meeting, once each month, which was inaugurated some time ago, is still maintained. It is under the direction of the ladies of the mission and Miss Cummings. The ladies of the mission make frequent visits to Chinese families, sometimes accompanied by their husbands, sometimes by one of the Christian Chinese women.

Mrs. Tam Ching, wife of the assistant, is expected to devote a portion of her time each week to this work. Until the establishment of the Home for Chinese Women, she accompanied Mrs. Condit on her visits; now she is more under the direction of Miss Cummings and the ladies of the Women's Missionary Society. It is expected also that she will act as an interpreter, and make herself generally useful among her countrywomen at the home, and, with this in view, rooms have been furnished them in the same house.

This home, under the direct supervision of Miss Cummings, is supported and managed by the Women's Missionary Society, which is auxiliary to the Women's Missionary Society of Philadelphia. The history, aims, and achievements of this society, together with the various duties and cares of their missionary, will be presented in their own annual report.

There are now three Christian Chinese families connected with the mission church; they live in a modest and nice way; and their example in influence, we trust, will be instrumental in correcting and improving Chinese morals and social life.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.

This institution still continues in a healthful and growing condition, and is casting out roots to other cities where similar societies are springing up, encouraged by the

example and aid from this parent society. They have been regularly incorporated during the past year, and all the auxiliary societies may participate in the benefits secured by the charter.

These societies are a powerful agency for good. Many boys and young men are saved by them from the temptations which everywhere are spread around them in a city and country like this. Besides the attraction afforded by their cozy rooms, and the quiet but powerful influence of their many religious meetings, the singing, the organ, the newspapers, they have a brotherly interest in, and care for, their members, warning them of dangers, endeavoring to reclaim the wandering as well as to draw new members into the fold. They also help pecuniarily those who have need of such assistance.

INFLUENCE OF THE MISSION IN OTHER PLACES.

It is gratifying to note the stand which is taken by the members of our church, and also by many of our scholars who have not yet made a public profession of religon, when they visit other places. The "Good Shepherd Chapel," in Carson City, and the mission-work among the Chinese there, owes its existence to the bold project and persistent efforts of Ah Tai, one of our pupils, and Ah For, a colporteur of the American Tract Society, and who was baptized by Dr. Speer when this mission was under his efficient direction.

The brethren in Oakland are largely indebted to our church-members and scholars, who assist in the Sabbath and evening schools, and go around gathering into these schools as many as they can induce to attend. Wherever they go these young men identify themselves at once with the Chinese Sabbath-schools wherever they find one in existence, or assist in forming one if none had been in being there before, providing they meet with Christian people who are willing to engage in the work. They are not ashamed to be known as believers in Christianity. They work in earnest to lead their countrymen into the light of gospel truth.

Six or eight promising young Chinamen recently united with the church in Oakland, and one not long ago in Carson City.

We have good accounts from some who have returned to their native land; we have good reason to think that they are faithful in exposing the folly and falsity of idolatry, and in teaching the better way. And, as the years pass on, the fruits of this mission will multiply, we trust; the circle of its influence will enlarge; the leaven which it spreads will operate more and more, till both here and throughout all China the power of the gospel truth and gospel grace shall be felt, and the idols shall be overthrown.

We thank and praise our God for all the tokens of His favor during the past year, giving so large a measure of health to the mission families, and bestowing His blessing upon the various branches of missionary work.

We trust that the disciples of Christ, both on this coast and at the East, will bear this mission more and more upon their hearts, praying for it and thanking God for opportunities of aiding it. Thus they will be co-workers with us and with our brethren in China; and we shall all rejoice together as year by year the light extends and the darkness flees away, till at length the idols shall be utterly abolished, and the Lord alone shall be exalted.

[Extract from a notice of the annual exhibition of the school, by Mrs. S. B. Cooper.]

The public schools of San Francisco have just passed their twenty-fifth glad anniversary-day. Following hard upon that memorable quarter centennial, we have the *twenty-second* anniversary of the Chinese mission-school—only three years behind the first American free school in its establishment on these western shores. There is something suggestive in this fact—a hint and prophecy of the fast-coming time when the nations of the earth shall indeed be one in Him—the great Teacher and Master of men. Surveying this field of educational effort from a high and broad stand-point, and permitting a comprehensive scope, we cannot fail to accord to this Chinese educational and christianizing work the foremost rank, in point of influence and results, so far as the world is concerned. Its bearing on the future of nations is impossible to conceive.

Among the gems of the Chinese classics we note the following choice *morceau*: "Treasure up gold to hand down to posterity, and it is not certain that posterity will take due care of it. Collect books to hand down to posterity, and it is not certain that posterity will read them. It is better, therefore, to lay up a store of virtue and knowledge, as the sure plan of permanent advantage to posterity." There is no lack of good, hard sense in this. Like most of the maxims of Mencius and Confucius, it is of crystalline beauty and richness. The work that this veteran mission is doing, in the propagation of virtue and knowledge among the followers and descendants of those revered sages, cannot be overestimated in its import and bearing on the future of the great Empire of the East. Well may the Presbyterian Church of the United States cherish with tender solicitude and eager enthusiasm this heroic, self-devoted child of her care, who, disdaining herself in all her plans and duties from day to day, labors

only for the race whom she longs to redeem. It is time she found ample nourishment, in her laborious efforts. It is time the cry for fresh workers was heard in behalf of the fields already white to the harvest. We wish the whole church of the United States had been convened, on this anniversary evening, to see what wonders have been wrought among the people whom we are pleased to class as heathen.

The synod of Cleveland never devised a grander, nobler, or more exalted scheme, than that of raising a fund for the enlarging of this glorious work. The thought was heaven-begotton. To the philanthropist, whose conception reaches only the humanitarian or civilizing aspect, the outlook is full of radiant possibilities; but to the Christian, whose vision spans the life immortal, it is resplendent with heavenly hope and prospects Had that noble and generous-thoughted body, the synod of Cleveland, been present at this entertainment, and watched the eager, questioning countenances of the vast throng of Chinese in attendance, they would have thrilled with an inspiration equal to the raising of $100,000 for this mighty work.

And if Presbyterians all over the country could but witness the glad results flowing forth from the various branches of the Chinese work here in San Francisco—from the Chinese Woman's Home, the Girl's School, the Chinese Young Men's Christian Association, and, above all, this grand old pioneer mission, with its corps of devoted workers, both male and female, there would be munificent bequests flowing in from all quarters, to broaden and enlarge and expand this the grandest and mightiest work of the Christian Church in its bearings and prospects that the world has ever known.—*Occident, January* 7, 1875.

This mission of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions to the Chinese in California was commenced in 1852, by Rev. William Speer, D. D. A mission church was organized in 1853. The mission-house, on the corner of Stockton and Sacramento streets, was completed about the close of 1873, and served very well all the purposes for which it was designed in the earlier years; but since the work has grown to its present proportions it is entirely too small.

Within a few years more interest has been taken in the Chinese on this coast, and other churches have commenced missions among them.

The Women's Union Missionary Society has been in operation for five years and a half. They employ an efficient missionary, Mrs. Cole, who visits and teaches the Chinese women in their houses, and conducts a day-school for girls and boys, at which hundreds of Chinese children have received instructions and impressions which can never be erased.

The Methodist Church has a mission here, with a fine and commodious building. The Baptish Church now supports a missionary and mission-school. The American Missionary Society supports teachers among the Chinese at several places. Many churches in San Francisco and in other towns have Chinese Sabbath-schools. There are cheering indications of a revival in the hearts of God's people on the subject of Chinese education and evangelization.

With a Chinese population of 100,000, and perhaps many more, on this coast, and a large portion of this population often moving about, with 20,000 or 25,000 coming from or returning to China every year, and all these passing through San Francisco, the importance and hopeful prospect of these missions must be apparent to all.

APPENDIX M.

(See testimony of Rev. Augustus W. Loomis p. 462.)

COUNCIL, CHAMBERS, SAN FRANCISCO.

REV. DR. LOOMIS: In looking over the Call of a recent date we find the inclosed insult to the whole working class of *free American citizens.*

Sir, are you an American, or were you born in the kingdom under the rule of some African Hottentot, or did you stay in China until you became a Chinaman in principle? The only conclusion that we can arrive at is that you have forgotten that you live in a *free country* under the American flag. Who was it that sent you to China as a missionary but the people of America, there to *bum* a living for twenty years, and then come back to the people who sent you and have fed you for this time and say that our *free American* people are inferior to the heathen Mongolian whom you are in favor of bringing here to supplant us in our own California. This insult we have noted and shall not forget; and our advice to you is to get back to China, where your company will be more congenial than among a free people.

In plain words, you had better leave this State or apologize to the people whom you have so grossly insulted, or feel the vengeance of—

☞ [SKULL AND CROSS-BONES.] P. S. Take warning in time.

By order of 163:

(Signed) 1 OF 163, *Secretary.*

APPENDIX N.

(See testimony of Rev. A. W. Loomis, p 482.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

I certify that the document hereto annexed is a true copy of the original now on file in this Department.

In testimony whereof, I, Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State of the United States, have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this sixteenth day of December, A. D. 1876, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and first.

[SEAL.] HAMILTON FISH.

Additional articles to the treaty between the United States of America and the Ta-Tsing Empire, of the 18th of June, 1858. Concluded at Washington, July 28, 1868.

Whereas, since the conclusion of the treaty between the United States of America and the Ta-Tsing Empire, (China,) of the 18th of June, 1858, circumstances have arisen showing the necessity of additional articles thereto, the President of the United States and the august sovereign of the Ta-Tsing Empire have named for their plenipotentiaries, to wit: the President of the United States of America, William H. Seward, Secretary of State, and his Majesty the Emperor of China, Anson Burlingame, accredited as his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, and Chih-Kang and Sun Chia-Ku, of the second Chinese rank, associated high envoys and ministers of his said Majesty; and the said plenipotentiaries, after having exchanged their full powers, found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

His Majesty, the Emperor of China, being of the opinion that, in making concessions to the citizens or subjects of foreign powers of the privilege of residing on certain tracts of land, or resorting to certain waters of that empire for purposes of trade, he has by no means relinquished his right of eminent domain or dominion over the said land and waters, hereby agrees that no such concession or grant shall be construed to give to any power or party which may be at war with or hostile to the United States, the right to attack the citizens of the United States or their property within the said lands or waters. And the United States, for themselves, hereby agree to abstain from offensively attacking the citizens or subjects of any power or party or their property with which they may be at war, on any such tract of land or waters of the said empire. But nothing in this article shall be construed to prevent the United States from resisting an attack by any hostile power or party upon their citizens or their property. It is further agreed, that if any right or interest in any tract of land in China has been or shall hereafter be granted by the government of China to the United States or their citizens for purposes of trade or commerce, that grant shall in no event be construed to divest the Chinese authorities of their right of jurisdiction over persons and property within said tract of land, except so far as that right may have been expressly relinquished by treaty.

ARTICLE II.

The United States of America and his Majesty the Emperor of China, believing that the safety and prosperity of commerce will thereby best be promoted, agree that any privilege or immunity in respect to trade or navigation within the Chinese dominions which may not have been stipulated for by treaty, shall be subject to the discretion of the Chinese government, and may be regulated by it accordingly, but not in a manner or spirit incompatible with the treaty stipulations of the parties.

ARTICLE III.

The Emperor of China shall have the right to appoint Consuls at ports of the United States, who shall enjoy the same privileges and immunities as those which are enjoyed by public law and treaty in the United States by the Consuls of Great Britain and Russia, or either of them.

ARTICLE IV.

The 29th article of the treaty of the 18th of June, 1858, having stipulated for the exemption of Christian citizens of the United States and Chinese converts from perse-

cution in China on account of their faith, it is further agreed that citizens of the United States in China, of every religious persuasion, and Chinese subjects in the United States, shall enjoy entire liberty of conscience, and shall be exempt from all disability or persecution on account of their religious faith or worship in either country. Cemeteries for sepulture of the dead, of whatever nativity or nationality, shall be held in respect and free from disturbance or profanation.

ARTICLE V.

"The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects, respectively, from the one country to the other, for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents." The high contracting parties, therefore, join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary emigration for these purposes. They consequently agree to pass laws making it a penal offense for a citizen of the United States or Chinese subjects to take Chinese subjects either to the United States or to any other foreign country, or for a Chinese subject or citizen of the United States to take citizens of the United States to China or to any other foreign country, without their free and voluntary consent respectively.

ARTICLE VI.

Citizens of the United States visiting or residing in China shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, or exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. And, reciprocally, Chinese subjects visiting or residing in the United States, shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, and exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. But nothing herein contained shall be held to confer naturalization upon citizens of the United States in China, nor upon the subjects of China in the United States.

ARTICLE VII.

Citizens of the United States shall enjoy all the privileges of the public educational institutions under the control of the government of China, and reciprocally, Chinese subjects shall enjoy all the privileges of the public educational institutions under the control of the government of the United States, which are enjoyed in the respective countries by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. The citizens of the United States may freely establish and maintain schools within the empire of China at those places where foreigners are by treaty permitted to reside, and, reciprocally, Chinese subjects may enjoy the same privileges and immunities in the United States.

ARTICLE VIII.

The United States, always disclaiming and discouraging all practices of unnecessary dictation and intervention by one nation in the affairs or domestic administration of another, do hereby freely disclaim and disavow any intention or right to intervene in the domestic administration of China in regard to the construction of railroads, telegraphs, or other material internal improvements. On the other hand, his Majesty, the Emperor of China, reserves to himself the right to decide the time and manner and circumstances of introducing such improvements within his dominions. With this mutual understanding it is agreed by the contracting parties that if at any time hereafter his imperial Majesty shall determine to construct or cause to be constructed works of the character mentioned within the empire, and shall make application to the United States or any other western power for facilities to carry out that policy, the United States will, in that case, designate and authorize suitable engineers to be employed by the Chinese government, and will recommend to other nations an equal compliance with such application, the Chinese government in that case protecting such engineers in their persons and property, and paying them a reasonable compensation for their service.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this treaty, and thereto affixed the seals of their arms.

Done at Washington, the twenty-eighth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

[SEAL.] WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

[SEAL.] ANSON BURLINGAME.
CHIH-KANG.
SUN CHIA-KU.

APPENDIX O.

(See testimony of Henry C. Beals, p. 616.)

[Extracts from the San Francisco Commercial Herald and Market Review.]

A WORD OF WARNING.

This journal has refrained from expressing opinions relative to Chinese immigration, for the simple reason that it is permitted and protected by international treaty, and the subject has been elaborately discussed by the daily press. Nor do we design now to canvass its merits, but merely to raise a note of warning which we trust will be heeded at Washington. It is undeniable that the nucleus of an organization has been formed in this State for the forcible expulsion of the Chinese, and it is as true that it is composed of material which will be wholly unscrupulous in the method of its accomplishment. Although the entire Chinese immigration into this country for the past twenty-two years is but a drop in the bucket compared with that which reaches us from Europe every year, yet there is such an immense margin of difference between the two that no parallel can be instituted. European immigration is acceptable, in fact desirable, while that from China is simply detestable. It should be borne in mind that the originating cause of our late terrible war was not philanthropy for the negro race. It was not only because a certain element of mankind was held in bondage throughout the Southern States, but because the labor and production of those slaves was brought into competition with those of the North. The owner of a certain number of slaves was entitled to a specified number of votes, as composing a congressional district, and this destroyed political equality. The war disposed of these objections, but Chinese immigration has resurrected the first in California. It is with no little truth that our artisans and laborers complain that the Chinese are depriving them of the opportunity to earn an independent livelihood; but, on the other hand, it is equally true that but for Chinese cheap labor, we could not profitably manufacture many articles which we now produce. Without stopping to argue these and other points which must naturally suggest themselves to all intelligent people, we beg to assure the Federal Government, in the most solemn manner, that the Chinese of California are sleeping upon a volcano that may burst forth at any time. Public notices have been given through the daily press that the question will be violently disposed of by an anti-Chinese vigilance committee, unless Congress shall take some action to repeal or so modify the Burlingame treaty as to suppress Chinese immigration. Furthermore, it is notorious that certain journals in this city and State, while seemingly discouraging any resort to violence, are actually fanning the fires of passion and prejudice, and covertly doing all they can to foment discord and bring about a sanguinary result. Our legislature has spoken on the subject in behalf of the people at large, and although its utterances do not represent the views of thousands among their constituents, they undoubtedly do those of the majority, whether it be right or wrong. It cannot be denied that Chinese immigration has been productive of much good as well as of much evil. They are our principal railroad-builders, and but for their cheap labor we would have to pay more for freights and fares. But, unlike European immigrants, they do not, will not, and never can assimilate with our people; there is a gulf between them, a yawning chasm which can never be bridged. So long as they remain, they will be a source of endless annoyance, and a promoter of outrages which will eventually culminate in terrible bloodshed. Again we take occasion to warn Congress that the nucleus for another massacre that will rival that of St. Bartholomew has been organized here, and that it only lacks leaders of sufficient ability and social standing to give it deadly vitality. This journal cannot stoop to play the role of alarmist, but it is its duty to point out the existence of certain elements which threaten to destroy life and property to an enormous extent. The hurricane once in motion, it will be difficult to curb its power or limit its range.—*March* 30, 1876.

ANOTHER PHASE OF THE CHINESE QUESTION.

The frenzied appeals of a blatant daily press have fired the hoodlum heart against the Chinese to a pitch of enthusiastic venom which has on several occasions narrowly escaped manifesting itself by a resort to violence. That we have been spared scenes of the most revolting nature has been mainly attributable to the treaty relations of the Federal Government with China, and the quiet but ominous disapproval of our best and most influential citizens. We are emphatically not admirers of the Chinese; we see nothing lovely or lovable about them. They possess no single trait in common with our people, and their presence among us in large numbers is not desirable. Nevertheless, there are certain features of the question which do not seem to have sufficiently impressed themselves upon the popular mind. It is certain that but for their

cheap labor this State and this city would not occupy to-day the commercial and agricultural rank they now boast, and it is no less positive that our maritime relations with China have been materially furthered by the Burlingame treaty. The trade of the Orient, in which China occupies the most prominent position, has always been the subject of a covetous struggle between the maritime nations of the Old World. It was a source of wealth and commercial prosperity worth having. It not only fostered shipbuilding and every interest connected with it, but has been a wonderful incentive to manufactures, furnishing employment to thousands upon thousands, and finding a profitable outlet for domestic products in large variety. It is true that the remoteness of China from European nations and from the Atlantic States was a bar to Chinese immigration, and before our transcontinental railways were laid down it was rare to see one of that race in Europe or America. All over the christianized world a determination was manifested to break down the "Chinese wall of exclusion," and force them to open the doors of their valuable commerce to the enterprise of "outside barbarians." This desideratum was only partially secured by England and France at a great sacrifice of blood and treasure. The United States Government adopted a totally different role. All its efforts were those of peace, argument, and reason, and they proved more effective than cannons and bayonets. Recognizing the wide difference between the approaches of America and those of her European competitors, the Chinese government readily accorded us greater privileges than she had yielded to them, a circumstance of which European governments were not slow to take advantage under the treaty stipulations which placed them on a footing "with the most favored nations." It was made manifest, however, that Americans were held in greater esteem as a rule, and that a disposition was shown to give them the preference whenever it could be done without exciting suspicion, and our commerce with China soon began to unfold itself into ever-enlarging circles of mutual profit. After California became a part of the American Union, with San Francisco confronting the Orient as its great commercial metropolis, it became apparent that the United States would eventually become the central figure of intercourse between Christendom and the Orient. Our geographical position, and the unlimited abundance of natural resources possessed by the Pacific slope, clearly indicated its ultimate success in grasping for a trade that had for ages been so eagerly sought by Europe. Chinese confidence in our frequent protestations of amity induced them to abandon the determination and usages of centuries, and come among us without fear of molestation. It is this confidence which the Federal Government has relied upon as the lever with which to open the treasure-vaults of Oriental trade and commerce. It is this confidence which has been the *sesame* that flung wide the doors of Japanese preference and intercourse. It is this confidence which was impressing itself upon other Oriental people, and inducing them to extend special favors upon our country. The main question for our present consideration is, whether it is better to renounce at once and forever all the golden opportunities within our reach, or by the exercise of cool judgment, clear and unimpassioned reflection, and the adoption of some acceptable, just policy, maintain possession of our advantages and reap the ripening harvest? Shall we, by a coarse, violent, and repulsive policy against the Chinese, disgust the people of Japan, India, and the Pacific isles, by disgusting and ostracising the Chinese? Is it wise to permit far-distant Europe to monopolize so vast a trade, and make this country tributary to its broader humanity, more admirable forbearance, and greater scope of enterprise? These are the salient points which will suggest themselves to our Representatives in Congress, to the men whose business is to legislate for the whole nation, to those who are intrusted with the solution of international problems, and on whose action must depend the future to a very large extent. Local maladies will be consigned to local treatment for mitigation or cure, within the scope of national supervision and under the regimen of international obligations. If California be permitted to exclude the Chinese, China will exclude our people. We are, probably, no less repulsive to them than they to us, but we are less so now than the people of other countries, and it is well worth our while to hold fast to so valuable a possession.—*May* 11, 1876.

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

We shall hold the daily press of this city to a strict accountability for all the evils that have been, or hereafter may be, perpetrated by the baser elements of society in their lawless raid against the Chinese. Their incendiary appeals, repeated day after day for consecutive weeks, were concocted with no other intent than to provoke the lower orders to the commission of outrages against a people who are among us under international treaty stipulations, and have as much right to be here as the comers from any other foreign land. Protestations to the contrary, with now and then a hypocritical expression of hope that no violence will be employed against the Chinese, are not sufficient to deceive anybody who is willing to give the question an impartial, manly consideration. The disgraceful scenes at Antioch have not only been publicly indorsed by certain clubs in this city and other portions of the State, but the privilege

of an American citizen to employ whom he chooses has been denounced with threats and covert assurances of cowardly vengeance. Thirty prominent citizens of Vallejo have been the recipients of postal cards bearing the following menace: "You are hereby notified to discharge your Chinaman at an early day for your own safety." It has already come to pass that the Chinese have been forcibly driven out of Antioch; their houses burned to the ground; mobs collected in this city to waylay and molest them on the route from the steamers; clubs organized for hostile action against them, and our own people threatened with some dire calamity unless they discharge them. What will be the next heroic exploit in this interesting programme can only be, just now, a matter of surmise, but preceding events foreshadow incendiarism on a large scale, murders, and other outrages of the most heinous character. The proprietors of the Mission Woolen Mills have received anonymous letters of menace, and other employers in this city have been favored with like civil attentions. It does not seem to have occurred to the people at Antioch that their acts are likely to be investigated by the United States Government, and that they will be compelled to pay for Chinese property destroyed by them. Nor has it presented itself to the reflection of our hoodlum element that the first attempt to imitate such deeds will be met with all the power of the civil and military authorities, State and Federal, re-enforced by every good and honorably-minded man in the community. During the twenty-two years that have elapsed since Chinese immigration commenced, a fewer number of that people have come to our shores than but two years brought from a single country in Europe. A fair canvass of the active agents engaged in this hostile movement against the Chinese will show that comparatively a very small number of Americans are connected with it, and those generally of the baser sort. The threats, yells, and clamors come from a foreign source which has no prerogative that the Chinese are not equally entitled to enjoy. We do not intend to mince matters, but declare truths whatever the result. This journal is not of those that pander to the lowest passions of mankind for the sake of cheap and nasty popularity. When the lives and properties of our citizens are menaced, as they now are, and when the peace and tranquility of the community are endangered, as at present, we step to the front, in common with every good citizen, and stand prepared to maintain the majesty of the law and the public welfare. The people of Australia, who precluded Chinese immigration by imposing a capitation-tax of ten pounds sterling, have since seen the error of such interdiction, and are preparing to recede from their former policy. San Francisco is but the entrance-gate to the whole Union, and the Chinese are emigrating hence to districts which need their services. If they be inferior beings, they can be readily utilized by those who are superior; but if they be a superior element to some in our midst, they will utilize the inferior, and be in so much a decided improvement. But without discussing that or cognate points, it is enough to say that the question is one which directly and seriously interests the Government of the United States, which alone possesses the power and right to determine the matter. When outrages like those that have occurred, and threats of others to come, have existence in our midst, it is time for all good citizens to unite in their suppression.—*May* 25, 1876.

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

The hot-house forcing process has been brought to bear upon the question of Chinese immigration until it has been pushed beyond the bounds of temperance, dignity, and self-respect, besides infringing largely on the domain of truth. While it is unquestionable that the Chinese are not acceptable as immigrants, and that many of the objections advanced against them are either well taken or founded upon facts, yet it is not true that their presence here is an "unmixed evil." No harm can come without some good, and it is neither manly nor just to deny them the credit of the services they have performed in our midst. Their cheap labor has enabled thousands of people possessing moderate incomes to live independently and comfortably. Their cheap labor has rebated the cost of many articles entering into every-day consumption. Their cheap labor has built our railroads and materially assisted in harvesting our large crops, and their cheap labor has enabled us to effect many other desirable things that we could not have accomplished except at immense cost. It pains us to know that the governor of the State, the mayor of the city, and other men in prominent positions, should lend themselves to inflammatory denunciations, instead of using their influence in a more proper and dignified manner. The people have an undoubted right to express their opinions upon all subjects affecting their interests; but it may be fairly questioned whether popular meetings in reference to subjects involving international rights, established by treaty and indorsed by the Federal Government, should be invested with official importance by the active co-operation of the governor, mayor, &c. The legislature has already acted in the matter, and the governor has already performed the functions of his office in its regard. He should respect his position, and refrain from exhibiting any tendency to demagogism.—*April* 6, 1876.

CHEAP LABOR.

If cheap labor be a curse—and we are not ready to dispute it—it is one that no amount of condemnation will arrest. It is stronger than the most pronounced public opinion, and has proved itself capable of resisting any pressure that may be brought against it. An inherent quality in the human mind is to procure whatever may be needed for the least possible expenditure of time and money, and to part from what it possesses in superfluity at the highest obtainable price. The question has been forced upon the acceptance of the American people for the past sixty or seventy years, and is still obtruding itself upon their attention. The immense area of the United States, its infinite natural resources, the comparative sparcity of its population, and the nature of its political institutions, especially the exemption from enforced military duty, universal tolerance of religious worships, and the facilities extended for becoming American citizens, presented the most alluring inducements to immigration from Europe. The wages paid for labor and service were also much higher in this country, while the cost of living was far cheaper. Furthermore, land could be obtained here at an absurdly low figure, whereas its procurement in Europe was attended with serious difficulties. The inrushing tide of immigration which ensued upon the furnishing of transportation facilities by the large number of regular packet-ships built for the business, was not composed of the best or most desirable foreign material until steamship communication was furnished on a large scale. In a very short time a very decided expression of opposition to the new-comers was heard throughout the Northern and Middle States. Wages were cut down right and left; active competition in every line of industrial production was established throughout the country; thousands upon thousands of American artisans, laborers, and domestic servants were either displaced, or were compelled to lower their demands. Not a single field of industry was left uninvaded, and many even intelligent thinkers looked upon the ever-coming hosts with consternation. But there was one saving grace, and it consisted in the fact that a large majority of the European immigrants came with the object of becoming permanent citizens, and were more or less provided with means to support themselves and families until they could engage in occupations which, although entering into competition with those of our own people, served to develop our natural resources, increase the public revenue, and improve as well as multiply the arts and industries of their new homes. They were likewise people with whom ours could assimilate on equal terms, with whom intermarriage and social equality was not objectionable, and who were educated in some acceptable religious belief. These are the points upon which Chinese or Mongol immigration differs widely from all others and renders it wholly objectionable. The exception taken to their cheap labor is comparatively trivial. When resort is had to the argument that the Chinese have invaded a large number of our industrial and productive fields to an extent that has driven American competition to the wall, it may be seriously contended that they must perforce do something for a livelihood. They cannot exist without work of some kind, and they naturally apply themselves to those occupations for which they are most fitted and can perform with the greatest readiness and skill. It is the same old competition, against which we have had to contend for years, presented in a new shape and from a fresh source. If, as is asserted, our people are so much more intelligent and enterprising, they can find no insuperable difficulty in cutting out and embarking in other vocations and rendering the Chinese useful to them in their new pursuits. This is not the true phase of the difficulty which attends the problem of Chinese immigration. Objection rests upon far higher grounds; reasons of a character that cannot be successfully impeached; and it is but weakening the many solid arguments against the influx of Chinese to place any important stress upon their cheap labor, which, after all, has not been unattended with a good deal of solid benefit to thousands in this State. We do not believe that what is called cheap labor is a desirable commodity, all things considered; but it has its benefits as well as its objectionable points, and we have no desire to discuss its merits at this time. If Congress is to be depended upon for action in reference to Chinese immigration, it must be upon the moral, social, and political aspects of the question, and not upon the reedy support of cheap labor.—*April* 13, 1876.

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

If Mayor Bryant, the board of supervisors, the board of health, and the police department performed their respective duties in a proper and efficient manner, instead of endeavoring to make political capital out of the Chinese question, we would soon see a change for the better that would delight the heart of every good citizen. Our civic authorities are undoubtedly clothed with the power to pass and enforce sanitary and hygienic ordinances, but this is precisely what they have not done, especially in so far as the Chinese are concerned. In the comparatively small space inclosed in ten

short blocks there are at least 25,000 Mongols, who at night are packed together as closely as Eleme figs in a box. Hundreds of the tenements crowded to suffocation by them have neither ventilation, drainage, nor sunlight, and would be in any other climate the certain generators of a festering corruption that would spread pestilence and death throughout the community. That we have escaped with one visitation of small-pox is almost miraculous, but how long we shall be preserved from a like scourge, the cholera, yellow fever, or some new and hitherto unknown disease of a similarly fatal character, no man can presume to say. That we are exposed to such a calamity at any time is beyond question, and it behooves the authorities to move promptly and efficiently for the prevention of such a disaster. Any pestilence once fairly raging takes a hold upon the locality where it exists, and although it may disappear after performing its fatal work, is sure to return at some future period, in some form or other, when the conditions are favorable. Perhaps no measure could be adopted which would more certainly suppress Chinese immigration, and effect a radical change in the habits of those already here, than the passage and peremptory enforcement of hygienic ordinances, which shall so bear upon the Chinese as to inhibit their huddling together as they now do, and compel them to use disinfectants, and perform other acts of cleanliness to their houses and persons. Their modes of life render them now a seething mass of corruption, liable at any time to become a virulent pestilence, and there can be no validity to a claim which gives them the right to maintain in our midst a standing menace to the health and lives of our people. These continual anti-Chinese gatherings, these legislative inquisitions, these never-ending newspaper diatribes, these ceaseless efforts to make the subject a stepping-stone to political promotion, and these daily announcements of how many are here, how many on the way, and how many more China is capable of launching upon us, are "leather and prunella." So far there has been nothing more serious than vain gabbling. Nothing whatever has been done to make the Chinese amenable to our laws instead of to those of the Chinese six companies. Nothing has been suggested of a practical character within our reach, and nothing proposed by which the nuisance can be abated in conformity with law. Neither the Burlingame treaty nor any other instrument compels us to suffer the existence in our midst of the Chinese in a condition which imperils not only the health and lives of all other residents, but the value of property and the reputation we enjoy as a city of extraordinary exemption from pestilences of all sorts. We shall see whether Mayor Bryant and the authorities will move in this matter or not, and whether we shall have a scattering of the Chinese and a thorough purification of the sections tenanted by them.—*April* 27, 1876.

THE CHINESE QUESTION—ÆSOP ILLUSTRATED.

Every one has read Æsop's clever fable of the man who blew hot and cold at his pleasure; but few seem to recognize the fact that the old blower still survives, although Æsop has long since gone to rest. He is, unfortunately, very often to be found in the editorial chairs of our daily press, blowing hot or cold, as inclination suits, or in accordance with his conception of popular opinion, regardless whether that opinion be right or wrong, beneficial or pernicious. The sturdy old blower courts popularity as the stepping-stone to pecuniary advancement, and to secure it he is just as ready to pander to the vicious demands of the slums as to cater for the best interests of the community. His eager support of the crusade against the Chinese proceeds from an innate proclivity to side with the *oi polloi*. He would sooner lead the rabble than imitate the example of the superior classes. With blasts hot as the sirocco's breath he inflames the passions of a prejudiced, unreflecting multitude, neither knowing nor caring for the freezing cold he inflicts upon interests of paramount importance to the State. The old blower not unfrequently dilates, with something like pride, upon the vast and varied agricultural productions of California. He will point to the six or seven hundred ships of a thousand tons each that annually seek San Francisco to take away our surplus wheat and convert it into gold for the enrichment of our people; but he is wonderfully cautious about acknowledging that it is cheap Chinese labor which lies at the bottom of this grand productiveness. He paints in glowing terms the beauty value, and increase of our magnificent vineyards, and speaks encouragingly of the time when California wines and raisins shall meet with just and remunerative recognition; but he carefully abstains from stating that without Chinese labor those now beautiful vineyards would cease to exist. He appears to take some pride in our extensive exports of salmon, canned fruits and vegetables, and other similar articles; but steadfastly refuses to note the fact that they subsist mainly through the aid of Chinese labor. The zealous old curmudgeon seems to feel no ordinary pleasure in occasionally showing the progress of the State, and how it is rapidly emancipating itself from dependence upon outside supplies by establishing large and important manufacturing interests, such as woolen, paper, and powder mills, &c., all of which would either be stopped if Chinese labor were inaccessible, or the prices of their products raised to such a height that eastern and foreign manufacturers would wholly control the market, and again reduce us to dependence, receiving all our surplus gold, and enriching themselves at our expense.

The same blower will go into ecstacies over our fast-growing net-work of railroads, our increased facilities for trade, travel, and regular, rapid communication with all portions of our common country, as well as the rest of the civilized world. He will speak in terms of extreme eulogy and self-contentment of the cities, towns and villages that have been brought into existence by reason of those railroads; of the vast and multiplied farms, teeming with wealth and producing food for millions, increasing the value of landed possessions, and raising the State to the highest pitch of prosperity; but he surreptitiously conceals the truth that Chinese cheap labor has been mainly instrumental in enabling California to occupy so proud and independent a position. Thousands of families in this State now enjoying the comforts of domestic life and living happily on a moderate competency would either have remained single or been compelled to seek the asylum of hotels, lodging-houses, &c., but for cheap Chinese domestic labor. For every dollar a Chinaman sends back to his native land he drops one or more in our treasury. His squalor, his filthiness, his alleged immorality, his heathenish disbelief of our religious tenets, his refusal to don our costume and accede to our styles of life, are not subjects for national legislation. We cannot call upon Congress to perform the police and health officers' duties of San Francisco. They are no more amenable to national intervention than the peculiarities, views, opinions, and habits of people from any other country, so long as they obey our laws. If, as the inferior race, they have occupied the more menial pursuits, and by so doing have decreased the prices of articles produced by them, let the superior Caucasian turn himself to those of a more exalted character, in keeping with his asserted superiority, and while wearing the hat, coat, boots, gloves, &c., of Chinese manufacture, resting comfortably within the precincts of his own residence, conducting his business with increased facilities, traveling from point to point with rapidity and regularity, or congratulating himself on being a Californian, let him also be thankful that, because of Chinese cheap labor, he is not compelled to expend the wages of three days' work for the possession of things that now cost him but one. Æsop's old cause of rebuke may yet discover that to blow hot in one direction is also to blow cold in others.—*June* 29, 1876.

APPENDIX P.

(See testimony of Edward J. Armstrong, p. 744.)

Report of joint select committee relative to the Chinese population of the State of California.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The joint select committee of the legislature, which was appointed to confer with the Chinese merchants of this State, and to report the result of said conference to the legislature, together with such views as bear upon the legality of admitting and the influence of permanent Chinese population among us, beg leave to submit the following report:

Your committee has had several interviews with the leading Chinese merchants of this city, and found them to be men of intelligence, ability, and cultivation, who kindly and promptly met our many inquiries in a spirit and with an urbanity that left upon our minds favorable impressions. They placed us in possession of a mass of statistics respecting the industry and the value of the labors of their countrymen to this State, which we here present.

These statements surprised us, and we feel confident they will deeply interest you and our constituents, and it will be well to ponder them before any action shall be proposed that will have a tendency to disturb so important an interest, and drive from our State a class of foreigners so peaceful, industrious, and useful.

From the information which we derived from the merchants and from examining their data, we put down the Chinese population in the State at this time at about fifty thousand. The merchants, from their books, where they keep an accurate account of arrivals, departures, and deaths of their countrymen, say there are 48,391; that there are engaged in mining about 30,000; in farming, about 1,200, hired as laborers principally; in washing and ironing and as servants, they could not tell; that there are about two thousand traders. The number of Chinese prostitutes they say they cannot tell, as they have nothing to do with them. There are about one hundred families of respectability here; that is, married females having families. They say they think that about two hundred Chinese are employed in the manufacture of cigars in this city.

Their estimates of the numbers in the various branches of industry in the State, they say, may not be correct, as they have no control over the Chinese; they pursue whatever calling they choose, and are as free as any persons in the State.

Upon this head your committee examined them at great length, and in the most minute and careful manner; and your committee is satisfied that there is no system of slavery or coolyism among the Chinese in this State. If there is any proof going to

establish the fact that any portion of the Chinese are imported into this State as slaves or coolies, your committee have failed to discover it.

The present laws in force in regard to this class of our population, in the opinion of your committee, impose upon them quite as heavy burdens as they are able to bear, and in many instances far beyond their ability to stand up under.

Your committee trust that no more legislation will be had calculated to oppress and degrade this class of persons in our State.

The truth of many of the statements we have been able to verify from other and independent sources, confirming their reliability.

STATISTICS FOR 1861.

Amount of duties paid by Chinese importers into the custom-house at this port was	$500,000
Freight-money paid to ships from China	180,683
Passage-money paid to ships from China	382,000
Head-tax	7,556
Boat-hire	4,767
Rent for stores and storage	370,000
Licenses, taxes, &c., in the State	2,164,273
Commissions paid to auctioneers and brokers	20,396
Drayage in San Francisco	59,662
Teaming in interior of State	360,000
Paid for American products in San Francisco	1,046,613
Paid for American products in the State	4,953,387
Paid for fire-insurance in the city	1,925
Paid for marine insurance in the city	33,647
Paid for steamboat-fare to Sacramento City and Stockton	50,000
Paid for stage-fare to and from the mines	250,000
Paid for steamboat up-river freights	80,000
Water-rates for Chinese miners*	2,160,000
Mining-claims bought by Chinese miners†	1,350,000
	13,974,909

The data of many of these estimates of expenditures are kept by several of the Chinese companies with great minuteness and particularity, so that from these accounts we have been enabled to deduce average expenditures per head per annum.

From the above remarkable statistics, amounting to fourteen millions of dollars nearly, you will be able to form an idea of the value which this Chinese population and industry confers upon the State.

Dissect these various items and see what employment this "scourged race" gives to our ship-owners, our water-men, our real-estate men, our merchants, draymen, teamsters, steamboat-men, our stage-owners, with their hostlers, and horses, and blacksmiths, and carriage-makers, our farmers, and cattle-men—in short to nearly every branch of human industry in the State.

These departments of labor are carried on by white men, independent of Chinese labor, but largely indebted for its recompense to Chinese industry and patronage. And for this fourteen millions of dollars, which we gather from the Chinese population, what do we give in exchange? Mainly, thus far, the privilege to work in the mines on bars, beds, and gulch-claims which have been abandoned by our countrymen and other white men, because by their intelligence and skill they could find other diggings where they could do better. Such claims to all but the patient, moderate Chinese would otherwise have remained idle and unproductive.

In towns and cities we have wash-men and cooks, who, to some extent, compete with imported servants from Europe; and this is about the only competition which some fifty thousand peaceable, patient, and industrious Chinese immigrants have thus far produced in California. Surely if this declared evil were doubled or magnified tenfold, it need not create alarm in the breasts of cautious and fearful citizens.

We have about eighty Chinamen working in the Mission Woolen-Factory, which by reason of their cheap labor is able to find employment for some seventy white men. With high rates of labor, this valuable enterprise could not be prosecuted in this State. Woolen-manufactures should be specially encouraged by generous legislation.

Our climate is highly favorable to sheep-raising, and it should be our study to find

* Twenty thousand miners buy water at 30 cents per man per day.
† Fifteen thousand miners buy claims at 25 cents per man per day.

a home-market for all the wool that can be grown here. Coarse blankets and coarse cloths are consumed upon this coast in unlimited quantities, and we shall soon find customers for stuffs of finer quality. The rearing of sheep and raising of wool could soon become an interest of vast value to the State. This interest, yet to be created, infringing upon no existing class of labor, would afford occupation for thousands of Chinamen, associated with as many or more whites, and prove a mutual and public blessing.

With cheap labor we could supply all our own wines and liquors, besides sending large quantities abroad. The wine-crop of France in 1849 was 925,000,000 gallons, valued at $100,000,000. In 1853, she had in vineyards 4,873,934 acres, (giving less than 200 gallons to the acre,) making about 8,107 square miles, or an area of 250 miles in length by 32 in breadth. California contains 188,981 square miles, which would give 120,947,840 acres, so that if only one twenty-fifth of our area should be planted with vineyards, she would have an amount equal to France.

We have a fresher soil, better climate for grape-culture, than France, and we could produce larger quantities of better quality than is grown in worn-out lands.

This cannot be done without the aid of cheap labor from some quarter; but a portion of Chinese with white labor would add incalculably to the resources of the State in this particular branch. It would also diminish drunkenness and consequent pauperism, thereby greatly diminishing crime and misery. To the wine produced add the cost of pipes and bottles, the transportation and commission on sales, and this wine and liquor interest would become second only to the mining and farming interests.

Turning from the grape, let us dwell a moment upon the production of rice, tea, sugar, tobacco, and dried fruits of every description, such as figs, raisins, &c., all of which can be easily grown within the State, and soon will be commenced if we encourage cheap labor from abroad to cultivate our waste luxuriant soil. It is industry which makes a people great, rich, and powerful; and to our enterprise and resources we need but the willing hand of patient labor to make our young and giant State the glory of our country and the marvel of the world.

To develop our latent resources and vitalize all our powers we need sound, liberal, far-seeing legislators; men who can mold and harness all inferior races to work out and realize our grand and glorious destiny.

It is charged that the Chinese demoralize the whites. We cannot find any ground for the allegation. We adopt none of their habits, form no social relations with them, do not intermarry with them, but keep them separate and apart—a distinct, inferior race.

They work for us; they help us build up our State by contributing largely to our taxes, to our shipping, farming, and mechanical interests, without, to any extent, entering these departments as competitors; they are denied privileges equal with other foreigners; they cannot vote nor testify in courts of justice, nor have a voice in making our laws, nor mingle with us in social life. Certainly we have nothing to fear from a race so contemned and restricted; on the contrary, those Chinamen who remain here are educated up to our standard.

When they leave us they carry the knowledge of our improvements home to their countrymen, and although we must not look for miracles in a decade of years in changing the manners of any people, yet the business relations between California and Asia will do more to liberalize and christianize those countries than the labors of all the missionaries throughout China. The Chinese are quick to see and ready to adopt any custom or thing that promises improvement.

The practice of Chinese prostitution by their women is as abhorrent to their respectable merchants as it is to us. They have made several attempts to send these abandoned women home to China, but their efforts have been frustrated, under the plea that this is a free country, and these women can do as they please. These women generally live in boats on the rivers of China, and arrange for the payment of their own passages to this State. No companies of Chinese merchants encourage the importation of women to California.

The evil exists to a far greater extent in China than here, and the respectable Chinese here would be glad to have the most stringest restrictions placed upon this degraded and abandoned class of persons. Your committee refer to the following letter to show how the Chinese of this city stand in regard to crimes and punishments:

"SAN FRANCISCO, *March* 5, 186[illegible].

"DEAR SIR: In accordance with your request, I herewith give you a statement of the convictions and forfeitures of bail in the police-judge's court during the year 1862, not including the twenty-four-hour sentences for drunks, in which only one Chinaman appeared during the entire year:

Months.	Convictions.	Chinese.
January	195	5
February	187	24
March	204	8

	Convictions.	Chinese.
April	209	7
May	233	14
June	181	8
July	204	7
August	166	5
September	228	6
October	356	15
November	355	21
December	265	48
Totals	2,783	168

"Average of Chinese, about 1 in 16. The twenty-four-hour sentences, as above, average about 130 per month. About three-fourths of the Chinese convictions are women (prostitutes) arrested from the alleys about Jackson and Pacific streets.

"Yours,

"JNO. H. TITCOMB,
"*Clerk Police-Judge's Court.*

"Hon. R. F. PERKINS."

Your committee were furnished with a list of eighty-eight Chinamen who are known to have been murdered by white people, eleven of which number are known to have been murdered by collectors of foreign miners' license-tax—sworn officers of the law. But two of the murderers have been convicted and hanged. Generally, they have been allowed to escape without the slightest punishment.

The above number of Chinese who have been robbed and murdered comprise probably a very small proportion of those which have been murdered; but they are all which the records of the different societies or companies in this city show. It is a well-known fact that there has been a wholesale system of wrong and outrage practiced upon the Chinese population of this State, which would disgrace the most barbarous nation upon earth.

Our relations with China are constantly increasing. Our exports to China were—

In 1859	$252,000
In 1860	623,000
In 1861	712,000
	1,587,000

One-seventh of our entire exports (other than treasure) goes to China. One-nineteenth of all the tonnage engaged in coming to or going from our port is in the China trade.

	Tons.
In 1861 entered from all parts of the world	600,000
Cleared	434,000
Total tons entered and cleared	13 4,000

Vessels in the China trade:

	Tons.
Entered	28,286
Cleared	28,092
Total	56,378

Our present principal exports to China consist of abalones, grain, bread, fish, flour, lumber, potatoes, and quicksilver.

Treasure shipped in 1861 amounted to $3,541,279.17. Nearly the whole of this sum was gold bars. Until recently the Chinese would receive nothing but silver. The Chinese merchants here have, by carefully-selected remittances, brought gold to be preferred to silver. This change will save to our State $1,500,000 which is now paid for remittances, and greatly enhance the value of our gold-product to the miner.

A number of our large steamers are now going to China to find profitable employment upon those rich and extensive rivers that have recently been opened to the commerce of the world. Ship and steamboat building and machinery will hereafter become a large item of yearly California export.

Our shipments of lumber are largely on the increase. Lumber shipped:

	Feet.
In 1858	263,960
In 1859	.....
In 1860	1,321,565
In 1861	963,982

Of quicksilver we shipped:

	Flasks.
In 1858	4,132
In 1861	13,788

At $30 per flask, it amounts to $413,640.

This carrying business to and from China (the safest business in the world) is nearly all our own. No Chinese capital or labor is here employed.

We have arrive and depart annually about thirty ships in the regular China trade, and these ships disburse in this port at each arrival from five thousand to ten thousand dollars each for repairs and refitting. The ship Dictator, now in port, will need to disburse before leaving about twenty-five thousand dollars. These amounts aggregate very considerably, and afford active employment to many ship and house carpenters, ship-chandlers, riggers, sail-makers, painters, and other laborers.

In the interior like advantages arise from Chinese residence. In some of the mining counties the Chinese, forming less than one-tenth of the population, pay one-fourth of the entire county-tax. Has the reflection occurred what these counties would do without these useful people?

Your committee are under obligations to Mr. T. A. Mudge, of the United States customs, for the following letter kindly furnished us by him:

SAN FRANCISCO, *March* 10, 1862.

T. MUDGE, Esq., *U. S. Customs:*

DEAR SIR: In reference to our conversation regarding the trade between this port and Hong-Kong, we have to say that since the 1st of January of this year we paid the following charter-moneys to vessels consigned to us, viz:

Name of vessel.	Charter-money.	Disbursed.
White Swallow	$11,000	$10,000
Dictator	13,000	8,000
Dictator, repairs	------	25,000
Mary Whitridge	13,000	7,000
Benefactor	8,000	5,000
Sword-Fish	12,000	6,000
Consigned to Messrs. W. T. Coleman & Co.:		
Fortuna, (about)	13,000	
Charger, (about)	18,500	
Consigned to S. C. Carey:		
George Lee	10,000	
Consigned to D. Gibb & Co.:		
Therese	6,000	
The disbursements of these four, (say)	------	24,000
We expect daily from Hong-Kong—		
Moonlight, (charter-money payable here)	13,000	
Joseph Peabody, (charter-money payable here)	26,000	
Daphne, (charter-money payable here)	24,000	
Bald Eagle, (charter-money payable here)	16,000	

The Bald Eagle, we are afraid, must have foundered with all on board, as we have no accounts of her since her sailing on the 10th November last.

We are, yours truly,

KOOPMANSCHAP & CO.

Instead of driving them out of the State, bounties might be offered them to cultivate rice, tea, tobacco, and other articles. Respecting rice, it will take considerable time and much labor on our tule-lands before they can be made to produce a crop of good rice. Tea is another article, requiring much nice experience, where Chinese labor could be productive of great benefit without coming in competition with white labor.

Our Chinese importers paid last year duties at the custom-house amounting to $500,000. Tea, which was then admitted free, now pays twenty cents a pound duty, and there will be imported about 1,500,000 pounds. The yearly import of rice is 25,000,000 pounds, on which the additional duty over last year will be $120,000. Sugar and China silks, and many other small articles, have been materially advanced by the existing tariff, so that instead of collecting from Chinese importers $500,000, the same as last year, the duties now will amount to nearly or quite $1,000,000.

After having reviewed the question of policy—the dollar and cent view, and morality of tolerating a Chinese community among us—we at last come to consider the legality of excluding or oppressing this class of residents.

The Constitution of the United States says "that all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

This extract brings us at once to inquire into the stipulations of the treaties that have been made between China and our own Government.

Our first treaty was made by Caleb Cushing in 1844, and was characterized by liberal reciprocal conditions, expressing sentiments of sincere and cordial amity to be observed by the two peoples, without exception of persons or places.

This treaty contained a clause that in twelve years it should be modified to suit the mutual requirements of commerce and navigation; and accordingly, in 1858, Commissioner William B. Read negotiated the Tien-Tsin treaty, which repeats the old treaty, and contains some additional clauses found by the growing intercourse between the two nations to be necessary.

Article first, among other things, recites that the two peoples "shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling causes, so as to produce an estrangement between them."

How far we are deviating from reciprocity in our discriminating and oppressive taxation of the Chinese need not here be recited.

Article 11 provides for the protection of subjects "from all insult or injury of any sort." It further contains the extremely liberal provision "that if citizens of the United States shall commit any improper act in China, they shall be punished only by the consul according to the laws of the United States." Could any treaty be more liberal? Is it not worthy of the most Christian nation? How lamentably do we fall short of mutuality in our conduct and statutes toward the Chinese in California!

Article 12 stipulates "that parties may hire houses and stores by mutual agreement, and not be subjected to exorbitant prices, and that each party shall conduct himself with justice and moderation."

Article 28 provides "that the extortion of illegal fees shall be expressly prohibited."

The thirtieth article provides "that should the Chinese nation grant to any nation, or the merchants or citizens of any nation, any right, privilege, or favor connected either with navigation, commerce, political or other intercourse, which is not conferred by this treaty, such right, privilege, and favor shall at once freely inure to the benefit of the United States, its public officers, merchants, and citizens," thus placing us upon an equality with the most favored nations.

This treaty gives us the privilege to reside in any port of China, pursue any business we may choose, to be protected in any religion we may profess, to be protected in our persons and property, and to be tried for offenses committed in China by our own countrymen under our own laws.

It stipulates for reciprocal intercourse. We mutually promise to live together in amity and good faith, and that the subjects of each government shall do as they would wish to be done by.

These are the main features of this late treaty, and on the part of the Chinese they are liberal beyond parallel. If we but improve and not abuse this peculiar privilege which our position has given to us, no pen can describe the benefits that will inure to the citizens of California.

Remember, our intercourse with China is but just opened; other nations are watching us with envious eyes. With our enterprise we must combine justice and reciprocal interests.

Our past conduct toward our Chinese residents has not inspired them with confidence toward us. They wish to cultivate our friendship. A better class than we have yet seen would come to reside with us if they could be assured of protection; but having no consul here, and being unacquainted with our laws, (although anxious to conform to them,) they dare not bring capital to invest in the country in large amounts.

While we are discouraging them, Her Majesty's subjects at Victoria are deriving the benefits of Chinese capital in the purchase of real estate to a considerable amount. Several of our resident traders have recently made real-estate purchases in Victoria, who inform us that they would have preferred to invest their money here if they could have been protected by our laws.

We now beg to refer you to the decisions of Mr. Justice McLean, of the United States Supreme Court. (See 7 Howard, p. 392.) These able decisions have since been recited with approbation and recognized as authority by the supreme court of the State of California, in the case of the People vs. Downer. (See 7 California R., p. 171.)

Justice McLean disposes of these great constitutional questions in a manner worthy of his fame as a sound jurist and just judge. His labors and reasoning will abundantly reward the time of truth-seeking students, and should be studied by every legislator who wishes to clearly comprehend this great constitutional question.

If we wish laws enacted to exclude Chinese from our State, we must go to the Congress of the United States for our remedies. We, as a State, are powerless to pass any law which will exclude them from any privileges accorded to the most favored foreigners. We have not the power, nor should it be our policy to shut ourselves out from one of the most magnificent openings of the age.

We hope soon to be connected with Asia by a line of mail-steamers, which will enable us to become better acquainted with this wonderful people.

Let us stay action, gather facts, study effects, enlighten ourselves and our constituents, and at the right time and in the right manner take such steps as will conduce to the greatest good of the greatest number. Our nearness and intimate connection with this industrious, numerous, and cultivated family of mankind may enable us to confer blessings on the whole human family.

Let us legislate as becomes a great, liberal, magnanimous people. Let us manifest our superiority by kindness. We are but at the opening of those mighty rivers which support four hundred millions of people. With the unequaled resources of our own matchless State and the unequaled enterprise of our own people, let us enter upon these grandest of enterprises of modern times with a prudence and intelligence that shall crown our efforts with countless wealth and national renown.

If a partial Providence endow us with ten talents, let us use them to gain other ten; and let us infuse into our benighted neighbors the blessings of that higher and purer civilization which we feel we were destined to establish over the whole earth.

R. F. PERKINS,
Chairman Senate Committee.
O. HARVEY.
G. K. PORTER.

JOHN E. BENTON,
Chairman Assembly Committee.
G. W. SEATON.
W. W. BATTLES.

SAN FRANCISCO, *March* 11, 1862.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *City and County of San Francisco, ss:*

I do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the foregoing copy of the report of joint select committee relative to the Chinese population of the State of California with the printed copy of the original, and that the same is a full, true, and correct copy thereof.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and official seal this 10th day of November, A. D. 1876.

[SEAL.]

HENRY C. BLAKE,
A Commissioner of Deeds for the State of Nevada, residing in the City and County of San Francisco.

APPENDIX Q.

(See testimony of Alfred Wheeler, p. 795.)

Table showing the annual arrivals and departures, as shown by the San Francisco custom-house records, of Chinese to and from California by sea from 1848 to October 1, 1876, with estimated deaths and departures inland to other States and Territories, and the total present Chinese population in the State of California.

	Arrivals.	Departures.	Gain.	Loss.
From 1848 to 1852	*10,000	.....	*10,000	.....
1852	20,026	1,768	18,258	.....
1853	4,270	4,421	.....	151
1854	16,084	2,330	13,754	.....
1855	3,329	3,473	.....	144
1856	4,807	3,028	1,779	.....
1857	5,924	1,933	3,992	.....
1858	5,427	2,542	2,885	.....
1859	3,182	2,745	437	.....
1860	7,343	2,088	5,255	.....
1861	8,424	3,594	4,840	.....
1862	8,188	2,795	5,393	.....
1863	6,435	2,947	3,488	.....
1864	2,696	3,911	.....	1,215
1865	3,097	2,298	799	.....
1866	2,242	3,113	.....	871
1867	4,294	4,499	.....	205
1868	11,085	4,209	6,876	.....
1869	14,994	4,896	10,098	.....
1870	10,869	4,232	6,637	.....
1871	5,542	3,264	2,278	.....
1872	9,773	4,887	4,886	.....
1873	17,075	6,805	10,270	.....
1874	16,085	7,710	8,375	.....
1875	18,021	6,305	11,716	.....
1876, to October 1	13,914	3,481	10,433	.....
Total	233,136	93,273	.....	.....
Total gain by sea	.....	.....	139,863	.....

* This item is estimate of State senate committee.

Total immigration in excess of emigration by sea		139,863
The departures inland to Oregon, Washington Territory, Nevada, Utah, Montana, Idaho, and to the States east of the Rocky Mountains cannot be less, in my opinion, than	20,000	
Estimating the annual mortality to be 2 per cent. (which is the average mortality of the white population,) the total deaths of Chinese who have remained within the State limits will be	25,900	
Making a total of deaths and departures inland		45,900
Deducting these from the net gain by sea, leaves the present Chinese population of California		93,963

ALFRED WHEELER.

SAN FRANCISCO, *November* 15, 1876.

APPENDIX R.

EXHIBIT 1.

(See testimony of W. W. Hollister, p. 843.)

The problem of labor.—The question of questions discussed by a practical man.—Work wages, and wealth in the United States.—Mind, money, and muscle as tripartite forces.—Idleness the great evil of the hour—only work will win.—Labor intelligently applied the true measure of a country's prosperity.—A people that works cannot be poor.—What is wealth?—Money only a measure of values.—Brain and brawn, an inequitable partnership.—Chinese labor in California.—Letter of W. W. Hollister.

Col. W. Hollister has addressed the following letter to the publishers of the Ohio State Journal, Columbus, Ohio:

SANTA BARBARA, CAL., *August* 1, 1876.

ANDY W. FRANCISCO, Esq.,
Columbus, Ohio:

DEAR SIR: I get intimation that you would like a letter from here on the subject of labor generally, and therewith connected a discussion of the question of Chinese labor in California.

As the Chinamen seem to be an object of consideration, important enough to get recognition in both the republican and democratic platforms, I suppose the discussion of the great problem of labor brings them to the front rank. They are really a very unimportant thing in the discussion.

I will give you, in as compact form as I can, my views on the subject; and while I do not claim the distinction of being a political economist, I will leave my arguments to the candid criticisms of my old friends, the citizens of Ohio, feeling confident that, knowing me to be a clansman—an old Buckeye—they will skip the rough corners of my argument and pass me on.

I am going, as is my wont, to ignore the preliminaries common to discussion, and jump without delay into the middle of the subject.

LABOR AND PROGRESS GO HAND IN HAND.

I will give you a formula, a proposition, and one that may serve as a text from which many a sermon could be preached. It is this:

Natural conditions being equal, the progress of a country (as of an individual) is in exact proportion to the amount of labor intelligently applied.

This opens the subject, and it seems to me that, admitting the justness of the proposition, it really needs no elaboration.

Without work there is no wealth. There is not a dollar added to the wealth of the nation without labor. Congress may make a promise, but it cannot create a dollar. The labor of the people alone can do that. When the Government issued its greenbacks it simply promised to the world that the American people would create by labor a dollar's worth of property for every dollar of paper issued. That promise we must fulfill. When we have done that greenbacks will be good as gold, and not one hour before. How have we fulfilled that promise? I think by immediately becoming the laziest and most prodigal nation on the face of the earth. A poor way to fulfill a promise or pay a debt.

We have become bummers, tramps, and have nearly brought the country to the verge of bankruptcy. A few years more of idleness and prodigality and we will see the end of this stupid career by eating the husks.

MUSCLE, BRAINS, AND CAPITAL MUST HAVE AN EQUITABLE COPARTNERSHIP.

Earnest labor and economy are not all that is necessary. Labor must not only be performed, but there must be an equitable distribution of the profits of the common toil of the country. There must be a fair division of profits between muscle and brains and capital. No one factor in the great machine, society, must claim all the profits. Here, in my opinion, is found the great enemy of progress. Muscle has demanded and received all the profits of the entire concern. Society is simply a great machine; all men are factors in it, and it requires the united effort of all to make it run smoothly. Every factor must be properly cared for; each part of the machine is necessary to the other. You cannot with safety lubricate and polish one part of the machine to the neglect of the other. Muscle has said, "I will be oiled and polished, and you may go without." The result is the machine is ruined, and muscle and brains and capital go to the bottom together. You may see the truth of my assertion in our bankrupt manufacturing industries, where, under the present tyranny of labor, the capital of the proprietor is gradually and surely becoming exhausted, and the closing up of great establishments tells the tale of unequal distribution of profits.

We labor first for food and raiment, then for what we call luxuries. The necessaries of life first; then, as we are fed and clothed, come aspirations for something higher—something in the way of art, something in the way of culture—something æsthetic. In order to realize to the fullest extent our highest hopes of life, there must be a perfect unity of purpose, a constant industry and economy, and an equitable distribution of profits. Our manufacturers and agriculturists are fighting a battle without weapons. Under the tyranny of labor our soil is left a desert and the workshop is closed.

EXPORTATION AT A LOSS RUINOUS.

Not a dollar's worth of the great staples or the products of our handicraft goes out of the country but at the expense of the proprietor or the expense of the soil. The national surplus finds no market except at a sacrifice, and so is rolled back upon ourselves to show us how badly the machine is running. England and France can send us the products of their labor and pay duties and thrive, and we send nothing abroad but the great staples, mainly food, and that at the sacrifice of the soil or the proprietor, or both. Bankrupt soil is bankrupt farmer, and bankrupt farmer is bankrupt commerce.

PRODUCTION BEFORE COMMERCE.

Antecedent to all trade is labor. England grows rich, not because she is smarter than other nations, but more industrious. France lives and thrives and pays that frightful war indemnity because her citizens work. Did she care for the millions of coin paid out and fear that thereafter she would have no measures of value left inside her dominion? Not at all. She went to work, and so brought them back from all nations with whom she had commercial relations.

MONEY NOT WEALTH.

Money as a measure of value has no other value. As a product of labor it is like all other products. If it pays to dig for gold or silver, dig; if not, dig potatoes or anything else that will pay better. (As a rule, everything else does pay better.) We lay too much stress upon, or give too high a value to, money. We fear to have it go out of the country. I think just the reverse. Send it out and pay our debts. We are not richer by having so much as measures of value.

IS THE VALUE IN THE GRAIN OR IN THE MEASURE?

I have a harvest of wheat—I am not much richer by having two half-bushels to measure it with. It is sometimes *convenient* to have two, but, if I am in a hurry, I borrow one of my neighbor. Get the wheat, and you need not worry about the half-bushel to measure it with.

LABOR, MORALITY, AND CIVILIZATION MARCH ABREAST.

Labor is the sum-total. Go to work and grow rich. If the nation continues idle nothing can save it. If idle it will be immoral. Poverty and crime go together. If you would have a moral community, make it prosperous. You can only do that by unflagging industry.

Labor is the penalty we pay for civilization. If there is an American who does not wish to work, let him don the scant apparel suited to the climate, go to the tropics, be a savage, and nature will feed him from a tree. If he wants the comforts and luxuries of a better life, let him take off his coat and go to work.

WE MUST WORK ON AN EQUALITY WITH OTHER NATIONS, AND WORK MORE.

The proposition that labor must not only be constant and unintermitted, but at a price that employment justifies, will hardly be disputed by thinking minds. Employment will only admit of such prices as prevail over the civilized world where the conditions are about the same as here. If we trade with other nations we are in constant competition with them, and must fight our battle with the same weapons. *Labor is the only weapon.* Either close the door to the advent of the products of other nations, or trade on terms of equality. With the price of labor here at double its price in other countries, we can certainly have no trade unless at a sacrifice. My opinion is that prices are double, and that we are working only half the time. I do not believe that for the whole people we are working three days in the week. I believe that merely to supply food and clothing it will take four days of honest work each week to enable us to live upon the plane on which we stand to-day; that is, with the expensive habits of our people, four days' work will not more than supply our wants. If that is true,

and I think it is, trade is impossible. I think that we are living upon our capital to some extent, and are actually, as a nation, losing ground. We are not creating as much as we consume. This must be taken with due regard to impoverishment of soils, the wear and tear of machinery, and general decline in value of works created by the industry of past years. A hundred years of great activity has created much wealth in the shape of all the appliances of art; cities, ships, railroads, farms, all constituting the wealth, or part of it, of the nation. They need no new creation by labor; they are a great power to aid us in the creation of greater wealth. We are, instead of using them as aids to further creations, using them to subsist in a fruitless effort to live without work. *We cannot live by our wits alone.* The labor of the head and hand are both requisite. Muscle must be guided by intelligence, and both working together create what we call capital.

WHAT IS CAPITAL? IS THERE CONFLICT BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR?

Capital is brain and muscle done up in a form agreed upon by the world and carried conveniently in the pocket. It is the measure of a power created by labor, and is a power. Without labor capital is useless; each is mutually dependent upon the other. There never can be any antagonism, from the fact of their absolute mutual dependence.

To-day, all over the Union muscle is crying aloud for capital to make concessions. What you have created by a year's slavish labor muscle wants for the labor of half that time. Capital says, "The trade is unfair; I will wait." Muscle starves, and capital is useless. Muscle has levied a tax upon itself and paid its own contribution. "I will be oiled and polished, and you may go without." The machine is broken, and both perish together.

Such seems to me the condition of affairs everywhere on our side of the great waters. How shall we extricate ourselves from the embarrassments of the situation?

LABORERS ENOUGH EAST, IF THEY WILL ONLY WORK.

On your side of the continent you have many laborers, and ought to get along without much trouble. Only go to work, all hands, and do your best, and you can't fail. But you have tramps and bummers. You have your muscular bummers, and your intellectual bummers. Both must work. Your cities and towns are full to overflowing, and your farms need the labor of thousands who are subsisting upon short rations as intermediates, or stealing from agriculture the too meager profits of rural toil. Send the surplus out and broaden the great basis upon which all social life is built. Make more farm and less town. Let them go to work at prices that capital can afford to pay, and not forget that capital is only one of the great driving-wheels of the car of progress, and that they are necessary factors in the same machine.

RESULTS OF HIGH-PRICED LABOR.

Contemplate the results of high-priced labor, and see the consequences. Take it as applied to railroads, for instance. With the prices paid for construction during the last decade, the roads have cost double what they ought to have cost. Then take the cost of the labor of employés in operating them. What do you see? An unrelenting necessity for high freights and fares. Can railroads run without pay? Where does it strike hardest? On your agriculture, as the great staples are bulky and heavy, and ought to be cheap per pound. Where is the blame to rest? You can't have railroads without labor. You must have muscle or no roads. You must have cheap labor or high freights. Take your farms. High-priced labor makes high-priced products, or your farmer starves. Who fixes the price for wheat and corn? The world. The price of a pound of wheat in Liverpool fixes the price for New York and San Francisco. The Mediterranean and Russian producers of wheat work at a low rate of wages. Can you expect to compete with them in the world's markets at more than double the wages? High-priced labor and half-time won't work. If you fight a battle with the world—and you can't help the fight—you must don your armor and fight it square, or you lose.

A BATTLE WITH THE WORLD—LABOR THE WEAPON WITH WHICH TO WIN THE FIGHT.

Your only armor is *labor*, as cheap as elsewhere. Put it on and win. With your natural advantages and increased power of production through labor-saving machinery, with equal industry you can beat the world. You thought you could win by labor-saving machinery alone, and live by your wits, but you can't. Give to the fight your brain, and muscle, and capital, and the sun will shine on no more prosperous people.

WOULD YOU DISCARD LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY?

Why do you seek to cheapen products by labor-saving machinery? Why is not cheap labor good if labor-saving machinery is good? Do you denounce a Chinaman

or black man, or any other kind of a man, because he sells his labor cheaply—is, in short, cheap labor—and cling to your labor-saving machines? If you discard the Chinaman for his cheap labor, you should quit the use of machinery. If one is a damage, the other is.

The fact is, our labor-saving machines have not of late years cheapened products. With increased power of production has come increased wages for labor, till it costs more for the farmer to put a bushel of wheat in the world's market to-day than it did forty years ago.

A MONOPOLY OF MUSCLE DEMORALIZING.

Muscle has gained enough to demoralize and degrade it, and capital has lost all. Let us have a new deal, and, with better counsel, all go to work with a will; and, adjusting the profits fairly to the equitable demands of all the factors in our machine, run it successfully. To-day, as for the last ten years, our failure to distribute equally the profits of the common toil of the country produces all the disasters that we are suffering. If we do not give ear to good counsel, and all go to work, each willing to receive his share and make no further demand, we will most assuredly solve the problem by suffering.

We either *brain* out a social problem or *suffer* it out. When common bankruptcy brings us to our senses, we will then go to work and do well; but can you count the criminals who, failing to see the necessities of the situation, go to prison rather than to work? Under a delusion, the outgrowth of many causes, muscle has concluded that capital was hostile. The laboring-man comes to the employer with the feeling that he meets an enemy. He demands the right to work at his own price, and fixes the number of hours that he will work. If this is not acceded to, he feels aggrieved, and denounces capital, his best friend, as an enemy. He does not know it, but really he is an animal that demands of the shepherd an open door to admit a wolf. He comes growling, not as a friend recognizing an obligation to give an equivalent for what he gets, but as an enemy to forage. There is none of the old feeling existing now that was so common and so beautiful twenty years ago, which the working-man felt for his employer, and the household where he labored, and where he had his home—his home in the true sense of the word. Not a bit of it, and far less here in California than with you of the other side.

LABOR AND CAPITAL MUST BE JOINED BY GOOD-WILL.

Capital cannot afford to lose good-will. I, as all other men, give something extra for the good-will of my hired man. I want his muscle and brain, but above all his heart. I want him to feel that I am his best friend, and if he is true I will be such a friend. But we are widely separated now. If I tell him that my business is tending to bankruptcy, that he gets all the profits of the labor of my brain and capital, he laughs in my face and thinks I lie.

CAN WE SOLVE THE PROBLEM AND AVERT THE DELUGE?

Can we reason this out and do better for the future? I doubt it, and so doubt the wisdom of this effort to reason out this problem of labor. Idleness seems to have stricken the country like a paralysis, and, as a great tidal wave, will run its course and subside after a while. But can you count the cost of the deluge? There will be bankrupt soils and bankrupt manufactures, decaying arts and flagging energies in all departments of industry, down to the dark bottom of social dissolution—a nation of thieves and nothing to steal.

THE EVIL DEEP AND WIDE-SPREAD—THE RULERS NOT ALONE TO BLAME.

I do not wish to paint this picture in too somber colors; but I am so convinced of the utter ruin which follows a cessation of industry, that, fruitless as it may be, I feel like crying aloud, "Spare us this humiliation." A nation more munificently endowed by nature than any other in resources, voluntarily descending to the lowest depths! Idleness, and its twin sister, Immorality, will type themselves in the capital, and a government too weak to defend the citizen becomes the prey of tyranny or the mob. Who fixes the plane upon which the rulers stand? Are *they* most to blame for the expensive life which prevails at the seat of Government? Begin at the bottom; make life less expensive by national thrift, which comes of national industry, and you will get national honesty and a pure government.

BUMMERS, INTELLECTUAL AND MUSCULAR.

Idleness is the root of all the evil. There is not only idleness of the men of muscle, but idleness of the men of brain—they who should plan and direct the labor of the

country. I have called them intellectual bummers. They throng our towns and cities; they are found in our schools and colleges, in our halls of legislation and in our churches; they are found in all of what are called the higher walks of life, and are more good-for-nothing than the mere muscular bummer, and more to be despised, as they descend to as low a level from a higher plane. What are we going to do with them? What are we going to do with both? Both are drones in the social hive; they will not work, but they will eat and drink, and must be supported. They are a great tax upon the industrious part of the community. How many a poor man, struggling hard at honest labor to support those dependent upon him, divides his crust with the lazy vagabond, half out of mistaken sympathy and half afraid the demoralized vagrant will fire his hut and make houseless his wife and children! Ask one of them to work, and he replies, "You will not give me wages enough, so I will not work."

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS TO-DAY.

To solve the question of how much can be given is the question of questions to-day all over the continent. Governed by conditions existing in all civilized countries, our rate of wages must nearly accord with that of other nations—not much more; in justice to labor, not less. More, if our natural resources are greater, but not enough more to cripple industry by embarrassing the employer. California can give but little more on the farm and in the workshop than is justified by difference of cost of transportation of products competitive. Our mines are our best field for labor at the present time. Our gold and silver are our best paying product, and mining the only industry justifying high wages. But for our mines, California would before this have felt the hard times common East; and now, unless labor becomes more abundant and cheaper, the time is not distant when we, too, will be as great sufferers. No farm in the State can survive the wages paid farm-hands. About one-half of present prices might do for labor by the year.

OF WHAT USE IS CAPITAL WHEN LABOR PLACES AN EMBARGO UPON IT?

With a vast amount of capital in our country held solely as measures of value, what is it worth to us? It is only good when used to stimulate enterprise as it goes out in the various industries. Now it is locked up because the holder dares not put out a dollar. He knows that there is no margin of profit if he undertakes to use it himself; he dares not loan it, for he knows all enterprises must fail from the exorbitant demands of labor. There is not, to my knowledge, in California a single undertaking that I would put money in, either in agriculture or manufactures. What then is to be done with it? Held here as a mere measure of value, it has no other value. If it is not used—and it cannot be used with safety—we are no richer for its possession, and would not be if the amount were multiplied by indefinite millions. If labor is not performed at prices that will call it out, it will be held indefinitely, and the country grows poor from idleness. There must be labor at prices that employment justifies, or no man is hired. The only way to use this capital, that I can see, is to cut off all trade with the world and use it at home. We must rid ourselves of the world's competition and then we will, after awhile, make some fair distribution of the profits of the labor performed at home. Now, we are distributing these profits with all nations, and, as I before stated, at a sacrifice of our capital.

CHEAP LABOR A NECESSITY AND A BLESSING—WHY SEND AWAY CHINAMEN?

There seems to be no possible way out of our difficulties but by a cheaper labor. I see no difference to the country whether that labor is performed by the citizens of one nation or many. Irish, Dutch, English, French, negroes, or Chinamen—any and all would do, provided their labor were cheap enough to enable us to prosecute any business, and enough of them to perform the work we have to do. With the American now disinclined to work at all, excepting spasmodically, and at a price double the value of his labor, we must either stop short all work or get somebody who will work steadily and at a lower price. This is the sum of all argument on this question; there can be no other conclusion. With this necessity of cheaper labor and the unwillingness of Americans to work, why discard the only man who stands ready to help us out? Why send away the Chinaman? I would send for more and more, till every enterprising American can get help enough at prices that will admit of continued undertakings, and then the country would once more start on its career of progress. The Chinamen can and would solve for us of California the problem, if they were allowed to come in sufficient numbers to create competition among themselves for positions. As it is and has been, the competition is among employers. Two or three employers were after every Chinaman here, even at high wages, and so high prices have been maintained. There are not now, and will not be for years to come, enough workers for the immense fields of labor opening up in California. Many a door to fruitful fields is closed simply because the price of labor is too high to admit of success.

THE ALTERNATIVE.

Here is a question to be met. Are we more willing to take our chances in a demoralized community, a certain consequent of idleness, than to set these willing Chinamen to work, and so make the whole country rich and prosperous? No willing American will lose a day's work on account of the presence of Chinamen here. On the contrary he will find two doors open to his superior skill where one is closed.

TESTIMONY IN FAVOR OF THE CHINESE.

I have employed Chinamen almost from the beginning of my life in this State. I have from five to fifteen or twenty as steady laborers, and for special employments, temporarily, many more at a time. I have studied the man as a man more closely, if possible, than I have any other race, and now give you my opinion of him as a worker and man. As a laborer he is most submissive and kindly, ready to do what you want done with entire good-will. He descends to the lowest employments, and when properly treated thinks of no degradation in the lowest of labors. In short, he is willing to be the mudsill and take the very bottom round of the social ladder. As a man I have found him honest, and, as a rule, very intelligent. Who ever saw a drunken Chinaman? They are unskilled in most of our labors, but when educated in them I have found them most useful and efficient. When skilled in your work, their accuracy and promptness are remarkable. For us of California they fill the very places which other laborers will not willingly fill. They perform the menial labors of our households, and in general do so much of our commonest toil that they pave the way for the higher labors of the better races. So necessary are they to us in filling the places they are filling now, that without them we would, if not actually come to a standstill, suffer extreme embarrassment in all departments. With the labor of these Chinese, numbering from fifteen to thirty in different branches of my business, I am able to give work to twenty to fifty laborers of other nationalities. Without their aid, who have thus opened the door to the advent of the higher labor, I would have found it so embarrassing to do anything that I would have been forced to forego many undertakings. In all fairness, considering the place filled by the Chinese in California, how are they to be considered as damaging or degrading to white labor? They do not often fill the positions sought after by others.

HOW MANY SHALL COME?

Now, then, comes the point of greatest interest to the opposers of Chinese immigration. How many Chinamen shall or ought to come to the country?

In nature great laws are constantly creating or bringing about great balances. In affairs of men, too, there are laws, or rules of action, which in the long run strike balances also. There is now so great a want of labor here that the Chinese are attracted by the promise of high wages. The supply from all sources is quite inadequate to the demand. Open the door and let them come, and just as soon as the balance is struck they stop coming, and you have solved the Chinese problem.

A WORD SPECIALLY TO WORKINGMEN.

Of the workingmen of the country I beg a careful consideration of the argument in this letter. You will see that I claim for the success of society, of which you form a necessary part, a general lower rate of wages. Competition with the world makes this a necessity. With wages which will admit of common success in business will come national thrift, of which you will be partakers. A high rate of wages does not necessarily mean prosperity for you. We are all only parts of a great machine. Let there be a fair division of profits and earnest industry, and we cannot fail.

W. W. HOLLISTER.

APPENDIX R.

Exhibit 2.

(See testimony of W. W. Hollister, p. 843.)

Memoranda as to Chinese in city and county of Santa Barbara, Cal., November 13, 1876.

Number of Chinese in county, estimated by assessor	400
Number of Chinese in city, estimated	300

On examination of the criminal dockets for the period of twelve months last past of the police judge and the justices of the peace of the city of Santa Barbara, whose

courts have sole cognizance of charges, under the statutes of this State, of crimes against the public peace, (including willfully disturbing the peace or quiet of any neighborhood, family, or person by loud or unusual noise, or by tumultuous or offensive conduct, or by threatening, traducing, quarreling, challenging to fight, or fighting —title XI, penal code; also many other offenses, such as assaults, gambling, &c.,) it appears that the only cases of charges against Chinese were as follows:

Date.	Before what judge.	Charge.	Disposition of case.
December 8, 1875	Cooley, P. J	Gambling	Dissmissed.
December 14, 1875	Ord, J. P	Gambling	Fined.
January 17, 1876	Rust, J. P	Assault	Not guilty.
July 17, 1876	Stark, J. P	Petit larceny, (stealing fruit from a garden)	Fined.
September 18, 1876	Cooley, P. J	Disturbing peace	Fined.

On application to the board of councilmen of the city of Santa Barbara for information as to how many Chinese receive support or aid of any kind from the city, the clerk of the board states that no Chinese are receiving from this city public support or aid, and no Chinaman has ever applied for such aid during the term of his—such clerk's—term of office, over two years.

And the clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Santa Barbara, in like terms, states that there is not one case of any Chinese receiving any public support or aid from the county, and that during the term of his office (over two and one-half years) no application for such aid has been made by any Chinaman or Chinawoman, while there are repeated instances of citizens of European birth and of Americans and native Californians constantly receiving county support or aid.

NOVEMBER 16, 1876.

The above information has just reached me (since my testimony was given) from Santa Barbara. It was prepared by my request, and is entirely reliable.

W. W. HOLLISTER.

APPENDIX S.

(See testimony of Morris Lessler, p. 930.)

Mr. J. M. Curtis, wine and spirit commission-agent, of 434 Jackson street, states: That from information I have had from the wine-growers personally is, that the picking of grapes is almost done entirely by Chinese labor, and I can safely say that $\frac{1}{20}$ per cent. is done by them. Some Chinese are also employed in working on the fields or vinebergs, but then generally in company with whites; the overseers are always whites.

Report of the first nine months of 1876: Our native wines appear to be steadily but silently gaining in public favor, both at home and abroad.

Exports by sea from 1st January to 1st October, 1876.

To New York	396,762 gallons,	637 cases, value	$251,006
To Central America	2,170 gallons,	180 cases, value	2,091
To Mexico, Peru, &c	6,614 gallons,	822 cases, value	8,375
To Honolulu and Tahiti	2,875 gallons,	111 cases, value	2,040
To China and Japan	101 gallons,	83 cases, value	552
To England, &c	1,024 gallons,	57 cases, value	1,363
To Germany	1,569 gallons,	90 cases, value	2,090
Total by sea	411,115 gallons,	1,980 cases, value	267,717

Exports by rail (10 pounds per gallon) forwarded East.

From San Francisco	42,795 gallons.
From Sacramento	100,083 gallons.
From Stockton	3,080 gallons.
Total by rail	145,958 gallons.

RECAPITULATION.

By sea	411,115 gallons wine.
By sea, 1,930 cases, at 2 gallons	3,960 gallons wine.
By rail	145,958 gallons wine.
Grand total	561,033 gallons wine

Receipts of California wines for 1876.

For January	97,087 gallons.
For February	100,350 gallons.
For March	108,468 gallons.
For April	171,768 gallons.
For May	189,111 gallons.
For June	140,952 gallons.
For July	123,000 gallons.
For August	172,000 gallons.
For September	184,000 gallons.
Total	1,266,736 gallons.

Receipts of California brandies for 1876.

For January	900 gallons.
For February	4,350 gallons.
For March	1,450 gallons.
For April	5,000 gallons.
For May	2,350 gallons.
For June	12,000 gallons.
For July	1,500 gallons.
For August	8,000 gallons.
For September	7,500 gallons.
Total	43,050 gallons.

The current price for shipping-lots in good cooperage and delivered free on board ship or rail is: For common white or red, 45 to 50 cents, gold, per gallon; common sweet, 70 to 85 cents; choice dry wines, from 60 cents to $1 per gallon. The average price for crude wines delivered in the city, the purchaser furnishing casks, is: For sound dry wines from mission grapes, about 20 to 25 cents per gallon; from foreign grapes, 30 to 40 cents; sweet wines, 45 to 65 cents per gallon.

Mr. Henry Gerkes's vineyard is producing annually about 150,000 gallons of wine. California has now nearly forty millions of vines growing, of which over three-quarters are in bearing condition. The crop of 1875 amounted to about 8,000,000 gallons of wine, and probably some 80,000 gallons of grape-brandy.

The principal wines produced are white wine, or hock, muskat, Tokay, claret, Burgundy, sherry, and port wine.

Mostly all the wines go to the Western or Eastern States, where they are more appreciated every year.

California has at least eight or ten millions of acres of land fitted for grape-culture, which can produce more wine than France, Germany, and Spain together. One single firm here, Kohler & Frohling, work up annually from three to five million pounds of grapes in their Los Angeles and Sonoma vineyards. They employ during the vintage season from three to four hundred hands, mostly Germans from the river Rhein.

The Buena Vista Vinecultural Society is the largest of its kind in this State, possessing over 6,000 acres in Sonoma County, of which over 500 acres are at present in grapes.

Mr. B. E. Auger, of 409 Battery street, agent for the above named, states that they employ at present sixty-five people; more than half are Chinese. The latter we require mostly for grape-picking and working the soil.

Mr. John Bach, manager of the United Anaheim Vine-Growers' Association, office 321 Montgomery street, states: We employ about half Chinese and half natives (Mexican and Indian mixed) in picking grapes and working in the vineyards generally. All our overseers are white men. We had in Anaheim originally about 1,200 acres planted with vines, and at present there are about 4,000 to 5,000 acres around Anaheim, all bearing fruit. About six to eight years ago the first Chinese came down there, and they are increasing very much every year. We pay them from $1 to $1.25 per day, and they have to find themselves. The white laborer does not earn much more, but we

have to find them in provisions, cooks, and good houses to live in, and they have to be treated better; but when work commences you can depend on them. It does not pay to keep whites all the year round; for that, Chinese and Indians are preferred.

The vegetable or fruit stands and markets as counted in Chinatown are as follows:

	Vegetable-stands.	Markets.
In Dupont street	20	14
In Jackson street	16	8
In Washington alley	9	8
In Washington street	6	
In Spofford street		3
In Commercial street	8	
In Sacramento street	17	12
Total	76	45

Mr. Sussman, secretary of the Pacific Jute Company, says that they employ at present 450 Chinese at $1 per day, and 12 whites at $3 to $4 per day. The jute (imported from East India) is worked up in a manner similar to other textile fabrics. After being prepared it passes through the different carding processes, and is then spun and woven upon the looms. The cloth, on being taken from the looms, is mangled and cut up, after which it is sewn up into sacks and pressed in bales of 500 sacks each, ready for market.

Mr. F. Grisar, of Grisar & Co., California Wool Exchange, corner Fifth and Townsend streets, states that for herding, washing, and clipping sheep nothing but white men are employed, as they must know the sicknesses and cures of sheep thoroughly. A very few Chinese are employed, but only for minor work. It requires a great deal of experience to look after sheep; it takes about twenty years. The Chinese are not learned sufficient about it as yet.

Wool-production for 1876, estimated, 52,000,000 pounds.

	Pounds.		Pounds.
1854	175,000	1867	10,288,600
1855	300,000	1868	14,232,657
1856	600,000	1869	15,413,970
1857	1,100,000	1870	20,072,660
1858	1,428,351	1871	22,187,188
1859	2,378,250	1872	24,255,468
1860	3,055,325	1873	32,155,169
1861	3,721,998	1874	39,356,781
1862	5,990,300	1875	43,532,223
1863	6,268,480	1876	52,000,000
1864	7,923,670		
1865	8,949,931	Total	323,918,668
1866	8,532,047		

At 18 to 25 cents, gold, per pound—value, $68,023,020; value for 1876, $10,400,000.

There are three kinds of wool: spring wool, fall wool, and pulled wool.

California cannot compete at present with Australia or South America in raising fine wool, as the climate is unsuitable. Manufacturers use California wools, because they cost less, clean, than the best foreign or domestic; and when the shrinkage is heavy, the price for the wool in the grease must be low, because it cannot be used in making high-priced goods.

The supply of wools of medium grade and long-staple is always less than the demand. By raising wool with these characteristics, growers would obtain good prices for their spring and fall clip, as both would be of good staple and condition.

There is a difference of 12 to 15 per cent. in favor of medium and against fine wools from the same section, and the former are preferred at the increased price. Better wools would be produced if growers would shear early in the fall, and give as much time as possible for the growth of the spring clip.

Comparative prices in gold of A 1 California wool.

	Spring.	Fall and Lambs.
1868	16 to 19 cents.	13 to 18 cents.
1869	18 to 20 cents.	12 to 15 cents.
1870	18 to 21 cents.	13 to 19 cents.
1871	25 to 33 cents.	21 to 30 cents.
1872	27 to 50 cents.	17 to 21 cents.
1873	19 to 25 cents.	16 to 21 cents.
1874	19 to 28 cents.	15 to 21 cents.
1875	18 to 25 cents.	10 to 19 cents.
1876	19 to 27 cents.	15 to 19 cents.

Mr. Gerard Douglas, of Douglas Brothers, owners of the sheep ranch Los Guntos, in this State, testifies that as near as possible, from his own knowledge, there are about 10,000,000 sheep in this State; land occupied for raising sheep, inclusive of Government or border land, about 35,000,000 acres, and people (or seven-eighths whites to one-eighth Chinese) employed to look after sheep, about 12,000. The average pay per person is $300 per annum and found.

Mr. Bissinger, of Louis Sloss & Co., of Sansome street, states that about 175,000 raw beef-hides and over 500,000 sheep-hides are coming yearly to this market from the State of California. Out of this about 60,000 beef-hides and about 50,000 sheep-hides are tanned here in San Francisco for sole-leather, uppers, morocco, and for saddle and glove leather, and deer-skins for imitation kid. About 300 to 400 tanners are employed here through the year to tan and manufacture the skins used here and for exportation. The most of the oak-bark used here for tanning comes from Santa Cruz County.

Mr. J. Landsberger, of No. 12 Jones alley, the largest champagne manufacturer in California, states that he employs about forty whites and twenty Chinese, the latter only for minor purposes, as washing bottles, &c. "I manufacture about 15,000 cases per annum. The same is more appreciated in Australia and England than here in the States. I ship about 800 cases per annum to Australia and Honolulu; also a quantity to Liverpool and London. I never have any complaints about the quality of the wine, but about bad corks, on account of the long passage per sailing-vessel to Europe. It will not pay me to send the same per rail or steamer. About 300 cases monthly are consumed in New York from my branch office, and the rest here and in the adjacent States."

Mr. I. W. Schaeffer, formerly president of the Cigar Manufacturing Society, at present cigar manufacturer in Sacramento street, states that it at one time employed only white boys and girls to make cigars, strip the tobacco, &c.

Mr. C. W. Kellogg, manager of the San Francisco Cordage Factory, of 613 Front street, states: "Our factory gives at present employment to about thirty Chinese, at $1 per day, and forty-five white men at $2.25 to $4 per day."

Mr. S. Lachmann, jr., of Lachmann & Co.'s wine vaults, in Market street, near First, states: "We have some Chinese employed for minor works here and in Sacramento; we employ about one Chinese to four white men; the Chinese we pay $1, and the whites between $2.50 and $3 each, per day."

Mr. G. B. Swan, of Swan & Co., Union Box Factory, in Spear street, testifies that they employ no Chinese, but seventy five white men at $2.25, and about forty-two boys and girls at 75 cents to $1.50 per day; has his factory on the same block as Code & Elfeld, fruit-preservers, have theirs.

M. E. Briggs, secretary of the Consolidated Tobacco Co., of 207 Front street, states: "Our company employs at their factory, in Gilroy, generally about seven hundred Chinese at $1.50 per day, about seventy-five whites from $1.50 to $2.50 per day, and about one hundred and fifty Chinese field-laborers at $1 per day."

Mr. Code, of Code & Elfeld, fruit and pickle preservers, of 314 Washington street, employ at present about fifty Chinese at 80 cents, and about fifty white boys and girls at $1 to $1.50 per day.

Mr. Sydney M. Smith, manager of Cutting & Co., fruit and pickle preservers, cider manufacturers, &c., of No. 17 Main street, states that they have employed generally about 400 Chinese in the summer and about 100 in winter.

Mr. I. T. Loose, secretary of the California Powder-Works, of No. 314 California street, states that the company employ Chinese labor only for minor purposes. They employ them also in coopering and filling cartridges, as the fumes are very dangerous to the health killing any ordinary white man within two years.

Agricultural implements:

	Per day.
Kimball Manufacturing Company, 65 whites	$3 50 to $4 00
M. C. Hawley, 20 whites	3 50
Grazier, Frank, 10 whites	3 00

Bag manufacturers:

Cook, H. N, 20 whites	1 50
Dakin & Libbey, 10 whites	1 75
Detrick, E. & Co., 8 whites	1 75
Gove, A. J., 6 whites	2 00
Meyerstein, J., 8 whites	2 00
Neville & Co., 8 whites	2 00
Stack, John, 10 whites	2 25
Taylor, S. P. & Co., 14 whites	2 00

Bed-comforters:

Dee, Rose & Co., 15 girls	1 50

	Per day.
Bolt and nut makers:	
Dunn, J. & Co., 8 whites	$3 50
Payne, W., 6 whites	3 00
Phelps Manufacturing Company, 10 whites	3 25
Boiler-makers:	
Monihan & Aitken, 10 whites	3 50
Prescott, Scott & Co., 12 whites	3 50
Roebuck, Th. G., 10 whites	2 50 to $3 50
McAffee & Co., 100 whites	3 00
Eagle Company, 15 whites	3 00
Pacific Company, 25 whites	2 25 to 4 00
Portland Company, 50 whites	3 00
Sacramento Company, 25 whites	3 00
San Francisco Company, 13 whites	2 25 to 4 00
Bell-foundery and brass-works:	
W. Y. Garratt, 92 whites	3 00
California Brass-Works, 35 whites	2 50
San Francisco Brass-Works, 15 whites	2 75
Band, F., 10 whites	2 50
Bee, S. W. & Co., 18 whites	2 75
Clark, W. D., 15 whites	2 50
Eisenbeis & Lachowsky, 10 whites	2 75
Engets, H., (Utah,) 15 whites	2 50
Union Company, 20 whites	2 25
Eagle Company, 15 whites	2 50
Wilson, A., 12 whites	2 75
Iron sheet manufacturers:	
Hayes, Geo. & Company, 8 whites	2 75
Hunter, I. & Co., 10 whites	2 50
Johnstone, James, 6 whites	2 50
Jute factory:	
Pacific, 12 whites, 450 Chinese	1 00 to 3 50
Lead-pipes and works:	
San Francisco, 20 whites	3 00
Pacific, 6 whites	3 50
Mattresses:	
Beale, S., 9 whites	2 50
California, 40 whites, 10 girls	1 50 to 3 00
Clark, Y., 6 whites, 1 girl	1 25 to 2 50
Mellus, I., jr., 4 whites	2 75
Valentine, S., 6 whites, 2 girls	1 25 to 3 00
Meat-preservers:	
Barraty & Coutelene, 10 whites	2 00
Durr, I., 12 whites	2 25
Eismann, I., 8 whites	2 25
Empey, C., 6 whites	2 50
San Francisco Prov. Company, 10 whites	2 50
Wilson, Merry & Co., 12 whites	2 50
Mirror factory:	
Whittier, Fuller & Co., 10 whites	3 25
Match factories:	
Bendel & Co., 4 whites, 6 boys, 15 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Eureka, 2 whites, 4 boys, 10 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
California, 6 whites, 14 boys	1 25 to 2 75
Maccaroni and vermicelli:	
California, Italian, 20 whites	2 00
Consolidated, 9 whites	2 25
Pioneer, 5 whites	2 25
Marble yards:	
Beale, W. & Son, 8 whites	3 50
Bianchi, C., 8 whites	3 00

	Per day.
Brignadello, S., 10 whites	$3 00
California, 12 whites	3 50
Dempsey, I., 10 whites	3 50
Duffy Brothers, 12 whites	3 25
Siovanini, V., 8 whites	3 00
Heverin, M., 12 whites	3 50
Larsenneur & Sheerin, 20 whites	3 25
Musto Bros., 10 whites	3 00
Roche, Ch., 14 whites	3 25
San Francisco, 10 whites	3 25
Tierney, W. H., 8 whites	3 00
Sweeney, John, 6 whites	3 50
Mucilage:	
Knowlton, J. J., 4 whites	2 25
Nickel platers:	
Pacific Electro, 10 whites	4 00
Dennisten, E. S., 8 whites	3 50
Oakum factory:	
Weeks & Co., 6 whites, 10 boys	$1 25 to 2 25
Organ-builders:	
Bergstrom, John, 8 whites, 6 girls	1 25 to 3 00
Pickle-preservers:	
W. C. King & Co., 10 whites, 10 boys, 25 girls	1 25 to 3 00
Fisher, J. H., 5 whites, 10 girls, 15 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Lohrman & Siemer, 4 whites, 8 girls, 10 Chinese	90 to 2 00
Taylor & Moore, 3 whites, 5 boys, 6 girls	1 50 to 2 50
Wangenheim, Sol, 8 whites, 10 boys, 20 girls, 4 Chinese	90 to 2 25
Pumps, steam:	
Wilcox, W. C. & Co., 16 whites, 5 boys	2 50 to 4 50
San Francisco, 18 whites, 4 boys	2 00 to 4 00
Tustin, W. J., 8 whites, 5 boys	2 00 to 4 00
Laswell, D. F., 6 whites, 6 boys	1 50 to 5 00
Paint (chemical) works:	
Darcey & Slassey, 4 whites	2 50
California, Avelts, 7 whites	2 50
Plumbers:	
About 250 whites, 75 boys	2 00 to 4 00
Planing-mills:	
Centennial, 100 whites, 20 boys	2 00 to 10 00
Beal street, 50 whites, 10 boys	2 00 to 4 00
Brown, W. S., 35 whites, 5 boys	2 00 to 5 00
California, 50 whites 10 boys	2 00 to 4 00
Enterprise, 25 whites, 5 boys	2 25 to 3 00
Mechanics, 70 whites, 10 boys	2 00 to 4 00
Southpoint, 25 whites, 5 boys	2 25 to 4 00
Southpark, 20 whites	2 00 to 4 00
Excelsior, 30 whites, 5 boys	2 00 to 3 00
Paper-mills:	
Pacific, 4 whites, 6 boys	1 00 to 4 00
Pioneer, 2 whites, 8 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Provision packers:	
Bunker, R. S., 10 whites	2 50
Nichelssen, Brown & Co., 14 whites	2 50
S. F. Packing Co., 10 whites	2 50
Rice-mills:	
India, 5 whites, 3 Chinese	1 75 to 4 00
Saw-manufacturers:	
Bonney, C., 6 whites	3 00
Pacific, 8 whites	3 00
paulding, N. W., 6 whites	3 25

	Per day.
Saw-filers:	
Fisher, J. H., 8 whites	$3 50
Hall, J., 6 whites	3 00
Magnold, S., 6 whites	2 50
Pacific, 12 whites	3 00
Terry, W. N., 6 whites	3 00
Verril, C. M., 8 whites	3 00
Soap-manufacturers:	
Alta, 4 whites, 8 boys	$1 25 to 2 00
Bettman, M., 2 whites, 8 girls	1 50 to 2 00
Commercial Co., 3 whites, 12 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Golden City, 20 whites, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Standard, 10 whites, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Safe-factories:	
California, S. Kittredge, 35 whites	2 50
Callagher, J., 10 whites	2 50
Leavitt, C. H., 8 whites	2 50
Nutting, C. & Son, 6 whites	2 50
Sins, John, 6 whites	2 50
Stair-building:	
Albert, H. M., 10 whites, 6 boys	1 50 to 3 50
Freeman, A., 30 whites, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Dillon & Drew, 18 whites, 2 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Jesse & Drew, 20 whites, 5 boys	1 10 to 3 00
Langland & Leach, 15 whites, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Sanborn & Byrnes, 25 whites, 5 boys	1 10 to 3 00
Shirt-factories:	
Occidental, 5 men, 20 girls	1 25 to 2 50
Diamond, 5 men, 5 girls	1 25 to 2 25
Anchor, 3 men, 15 girls, 25 Chinese	1 10 to 2 25
Standard, 4 men, 25 girls, 45 Chinese	1 10 to 2 25
Oriental, 3 men, 10 girls, 20 Chinese	1 10 to 2 25
Eureka, 3 men, 6 girls	1 25 to 2 50
San Francisco, 3 men, 5 girls, 39 Chinese	1 10 to 2 25
Sugar-refineries:	
Bay, 50 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 4 00
California, 35 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 4 00
Golden Gate, 60 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 3 50
San Francisco and Pacific, 100 men, 20 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Tools for blacksmiths, &c.:	
Kuhling, 14 men	4 00
California, 12 men	3 00 to 4 00
San Francisco, 10 men, 5 boys	1 50 to 3 50
Hinz, C., 5 men, 2 boys	1 50 to 3 50
Trunks, &c.:	
Behrend, H., & Co., 20 men, 10 boys	1 10 to 2 50
Haas, A., & Co., 20 men, 5 boys	1 10 to 2 25
Martin, D. S., & Co., 10 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Weirsing, Ch. H., 10 men, 5 boys	1 10 to 2 25
Tanneries:	
Becker, G., 20 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Beisel & Cook, 15 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Curtis, R., 25 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Dietch, G., 20 men	2 25
Gray, S. C., 30 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Mahony & Tevlin, 25 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 25
McAlleer, F., 30 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 25
O'Donnell, C., 20 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Patrick, A. B., & Co., 20 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 25
Sedgeley & Davis, 10 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Union, 25 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 25
Pacific, (sheepskins,) 20 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Dow & McBowen, (sheepskins,) 20 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 25

	Per day.
Fitch, D., (sheepskins,) 10 men, 10 boys	$1 00 to $2 25
Geary, I., (sheepskins,) 20 men, 5 boys	1 00 to 2 25
Hoffman, S., & Co., (sheepskins,) 10 men, 5 boys	1 00 to 2 25
Hellwig, S., & Co., (buckskin,) 20 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Katta, J., (buckskin,) 10 men, 5 boys	1 10 to 2 25
Krieg & Anton, (furs,) 10 men, 2 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Onen, A., (furs,) 15 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Struven, B., (furs,) 10 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Wolf, James, (furs,) 15 men, 5 boys	1 10 to 2 50
Tools, engravers:	
Dinkelspiel & Co., 5 men	3 50
Type-foundery:	
Pacific, 8 men	3 00 to 4 50
Painter & Co., 50 men	3 00 to 5 00
Upholsterers:	
About 120 men and 30 boys	1 25 to 4 00
Wood-turners, &c.:	
Job, 20 men	3 50
Atkinson, G. T., 15 men	3 00
Brehm, R. W., 10 men	3 00
Henry, W., 8 men	3 50
Orton, R. H., 12 men	3 00
Wire-works:	
California, 50 men	3 00 to 3 25
San Francisco, 10 men	3 25
National, 8 men	3 25
Pacific, 30 men	3 25
Wire springs:	
Wire-Spring Manufacturing Company, 8 Chinese	1 50
California, 8 men	2 25
Star, 10 men	2 00
Cray, I., & Co., 10 men	2 00
Bellows factories:	
California Bellows Factory, 20 whites	2 25
W. E. Edwards, 8 Chinese	1 50
Thomas, Ch. W., 12 whites	2 25
Fenn, F. C., 4 whites	2 00
Barbers:	
About 1,850 whites	2 25 to 2 50
Blacking:	
Cox, J. W., & Co., 8 whites	2 25
Lake, H., 6 whites	2 00
Belt-factories:	
Cook, M., 10 whites	2 25
Boyer, H., 8 whites	2 50
San Francisco, 3 whites	2 25
Box-factories, (packing:)	
Hobbs, Pomeroy & Co., 70 whites and 18 boys	2 00 to 3 50
Cook Brothers, 30 whites and 10 boys	2 00 to 3 25
Pacific, 50 whites and 10 boys	2 50 to 3 00
Meyers, W., & C., 40 whites and 5 boys	2 50 to 3 50
San Francisco Co-operative, 50 whites and 10 boys	2 50 to 3 00
Swann, G. W., & Co., 75 whites and 35 boys	1 25 to 2 25
Box factories, paper:	
Waizman Marks, 8 whites, 6 girls	2 50
Wempe Brothers, 7 whites, 30 girls	1 50 to 3 00
Box factories, tin:	
Justin, B. C., 15 whites, 6 girls	1 25 to 3 00

	Per day.
Beds and bedding:	
Appel, S., 6 whites	$2 50
Baum, G., 8 whites	2 25
Boyle, H., 6 whites	2 75
Butterfield, W., 6 whites	2 75
Chadborne, F. S., & Co., 10 whites	2 75
Clark, Bickoff & Krebs, 12 whites	2 50
Connely, I., & Co., 16 whites	2 75
Frank, B., 8 whites	2 50
Frank, H., & Co., 14 whites	2 50
Goodwin & Co., 12 whites	2 75
Gray, I., & Co., 10 whites	2 50
Hansen & Bordfeld, 14 whites	2 75
Hoey, John, 10 whites	2 50
Hufschmidt, F., 10 whites	2 25
Koser, W., 12 whites	2 75
Lang & Hanbury, 14 whites	2 50
Regan & Bell, 15 whites	2 75
Walcom & Schomberg, 10 whites	2 75
Watson, E. & R. E., 12 whites	2 50
Williams, G. M., & Co., 14 whites	2 50
And about 2 whites in each second-hand furniture store, 700 whites	2 50
Boxes, fancy:	
Hendrickson, I. R., 8 whites	2 50
Billiard-factories:	
Liesenfeld, 20 whites	3 33
Strahle & Co. 15 whites	3 25
Book-binders:	
About 100 whites, 20 boys, 80 girls	$0 75 to 3 00
Bakers:	
About 800 whites	1 50 to 2 00
Broom and brush factories:	
California, 40 whites, 10 boys	75 to 2 50
Pacific, 25 whites, 5 boys	1 00 to 2 50
Simpson, R. W., 15 whites, 5 boys	1 25 to 2 25
San Francisco, 20 whites, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Ward, Th., 20 whites	2 50
Figer Brothers, 20 whites	2 25
Martin & Peterson, 15 whites, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Box factories, cigar:	
California, 6 whites, 25 girls	1 00 to 2 25
Korbel, F., & Bro., 30 whites, 7 boys, 45 girls	85 to 3 00
San Francisco, 8 whites, 15 girls	1 00 to 3 00
Waldstein, A., 30 whites, 40 girls	1 00 to 3 25
Boot and shoe factories:	
Einstein & Bros., 150 whites, 80 boys, 120 girls	1 00 to 3 00
Levinsky Bros., 18 whites, 20 girls, 60 Chinese	1 25 to 2 25
Buckingham, Hecht & Co., 40 whites, 20 girls, 140 Chinese	1 25 to 2 50
Emerson, D. W., 4 whites, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 50
Hamlin & Chase, 4 whites, 6 girls	1 25 to 2 75
Irwin, John, 5 whites, 15 girls	1 50 to 2 75
Porter, O., & Schleinger, 30 whites, 40 boys, 60 girls, 54 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Rosenstock, S. W., & Co., 60 whites, 40 girls	1 50 to 2 75
Rosenthal, Feder & Co., 60 whites, 10 boys, 30 girls, 16 Chinese	1 25 to 2 75
Sullivan, John, 30 whites, 10 girls	1 50 to 2 75
United Workmen Co-operative, 40 whites	2 50
Wentworth, I, M., & Co., 40 whites, 30 boys, 30 girls, 175 Chinese	1 10 to 2 75
Wolff, S., & Co., 10 whites, 25 Chinese	1 00 to 3 00
Employed by Chinese, and board, 1,500 Chinese	50 to 1 10
Employed in retail stores, 700 whites, 200 boys, 100 girls	1 25 to 4 00
Blankets and woolens:	
Hyneman & Co. and Mission Wool and Pioneer Mills, 150 whites, 60 boys, 40 girls, 700 Chinese	90 to 3 00

	Per day.
Candles and soap:	
San Francisco, 10 whites, 10 boys, 35 Chinese	$1 00 to $4 00
Mission, 6 whites, 30 Chinese	1 25 to 4 00
Smith, Lucy & Co., 3 whites, 3 Chinese	1 25 to 2 50
Coffee and spice mills:	
F. Bernhard, 14 whites	2 50
Eagle, 13 whites	2 00 to 2 50
Chartres, 16 whites, 2 boys	2 00 to 2 50
E. Loeven & Co., 5 whites	2 50
Ira Marden & Co., 8 whites	2 50
H. E. Bothin, 8 whites	2 50
Campe & Co., 12 whites, 4 boys	2 00 to 3 00
Finck, Ch. H., & Co., 8 whites	2 50
Canned fruits:	
Cutting & Co., 150 whites, 20 boys, 40 girls, 30 Chinese	90 to 2 50
Code & Elfeld, 20 whites, 10 boys, 50 girls, 50 Chinese	80 to 1 50
Cracker-factories:	
California, 60 whites, 20 boys	1 00 to 5 00
Boston, 10 whites, 2 boys	1 00 to 5 00
Muller, G., 8 whites	2 75
San Francisco, 20 whites, 10 boys	1 25 to 2 75
Cordage-factories:	
Pacific, 40 whites, 10 boys	1 25 to 3 25
San Francisco, 40 whites, 5 boys, 30 Chinese	1 00 to 4 00
Royer, H., 20 whites, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Color and white-lead works:	
Whittier, Fuller & Co., 10 whites	3 00
Chair-factories:	
Centennial, 6 whites	2 00
Haywood Bros., 12 whites	2 25
Klemm, Ch., 10 whites	2 25
Coppersmiths:	
Macken & Co., 14 whites	3 25
Carpeau, Ch., 6 whites	3 50
Johnston, J., 6 whites	3 25
Percy, P., 8 whites	3 25
Sanders & Co., 6 whites	3 25
Smith, C. W., 10 whites	3 50
Wagner & Lodt, 10 whites	3 25
Cigar-manufacturers:	
Bollmann, I., & Co., 12 Chinese	2 00
Bowman, I., & Co., 20 Chinese	2 50
Cobo, Ygual & Co., 14 Chinese	2 00
Consolidated Tobacco Company, 75 Chinese	2 25
Dennicke Bros., 25 Chinese	2 75
Garcia & Alvarez, 8 Chinese	2 50
Herber, W., & Co., 8 Chinese	2 50
Kammiter & Brune, 11 Chinese	2 50
Danielwitz & Williams, 9 Chinese	2 25
Lewis Bros., 10 Chinese	3 50
Liebes Bros. & Co., 12 Chinese	3 50
Oppenheim & Bro., 8 Chinese	2 50
Ordenstein & Co., 10 Chinese	3 00
Plageman, H., & Co., 12 Chinese	2 75
Rosenbaum, A. S., & Co., 16 Chinese	3 00
Rosenshine, M., & Co., 11 Chinese	3 25
Wertheimer, M., & Bro., 15 Chinese	1 50
Other factories, 133 Chinese	3 00
Other factories and board, 2,800 Chinese	50 to 1 25
Coffin-factories:	
Lockhard & Porter, 16 whites	3 50
Hunt, D. W., 10 whites	3 50
Carson & Hayes, 20 whites	3 25

	Per day.
Coopers:	
Armstrong, I. S., 8 whites	$2 50 to $3 50
Armstrong, R., 6 whites	2 50 to 3 00
Arnold, F. W., 6 whites	3 00 to 4 00
Bucking, D., 10 whites	2 50 to 3 50
Carl, Bro. & Co., 14 whites	2 75 to 3 00
Cronin, D., 8 whites	2 50 to 3 50
Dyer, W. C., 6 whites	2 75 to 3 00
Felvey, L., 8 whites	2 75 to 3 00
Fulda, M., & Sons, 50 whites	2 00 to 4 00
Gittardy, R., 8 whites	2 50
Handy, L. N., & Co., 6 whites	2 75 to 3 00
Nesbitt & Co., 30 whites	3 00
Hubbel, S. S., 5 whites	2 75
Kruse & Olsen, 15 whites	2 50 to 3 00
Pacific Barrel and Keg Company, 20 whites	2 75 to 3 00
Norton, R., 8 whites	2 75 to 3 00
Paul Bros., 8 whites	2 50 to 3 50
Ralph, W., 10 whites	2 50
Roach, I. F., 8 whites	2 75
Schiller, F., 10 whites	2 50 to 3 00
Warner, Ch., 20 whites	2 50
Woerner, D., 12 whites	3 00
Engravers:	
Allan, John, (stone,) 3 whites	4 00
Giller, Ch., 2 whites	3 50
Goldsmith & Son, 3 whites	2 00 to 3 50
Kuner, A., 2 whites	3 00
Pages, I. F., 3 whites	3 25
Butler, F. A., (wood,) 3 whites	3 00
Butler, W. C., 2 whites	2 75
Curtis, Leila & Co., 4 girls	2 50
Deaves, C. W., 3 whites	3 25
Eitner, R., 2 whites	3 00
Fabens, H. T., 2 whites	3 25
Harrison, W. P., 4 whites	3 00
Pacific Engraving Company, 3 whites	4 00
Pelitt, T. I., 2 whites	3 25
Shourds, I. A., 3 whites	3 50
Van Fleck, D., 2 whites	3 25
Dewey & Co., (general,) 5 whites	3 50
White & Burgeon, 4 whites	2 50
Wood, S. M. & Co., 5 whites	3 00
Hoffman & Co., (metal,) 3 whites	3 50
Yonks, I., (metal,) 2 whites	3 00
File-works:	
Parkin, I., 10 whites	3 50
Ridgeway Bros., 10 whites	3 25
Union, 15 whites	3 50
Foundery and iron-works:	
Empire, 110 men, 15 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Pacific, 180 men, 20 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Occidental, 30 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Miners, 60 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Metropolitan, 4 men, 2 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Pioneer, 16 men, 4 boys	1 50 to 3 00
Ætna, 60 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Fulton, 60 men, 10 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Globe, 20 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Union, 450 men, 50 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Golden State, 50 men, 6 boys	2 00 to 3 50
City, 60 men, 13 boys	1 50 to 3 25
Excelsior, 45 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 25
Hope, 25 men, 2 boys	1 50 to 3 00
Hawkins & Cantrell, 12 men, 3 boys	2 00 to 3 25
Phœnix, 16 men, 2 boys	1 50 to 3 25
Columbia, 30 men, 6 boys	1 50 to 4 00
dustrial, 10 men, 2 boys	1 25 to 3 50

	Per day.
Marine, 15 men, 5 boys	$1 50 to $3 25
O. K., 25 men, 5 boys	1 75 to 3 25
Risdon, 325 men, 25 boys	2 00 to 3 00
San Francisco, 8 men, 2 boys	1 25 to 3 00
Small, I. & Co., 8 men	3 75
Cyclops, 40 men, 5 boys	1 50 to 3 25
Eureka, 30 men, 5 boys	1 50 to 3 50
Metropolitan, 35 men, 5 boys	1 25 to 3 50
Others, 60 men, 9 boys	1 75 to 3 75
Flour-mills:	
Golden Gate, 50 whites	2 50 to 5 00
Pioneer & Alta, 11 whites	2 50 to 4 00
National, 26 whites	2 50 to 4 00
Golden Age, 16 whites	2 50 to 4 00
Capitol, 30 whites	2 75 to 4 00
Furniture:	
Field, C., & Co., 60 whites, 6 Chinese	1 25 to 3 50
Frei, A., 51 whites, 4 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Kragen & Co., 75 whites, 11 Chinese	1 00 to 2 75
San Francisco, 30 whites, 3 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Westcoast, 260 whites, 2 Chinese	1 00 to 2 25
Friedrichs & Gerke, 30 whites, 10 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Morrel, O. L, 30 whites, 8 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Sheisen, I. I., 20 whites, 6 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Ueffinger, S., & Co., 28 whites, 6 Chinese	1 25 to 2 50
California, 210 whites	2 25
Colbert, L. A., 30 whites	2 50
Emanuel, L. & E., 20 whites	2 75
Frank, H., & Co., 35 whites	2 50
Gilbert & Moore, 20 whites	2 50
Granz, H., 40 white, 10 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Pacific United, 80 whites	2 75
Palmer, W. I. T., & Co., 25 whites, 5 Chinese	1 00 to 2 50
Weir & Greenwood, 20 whites	2 25
Linforth, E. H. & Co., 20 whites	2 25
Luchsinger & Son, 20 whites	2 50
Gas-fitters and plumbers:	
Gas Company, 120 men	3 00 to 5 00
Bush & Milne, 20 men	4 00
Day, Thomas, 10 men	4 00
Douglass & Martin, 10 men	3 50
Enright & Dufficy, 25 men	3 50
Freeman & Wrin, 12 men	4 00
Grimm, A., 8 men	4 00
Healy & Wilky, 10 men	3 50
Howard, W., 8 men	4 00
Hufschmidt & Bro., 14 men	3 50 to 4 00
Lasswell, B. T., 10 men	4 00
Marcy & Etienne, 12 men	3 50
O'Brien & Bros., 10 men	3 50
Pendergast & Doherty, 6 men	3 50
Raisch & Bucholz, 8 men	3 00
McNally & Hawkins, 10 men	4 00
Snook, T. & W., 8 men	3 50
Walmsley, W., 6 men	3 25
Others, 175 men	3 50
Gilders:	
Burckhard, M., 6 men	3 50
Gump, S. & G., 12 men	3 00
Leon, R., 8 men	3 25
Nile, M. D., 4 men	3 00
Pendergast, Th., 6 men	3 00
Smith, D., 4 men	2 50
Glass-works:	
Newman, C. & Co., 30 whites, 20 boys, 5 Chinese	1 00 to 3 00

	Per day.
Glove factories:	
California, 5 whites, 35 girls	$1 50 to $2 75
Central Pacific, 2 whites, 8 girls	1 25 to 2 50
San Francisco, 4 whites, 30 girls	1 25 to 2 50
Pacific, 2 whites, 15 girls	1 25 to 2 50
Glue factory:	
Pacific, 35 whites, 10 Chinese	1 10 to 1 25
Gold-platers:	
Pacific, 8 whites	3 00
Painter & Co., 6 whites	3 50
San Francisco, 10 whites	3 00
Spink, S. P., 4 whites	2 50
Yonks, I., 6 whites	3 00
Hawkins, J. M., 4 whites	2 75
Gunpowder:	
Giant, 10 whites, 45 Chinese	1 20 to 2 50
California and Hercules, 35 whites, 18 Chinese	1 10 to 2 50
Horseshoe-nails:	
Higgs, John H., 10 whites	3 25
Moore, W., 6 whites	3 00

APPENDIX T.

(See testimony of Morris Lessler, p. 930.)

List of bodies buried in the Chinese Cemetery, San Francisco, and names of the different divisions.

	Graves and bodies.
Hing fook tong	14
2d, no name	27
Sin hingtong of the Zun wo Co	21
Gan wo tong of the Zan wah	17
Quien tuck	106
Jap shin of the Zoung wo	8
Loak shin of the Zoung wo	8
Quai shin of the Zoung wo	13
Luck shin of the Zoung wo	25
Yonns woo tun, Sin tong Co	16
Lung shin tong, Zoung wo Co	30
He shin tong	26
Gee on tong of the Zoung wo Co	49
Leong sin tong	6
Shup fook tong	12
Chun ho tong	3
Tung shin tong	26
Chucksen tong	60
Ning jeong & Co	568
Hopwo	220
Kong chow	197
Poo On tong	72
Without inclosure, 2 large and 230 small	232
Hung on tong	81
Fook yum tong	200
3 open (without enclosure) containing	521
Chong how tong	56
Total of graves	2,614

APPENDIX U.

THE CHINESE LABOR PROBLEM.*

We stand to-day on the eve of important changes in the course of trade, with our own Pacific coast, China, Japan, and the thousand islands of the Polynesian Archipel-

* By Charles Wolcott Brooks.

ago. We cannot hold too sanguine a conception of the magnificent future of this great ocean when we predict that the day will come when that nation which controls the Pacific will command a trade equal to that of the world to-day.

Ancient record divides the East from the West—one empire to remain comparatively stationary, while the other encircles the globe. In our age they again confront, having ripened under different atmospheres. Both reveal their present civilization as the result of the faith that is in them. San Francisco stands on middle ground, between the Orient and Occident of former years. Our progress westward renders these terms obsolete. Steam brings Asia to our very door—a mighty continent beyond the broad Pacific, with unnumbered millions, now our neighbors; a land claimed by scholars as the birthplace of mankind, and by merchants known to have enriched every nation that has enjoyed the advantage of its trade. Already her olive hand has been extended with treaties of peace and commerce, while her sons have been lent to serve as willing apprentices in our midst. When laborers were scarce—impossible to obtain in sufficient force—gates closed for centuries were unsealed at our bidding, and a transcontinental railway opened for us a new chapter in national progress.

Earth supplies, in appointed time, from hidden reserves, what becomes necessary for the wants of man. Should we look on Mongolians—now offering as laborers—in this beneficent light? Are the necessities of our planters as pressing as were the needs of those bold and deserving men who, with courage, skill, and enterprise, planned and executed the national highway under circumstances calculated to appall the most adventurous?

Questions of such importance should be thoroughly understood, and pertinent facts reviewed, before completing judgment. Enterprises, to succeed, must be well directed. Let us examine and ascertain, so far as facts can reveal, whether endeavors to furnish Chinese laborers to the United States are steps in the true interest of civilization. Will an influx of Chinese laborers contribute to local or national prosperity? Events now concur in placing the people of the United States as prominent customers in labor-markets of the world, seeking accessions of cheap muscular labor. Opinions stated in open convention at Memphis appear to have met singular unanimity of approval at the South: that our present labor system must be re-organized; that comparatively few women now labor on the crops; that three millions of negro laborers before the war are now reduced to scarcely a million available field force; and pending some change, or until a substitute from abroad is supplied, enterprise throughout cotton, sugar, rice, and tobacco districts must languish.

A want seems to exist, and for purposes of investigation we admit these statements as facts. How shall it be supplied? As payment of interest and final principal of our national debt, foreign exchanges, and consequent extension of commerce now measurably depend on our ability to export cotton—which product, in turn, depends largely on supplies of labor—the subject becomes national, assuming importance far beyond merely local questions on the west coast.

San Francisco is already, by internal-revenue returns, the ninth manufacturing city of the United States. With Chinese laborers properly apportioned, California may realize a manufacturing greatness and wealth scarcely second to any State, and largely rival England. Her coal, iron, lead, tin, copper, antimony, quicksilver, marble, &c., wait only for labor to disengage their latent powers.

Chinese have long been willing suppliants for labor at our Golden Gate. San Francisco, nearer in distance to the Central Flowery Kingdom than any spot advanced in western civilization, as the principal inlet of Oriental immigration, has a personal experience founded on twenty years of intercourse. Notwithstanding uninformed or partisan assertions, immigration has been, and we trust always will be, conducted on principles universally acknowledged as strictly just, without violation of any existing law, if we except individual cases, where foreign ships have brought to our shores a small excess of passengers—a result occasioned because American law requires more room on shipboard, *per capita*, than British passenger regulations, under which vessels clear from Hong-Kong.

Chinese already here have come about fast enough for gradual assimilation to our wants. They quickly catch the spirit of American enterprise, and profit by its elevating influences. As workmen on the Pacific Railroad, they gave essential and substantial aid, laboring in deep snows throughout the coldest weather with undiminished energy—showing ability to live in even extreme sections of our country, although our Southern States present a climate more nearly allied to that portion of China from which we draw most of our immigration.

America, where millions of acres, rightly fruitful, remain barren and fallow because unsettled, where golden harvests await cultivation, because there are not laborers enough, has yet some apparently short-sighted protectionists, who, at heart, desire to exclude any accession of laborers. With whatever cultivated jealousy, or apparent aversion, the presence of Chinese may be regarded by a class of laborers whom they at first may seem to supplant, but whom they really supplement, they will, nevertheless, certainly form henceforth a part of the industrial sinews of our land.

China can furnish intelligent laborers for a thousand varied requirements, ashore or afloat, for railroads and steamships, for mines, factories, farms, or firesides. Their transportation hither will employ merchant-shipping, and may prove a stimulating element in redeveloping it numerically toward that position it held before the rebellion. Railroads will also reap liberal benefits from this movement. Americanized Chinamen acquire great love of travel. California stage-lines have been largely supported by Chinese. In some districts a withdrawal of their patronage might have proved ruinous to even those who, on election-days, voted anti-cooly tickets. Chinese "custom" in California is not one to be overlooked in items of calculation.

Coming to us, necessarily, by water across the Pacific, they can only reach us in proportion to our marine transportation. To bring large numbers, adequate to a demand likely to spring from the cotton States, facilities must be largely and rapidly increased. American mail-steamships of the China line, unequaled in size and beauty as specimens of naval architecture, now sail monthly, making twelve round trips a year. The United States Government pays them for carrying mails an annual subsidy of $500,000 in currency, equal to $375,000 in gold. Considering the length of voyage and necessary outlays of running steamers between ports where all disbursements are gold or Mexican silver dollars, the present subsidy appears trivial. In view of a prospective demand for largely-increased transportation, Congress can hardly do better than double this amount and require double service from the company. They have large and airy accommodations for about 1,200 Chinese passengers on each steamer; thus their capacity, running their present number of trips, is only equal to supplying 14,000 laborers per year, and as they carry back over one-third and often half that number of old residents, they cannot produce an annual gain much exceeding seven or eight thousand persons, when coming full every voyage. It is true, many come in sailing-vessels, but the regular accommodations of these steamships are so far superior, as regards area, food, and general attention, that they prefer paying $45 passage by steamer, to one-half that sum for the improvised berths temporarily erected between decks in sailing-vessels. We have searched in vain for any statute enacted by Congress interposing any possible objection to their coming.

To tempt Chinese immigrants and introduce them into our cotton States in sufficient numbers to further a higher prosperity will require skillful management. Chinese merchants, entitled to esteem in their several companies, have lately returned from a prospecting tour to the Atlantic coast, where universal kindness was bestowed upon them, and unmeasured good feeling manifested toward their people. Pioneer gangs have lately started for places in the Eastern States, where their labor is represented as almost a pressing necessity. These, after a short period in a country where all is new to them, write back to their friends accounts, favorable or otherwise, of the locality, people, and occupation. Thus, by degrees, through these means, an immigration will be established. They will come freely when every letter written home unites in confirming the encouraging assertions of those who visit China personally, to start them forward. The traveled Chinaman, telling stories of his wanderings, will become a sage in his native district when describing railroads, factories, and numerous inventions of our civilization.

The Chinese Empire, with its dependencies, embraces 4,695,334 square miles, and supports at the present time a population of 477,500,000, or nearly half the human race. China itself, the most populous locality on earth, contains in eighteen provinces of compact territory 1,308,016 square miles, with a population of 413,267,030, divided, according to the census of 1842, as follows:

Province.	Miles.	Population.	Capital.
Pee-cho-lee	58,949	36,879,838	Peking.
Shan-Tang	65,104	28,958,764	Ise-Nan.
Shan-Soc	55,268	17,000,000	Tai-Yuen.
Shen-Lee	67,400	10,500,000	See-Gan.
Ho-Nan	65,104	30,000,000	Kai-Fung.
Kiang-Soo	44,500	40,000,000	Nankin.
Kiang-See	72,176	26,513,889	Nan-Chang.
Ngan-Why	58,468	36,596,858	Ngan-King.
Fook-Keen	53,480	25,799,556	Foo-Chow.
Che-Kiang	39,150	30,437,974	Hang-Chow.
Hoo-Pee	70,450	28,584,564	Koo-Chang.
Hoo-Nan	74,320	20,048,969	Chang-Cha.
Kan-Soo	86,618	19,512,916	Lan-Choo.
Sze-Chuen	166,800	22,256,964	Ching-Too.
Quang-Toong	79,456	21,152,603	Canton.
Quang-See	78,250	8,121,327	Kwe-Lin.
Yun-Nan	107,969	5,823,670	Yun-Nan.
Qui-Chow	64,554	5,679,128	Kwi-Yang.

The state of Mantchoo-Tartary has been recently incorporated as the nineteenth province, under the Chinese name of Shing-King, adding her population to the empire. Statisticians estimate the population of the world at 1,200,000,000, speaking 3,064 languages, and professing 1,100 forms of religion. China proper contains, therefore, over one-third of all human beings on the globe—a singular and conservative people, with a large share of the earth's wealth and precious metals. At regular intervals a government census is accurately taken. Provinces are ruled by mandarins, or governors, who are annually obliged to render written reports of their official mistakes and misdemeanors, in which any omission receives the severest punishment when discovered. Government offices are held only by educated men, who, after receiving the proper educational degrees corresponding to their office, obtain appointments by competitive examinations rigidly conducted. The literary men of the empire are eminently conservative; their quiet influence governs the seven advisory boards, who, through an autocracy free from despotism, virtually direct a paternal government. These boards are classified under the names of justice, forms, finance, public works, appointments, war, censors. The latter are pledged to rebuke wrong wherever found—even in the Emperor; a necessity exercised fearlessly, with true moral courage, when occasion demands. Believing a future existence better than this world, they meet death fearlessly.

Confucius, (meaning Holy-Father Kung,) born 551 B. C.—just before Cyrus ascended the throne of Persia, in the days of the prophet Ezra, when the Israelites returned from Babylon and Xerxes invaded Greece—was a contemporary of Pythagoras, Solon, Æsop, and Thales. He collected the three sacred books of "Kings" and the "Leke," acknowledging a personal God; authentic records of Chinese history extending to 2357 B. C.—unquestionably among the oldest productions of the human mind.

Recent scientific explorations have exhumed Chinese sacred mottoes, carved on tombs in Egypt—counterparts of phrases in use to-day—revealing that an intercourse existed when China was ruled by kings anterior to Moses.

Confucius, who is sometimes called the "Star in the East," whose writings are still respected by scholars of all nations, affirmed that his work would be completed by a true saint, to be looked for and found in the West. He recorded in the Shu-King, 500 B. C., the germ of our golden rule—"Do not unto others what you would not that others should do unto you"—the great doctrine of reciprocity. And there we find that the famous "*vox populi, vox Dei*" of later Rome was but a transcript or repetition from this book, or the more ancient Chinese authorities from which it was compiled. He inculcated, "Honor thy parents, that life may be happy," and enjoined family affection as a duty. No crime, in Chinese eyes, exceeds a violation of filial duties. Family ties are their closest bonds, and family honor is their constant pride and greatest restraint. Their religion inculcates strict honesty, and they believe in "Fung Shuey," or sweet influences from departed ancestral spirits. Education is esteemed one of the chief ends of life, which, they hold, should be universal. Toleration is a principle taught in their religion, as well as a higher law. "Original equality of man before the law," and "Aristocracy comes of intellect, not of birth or wealth," have with them long been fundamental principles. These are their bulwarks of national strength, and, combined, form a religion inculcating the purest moral principles, encouraging neither cruelty nor sensuality. In these lie the secret of that perpetuity with which their type of humanity has quietly sustained itself through centuries, while Bactrian, Assyrian, and Persian kingdoms, with polished Greece and mighty Rome, have, in turn, erred from these high principles and yielded up their national life.

Among the lower classes are many Budhists; these erect images of Joss, who, like the Satan of Persia, represents their Evil Spirit. They refuse to make any image of God, whose care, they claim, is paternal, and whose kindness to his children can be implicitly relied on; but make offerings to conciliate the Evil Spirit, hoping thus to buy him by bribery from any desire to plot evil against them. Their merchants, as a class, are as upright in business and social intercourse as those of nations who have enjoyed our civilization.

Chinese coming to America land in a country where everything is strange to them, and their tongue unknown to its citizens. Their first tribute to our civilization is an attempt to acquire our language. To assist them in their helplessness as strangers, they have organized into clubs or companies for mutual assistance and protection. Six such companies, presided over by Chinese merchants of probity and influence, now exist in San Francisco. Their duties and operations have already been fully described in these pages.

All Chinese read and write their own language. They figure by mechanical figuring frames with rapidity far exceeding our way of adding, subtracting, multiplying, or dividing. All settle annually every outstanding debt, among themselves, at Chinese New Year. They are understood to have access, by courtesy, to each other's books, enabling them to judge of each other's standing—much as we do that of stock companies.

In China, three hundred Mexican silver dollars are considered a competency. Among a people strongly attached to their native soil, poor men alone are induced to come abroad in hope of bettering their condition. To the impecunious, an advance is absolutely necessary to enable them to reach a foreign field of labor. If Americans desire Chinese to come in numbers sufficient to form an important element in the labor markets of Southern States, Congress will be called upon to legislate and protect the interests of American associations, formed to advance expenses necessarily incurred in bringing laborers to this country and transporting them to the Mississippi Valley. They should not scan this question with merely local views, but face all its bearings and larger results, affecting material development throughout the whole country.

Foreigners will certainly come from the overcrowded districts to a desirable country, with a population of less than ten persons, and to a State with only two and a half persons to a square mile. The national Constitution makes no discrimination regarding who may come, but affords equal rights to all. If Chinese present themselves, we must admit them. We are bound by treaty to afford them the same protection we accord other nationalities. Great nations cannot afford to be unjust.

Rather than prevent their coming, if it were possible, let us study to understand and become masters of the situation, and direct a system furnishing us Asiatic laborers so as to advance and elevate all of our present white laboring classes who have within them ability to rise. Their introduction will be gradual, but constant; and after supplying the large deficit of labor at the South, and furnishing sufficient for the inauguration of new enterprises, it will enable all who are capable to advance—and keep pace with the gradual withdrawal of their competitors—from menial labor to higher positions.

Labor will always be valuable in proportion to supply, demand, and its power of production. Legislation can not affix to it any fictitious value that will *stand*, any sooner than paper dollars can be made equal to gold, unless they produce gold; neither would it be any more effective than are usury laws to accomplish their purpose. Labor and money markets of the world are open markets. We may as justly frame a law—and expect that it will succeed—that one grocery store shall not undersell another, as that one laborer shall not work for less, or spend less, than another. Both, like the Fourierite system, would become thoroughly inoperative from natural causes. It is only people without enterprise who cannot live in competition with Chinese. Laziness never can compete with industry; God never intended it should. Shall we legislate to protect indolence? That would certainly be special legislation. Let our present laboring classes profit by education, and advance to higher callings. Let them cease to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, when necessity for it ceases. Let them employ Chinese servants, and exercise ability by finding employment for twenty Mongolians to labor, under their supervision, in ditches, where they labored themselves before. In few words, we say to our present laboring classes: Become employers instead of continuing common laborers. Thus, the existing population could be no poorer, but the community, in fact, richer for their presence, by realizing profits from fruits of their labor. If our wheat crops were doubled by employing additional laborers brought from China, that very result would give profitable employment to additional thousands of white laborers, in transporting to market, storing, selling, and shipping it; and our present ranks of draymen, stevedores, and all occupations connected with movements of produce would require recruiting correspondingly. The mere handling and ordinary transportation of stores daily required for even one hundred thousand Chinese, over any distance, would be sufficient business for no ordinary number of our people; yet some object to supplying the South with two millions actually needed to-day.

John Stuart Mill has pictured the course of every enlightened proposition presented to the masses for consideration in three words: "Ridicule, argument, adoption." Already our pictorials have ridiculed the coming Chinese immigration, and our leading journals have entered into the argument: the adoption of a national policy regarding it seems now but a question of time. It can be introduced not only without interfering with existing laboring classes, but so as to necessitate the immediate employment of double the white force now engaged.

If, through the introduction of Chinese, necessities of life can be profitably produced at lower cost, and furnished those who now labor here for half they now pay, would not this reduction of their expenses be equivalent to an increase of wages? Our scale of living is inflated far above any other standard in the world. Like our rates of interest, things range proportionally high. We need both labor and capital. They are joined together, and they are both entitled to protection, in accordance with their proportionate relations to each other. Of these the strength of nations is born. They should be happily adjusted, and go hand in hand. Lower interest on capital will follow lower rates for labor; cheap labor will, in turn, when assisted with cheap capital, produce ordinary necessities of life at rates within reach of the great mass of any nation, a numerical majority of which are persons of moderate or limited means. Capital claims protection as the hope of all classes, the life-blood of commerce, the stimulant

of enterprise, and sinews of war. It should never be forced to lie inactive, suffered to waste, or be driven away. It is what labor, industry, and genius have earned and laid by, in excess of a sufficient support. Cheap labor, like cheap fares, has its place in the world. We require it in this country, wherever labor at higher rates would be unavailable, or, if used, result disastrously. When employing laborers to harvest crops, we become gainers to the extent of what would otherwise go ungathered and lost. Accessions of laborers cannot impoverish our country. Nature is no poorer for yielding her annual bounty to man than is the capital of banks when paying dividends from accumulated interest.

Many things charged by those who look unfavorably on this movement become harmless under investigation. It has been alleged that men hired in China at one rate of wages have been sublet at higher figures. Do not our contractors charge profits on laborers they employ, hiring at $2.50, and charging $3 per day to their principals? Journeymen carpenters, hired at $4, are sublet for $5. Is profit on labor at all akin to slavery? What is thus charged against Chinese as wrong we practice daily ourselves! It is further alleged that, because they are a people among whom economy is a virtue and industry a habit, they are injurious to the State; and "it is the duty of every class of men to unite to prevent the introduction of Chinese."

Laboring Chinamen, when poor and in debt, live, save, and thrive on wages far below our laborers, because honesty is inculcated in their religion; but experience has shown that after they are forehanded, they become more free in the distribution of their money, purchasing freely what will most conduce to their comfort. Human nature is singularly alike the world over. It is natural to use the gains our labor has brought us. As a people, they are neat, orderly, and skillful; not readily excelled in handicraft; frugal, industrious, teachable, patient, and intelligent. They make excellent house-servants, and may be trained to cook skillfully in any style. When taught by French cooks, it is difficult to excel them. With one explanation thoroughly understood, they will need no further instruction or correction. They may occasionally be sullen, but never stupid. They are not given to excessive hilarity, but are quiet, peaceful, and persistent. Their manipulation is careful, and often extraordinary. They would make dexterous cotton-pickers; never bungling ones. The builders of the Central and Western Pacific Railroads confirm the above statements regarding Chinese laborers; and monthly accounts of the several gangs during more than a year past fully establish many of these facts. Laborers generally drew from thirty-five to forty per cent. of their $35 monthly wages in supplies from the company's furnishers. A balance, ranging from fifty to sixty-five per cent., was paid to them monthly in coin. A large proportion of this was spent at outside stores along the line, more particularly after repaying their advance for passage, and free from debt. It is the opinion of well-informed Chinese merchants, who are close observers, that the annual savings remitted to China by the 65,000 Chinese now on the Pacific coast do not exceed $30 to each man; against which, as a State, we have the profit on 23,725,000 day's labor, and all permanent industries developed through their presence, which afford further employment to pure white laborers. A very large portion of even this sum sent to China generally goes to assist in bringing more neighbors and friends to this country; and contributes largely to support American shipping. Eight out of every ten ships plying between California and China are American, Chinese merchants having invariably given them preference, even when compelled to pay war-risks, which, with all their other insurance, they give to our local insurance companies. During the war, their merchants gave freely to the sanitary fund. They have no desire for suffrage, and study to keep out of politics. All return to China generally after about five years. A majority return here, bringing others with them. If they die abroad, their bodies are carefully preserved, taken to their native place, and buried in line, at the ancestral grave-yard.

If California could manufacture as cheaply as Massachusetts, she might retain annually $14,000,000 in the State, which now go East to pay for imported goods. Her wealth may also be largely increased by employing Chinese in silk and tea culture. In China, where the use of silk originated, it was a noted industry 4,767 years ago—2898 B. C., or, by Hebrew record, A. L. 1293. They are recorded as using silk strings for musical instruments 3400 B. C. The world now annually produces silk valued at $225,380,000, over half of which still comes from China, Japan, and the neighboring parts of Asia. The United States produces but $100,000 worth, and imports from $40,000,000 to $45,000,000 worth annually, of which about $27,000,000 worth comes from France, which, in 1860, manufactured $140,000,000, and exported $110,000,000, thus giving employment to over 500,000 persons, and adding vastly to her national wealth. We can furnish America all her tea and silk, with the assistance of Chinese laborers. California can thus, singly, settle our national exchanges, by a solution far more satisfactory than England, when she forced opium upon the Chinese. Accessions of cheap laborers, without interfering with those now here, would enable her to supply herself, and produce raisins, almonds, olives, prunes, oil, tobacco, and wine profitably for export. These fields of productive industry will reap far ampler

rewards, enriching California more than any present export from the gold-fields. These articles are, also, more valuable as exports, because *annually produced and consumed;* while the production of gold is single and exhaustive, and not being perishable, its relative value to other property diminishes in nearly the ratio of its annually-increasing volume.

In addresses to workingmen, the theory has been put forth that the necessary consumption, or powers of destruction, developed in an agent performing labor, are a gauge of his usefulness to any community! Machines are but mechanical hands, that consume scarcely anything, particularly when run by water-power, of which our State has an abundant supply, as yet unused. Who is bold enough to pronounce machinery an injury to the State? Yet it represents cheaper labor than ever came from China. England, to-day, with her labor-saving machinery, has looms whose production represents a working population of 100,000,000, nearly four times her actual population of all classes, and a number incapable of existing on her territory. Thus, she quadruples her ability, and is enabled to supply nearly all Asia, the very home of cheap manual labor, in its own market, with her manufactured cotton goods. California may herself some day supply China.

What has America done? Negroes—first imported from the wilds of Africa; heathen barbarians in a wild and savage state far lower in the scale of being than the Chinese were four thousand years ago, for negroes had no literature, philosophy, or cultivation—were brought as slaves, against their will, with all the horrors of the middle-passage, to furnish involuntary labor under the lash, a thing no Chinaman will bear. When, in later days, necessities in the North demanded more laborers, without which improvements could not have advanced, immigration societies gave assistance to Irish laborers, many of whom were specially ordered and brought over for employment in constructing the early railway enterprises of America. The rigid system of government adopted by England assisted in alienating and transferring a large surplus population from the laboring classes of Ireland to this country. This drain has continued until, at present, Ireland has few persons she can well spare for emigration abroad. From the general report of British emigration commissioners, recently presented before Parliament, we learn that Ireland at one time gave eighty per cent. of the foreign emigration of the kingdom. In 1863, it fell to sixty and thirty-four hundredths per cent., and, in 1868, it was but forty-seven and two-hundredths per cent. The Hibernian exodus is nearly completed. The German emigration developed later; but, once inaugurated, increased in volume as Ireland became depleted, until to-day arrivals from the North-German Union are more than twice those from Ireland, as the following statistics show:

Years.	From Ireland.	From Germany.
1863	91,157	35,002
1864	89,399	57,446
1865	70,462	83,451
1866	68,047	106,716
1867	65,134	117,591
1868	47,571	101,989

America, with a people of the future pre-eminently cosmopolitan, daily opening up immense areas heretofore untraversed, "has stomach for them all;" and present urgent wants in our cotton States point clearly to a large accession of Chinese at no distant date. If we consider ourselves the higher creation, and believe all things were made to minister to our use, why except Chinese laborers from a general law? Is confidence in our race and institutions so limited that we dare not admit them, fearing they will overcome young America; and, instead of our digesting them, they will swallow and digest our nation and civilization? We welcome their coming, for we fear it not. In the future conflict for manual labor, the Irish will scarcely be in the contest; they may imagine they feel it occasionally to-day, but to them it is but transient, and their children will not dream of it. The negro and Chinese will become daily associates in application for labor, and will measure each other as a race, until the admitted superiority of one or the other is proclaimed. The inferior race will naturally hate the one next above it. What Chinese lack in bodily strength they make up in persistency and application. They have never indulged in strikes; but, being good imitators, some of our sanguine "labor leagues" may yet succeed in teaching them. It is an axiom of political economy that no commodity can long remain below its true market-value. Rates of wages hereafter paid them will doubtless assimilate to the employer's true estimate of their value.

Chinese are coming; the movement is well under way; its progress seems inevitable; natural laws are at work, greater than man's ability to combat. To forcibly attempt its stay is of no avail, for it is thoroughly legal; whether it develops this year or next, is of little moment. To postpone its discussion, is to allow it to advance unorganized. Let the Irish avail of the opportunity to become masters, rather than competitors, of the Mongolian. Let us control what cannot be prevented. It is

better to lead than be led or left behind. Organized in conformity with just laws, under responsible guidance, Congress has but to direct how it shall be conducted—enacting effective laws for equal protection of employers and employés. It will advance our national prosperity, enabling us to undertake, complete, and maintain public works to which the aqueducts and monuments of Rome, the pyramids of Egypt, or the great wall of China shall be as their early civilization to that we now enjoy.

We are no advocate for what is known as the "cooly trade," conducted in a terrible and outrageous manner, that should disgrace any civilized nation. "Cooly" is not a Chinese word, but adopted from the Sanscrit, the oldest language extant, affirmed by scholars to have been the original tongue. It simply means laborer. If horrible atrocities were inseparable from any system of cooly transportation, it should be as decidedly prohibited as the vile slave-trade that so long disgraced the civilization of both the Old and New World. Because it has been improperly conducted by Portuguese and Peruvians, is no argument that it cannot be done with propriety. If we demonstrate a humane manner of conducting this emigration, other nations, seeing its feasibility, will not dare conduct it otherwise. Because emigrants were overcrowded and maltreated on board the James Foster, between England and New York, and horrible atrocities perpetrated on that unfortunate ship, shall European emigration be abandoned? If this emigration can be made serviceable to us, let us seek to regulate it under such considerate laws as shall insure to all the Chinese coming to this country a sufficiency of good food, pure air, and kind treatment; in fact, what they now receive on every steamship of the great American steam line to China.

As a general desire for information regarding labor-contracts has been manifested by the press of the country, we are urged to include arguments advanced by advocates of this system; which we do, believing that, after a thorough understanding of the subject, public opinion will be able more completely to guard our national principles, as well as local interests. Legislators are aware that human nature is not to be wholly trusted with irresponsible power. By emigration regulations in force at the colony of Hong-Kong, all laborers under contract to labor abroad must, before leaving, have their contracts read or translated to them personally and alone, and their distinct assent obtained, fourteen days before they can legally embark. After a fortnight it is again read to them by an emigration-officer, and inquiry made if they have changed their minds. If still anxious to go, they are sent on shipboard, where they are offered by the consul a last opportunity of withdrawing, who certifies that they executed their contracts voluntarily; and thus having, after reflection, thrice publicly re-affirmed the fact, they clear legally from Hong-Kong. The disreputable manner in which the Portuguese and Peruvians have at times—from Amoy and Macao—pursued the notorious cooly trade, where men were "shanghaed" for slavery at the Chincha Islands, is so utterly unlike anything connected with free emigration to America as not to come within range of this investigation.

Labor-contracts, if introduced into our Southern States, must be protected by special laws, necessary to prevent the unscrupulous from taking unjust advantage. No likeness of slavery will be tolerated. They should be invalid until read, clearly explained, and assented to before a notary or proper officer, whose certificate, with the contract, should be always accessible as a public record. If hedged around with requisite safeguards to prevent kidnapping or any similar outrage, providing care and exemption from work in sickness, and fixing a consideration on payment of which they may be justly canceled, it is claimed the objections to them are principally overcome.

If, *ab initio*, wrong in principle, as some contend, why do the Federal laws sanction labor-contracts in our merchant marine, when certifying to seamen's shipping-articles?—or courts, in case of minors, bind out apprentices?—or Government contract for the labor of man-of-war's men or soldiers for terms ranging from three to five years? Why does the strictest law interpose, remanding deserters to labor, who attempt a violation of terms which they voluntarily contracted to fulfill? Perhaps because exigencies require it. Are not, they ask, the pecuniary exigencies of planters in crop-time as great? For instance, a sugar-planter in Louisiana, whose crop realizes $100,000: the cane cannot be ground until it tassels; it is not ripe enough to do this before September; November frosts ruin it, if uncut. A year's outlay, and results of much labor, depend on the activity of six weeks in autumn.

The civil code of Louisiana secures the laborer a first lien for the price of his labor on growing crops he assists in cultivating; also, on farm-houses, furniture, and implements used in cultivation; which lien cannot be divested by any prior mortgage, whether conventional, legal, or judicial, or by seizure and sale while the crop is on it. While securing to laborers the fruits of their labor, it is thought just to insure to planters an honest fulfillment of labor-contracts voluntarily entered into by those on whom they must rely quite as much as the merchant on the crew of his vessel. Should a planter's hands desert in crop-time, a year's work would be a failure—perhaps entailing his ruin.

As a question of intrinsic right, when general laws of the United States bind those who enlist in an army, navy, or merchant marine to fulfill their contracts to labor

compelling their return in cases of desertion, they ask where their case differs from laborers who voluntarily contract to work twelve months for a planter, and desert when most needed? Is the one a greater restraint of personal liberty than the other?—or is either any violation of justice, when contracts have been voluntarily entered into?

Reports are current that Government, influenced by memorials against the cooly trade, instructed its officers to inform all Chinese immigrants arriving that no law exists to enforce fulfillment of contracts for labor made abroad. Hence, until congressional legislation indicates a policy, no one will be likely to come under positive engagement to fill orders for laborers under contract. If planters, by association or otherwise, organize proper means for bringing them from China, the South may be supplied with laborers, under contracts to work until their advance shall be reimbursed to the planter, at $8 to $12 per month and found; and laborers will be better off than at home. Actual expenses for transportation from mountain districts in China to any part of the South, with outfits, taxes, passage, provisions, commissions, and wages advanced, need not exceed $200 per head. Customary provisions daily required for each man are: two pounds meat, (pork preferred,) one-fourth pound fish, some vegetables, tea, and a little sweet-oil for cooking. Parties contemplate contracts running until advances are paid, not exceeding three years, if without legal objection. Advances necessarily incurred in bringing impecunious laborers to America may thus be repaid to the planter within eighteen months or two years, and all wages after that time be realized to the laborer. Planters contracting for laborers to be brought from China should deposit securities for prompt payment of expenses incurred in obtaining them. Local demand for Chinese laborers at $35 gold per month is now so urgent for railroad and other purposes, and their labor so satisfactory, that all arriving are immediately taken for employment on the west coast. Few now in California could profitably be transferred to Eastern or Southern States. Emigration circulars, printed in Chinese, should be extensively circulated in China, if we would secure her better classes from the interior. Agitation may hasten their coming; but solid, patient labor will be required to accomplish permanent results. Their coming will stimulate industries, and enable us to assume a position of greater importance among producing countries of the world. Current estimates place our present average crop at 2,500,000 bales, of 450 pounds each, worth, at 20 cents a pound, $225,000,000. Before the war we produced 5,500,000 bales. With Chinese laborers we can readily produce 10,000,000 bales, and add immensely to our national wealth and credit. Arkansas alone, with her scanty supply of labor, produces this year a cotton crop valued at $30,000,000, and thus materially assists our foreign exchanges with Europe.

The policy of introducing a new race differing in features, tastes, and religion into our country is a branch of this problem whose solution should be referred to the best talent among political economists. Emigration should not flow in solitary channels. If we encourage Chinese in coming, we should equally stimulate a constant Anglo-Saxon immigration. The Minnesota State immigration agent, after spreading the glorious advantages of his State before the Swedes, writes promising to forward 75,000 Scandinavians this year. This example, repeated by other States, constitutes movements by which civilization advances and develops, while isolated California is debating whether to shake off her lethargy and awake from her dream of gold. European immigration made New York the city she is to-day; yet most of it merely passed through her as Chinese will through San Francisco.

In an address to the congressional subcommittee of Ways and Means, Fung-Tang, a prominent Chinese merchant, who speaks English, French, German, Japanese, and Chinese, remarked: "We have very rich merchants and bankers in China, but cannot advise them to risk capital here, when their agent cannot testify in your courts; for, like your own capitalists, they wish their property protected and secure to them before parting with it. Much gold and silver is hoarded in China, which might be used profitably here, if Chinese felt sure they would have full and proper protection."

The earth has produced about three thousand millions of dollars in gold. America has of this produced one thousand three hundred millions, and retains to-day about one hundred and thirty millions. The balance, less the wear of usage and consumption for ornaments, has been shipped to Europe, and thence largely absorbed by the traditional East, so long known as the sink of precious metals. Returns of a British steamship company show they carried silver direct from England to Asia, amounting in 1856 to sixty millions, and in 1857 to eighty-four millions of dollars. These years, while they show the tendency, exceeded the average, as the world's annual yield of silver is now only forty-four millions. If Chinese were not promiscuously stoned and outraged in our streets, their capitalists might come to us, as a number of their millionaires have gone to Australia and taken their fortunes with them. Sums thus received would assist materially in relieving the tightness of our money market without perceptibly depleting the immense monetary eddy so long chronic in China, and inaugurate a healthy and complete circulation of specie around the world highly beneficial to all. Our Golden Gate, so long the outlet, will some day become an inlet or

wealth and precious metals. People of China and Japan, ever watchful of our example, may learn that Christian practice is too often at variance with Christian profession, if we treat them now as heathen having no rights which Christians are bound to respect.

Eminent divines publicly proclaim that Christian people throughout the land are deeply interested in the initial steps of an emigration whose effects will permeate, like rain from heaven, throughout the vast seclusion of that empire—exceeding, in the interest of Christianity, any fruition hitherto developed by foreign missions. The mountain is coming to Mohammed. Pagans who have beheld the glory of a western empire, instructed in civilization, return to their native districts effective missionaries in the cause of enlightenment, ready and eager to combat the absurdities of paganism in every section of Asia where foreign footsteps are unknown, and thus largely influence for good the destiny and future welfare of the human race in Oriental empires.

So China appears, to-day, before nations ready to play her part in the coming drama of the world. In nature's grand economy, we have learned that everything has its appointed time; nations as well as fruits develop and ripen through exact and latent laws; she has her century-plants as well as Jonah's gourd. Four thousand years of recorded history have, in their march, assisted in molding the character of this secluded race. Heirs, to-day, of the collected wisdom of many centuries, they retain a peculiar individuality, the result of organization, shut out from active participation with the outside world. They have enjoyed quiet prosperity as national hermits. As Orientals, their civilization has been a separate development under laws of Confucius, Brahma, and Zoroaster, while we moved westward under Hebrew and Christian precepts. The social progress has been in proportion to intellectual development; and the organization of the best intellects is sure to rule the world. Mind is the standard of quality in man, and largely determines his position in life. One clear head, capable of executive talent, is more effective than a universe of stupid impotency. As a race, their mental power will render efficient aid in their service to the people of the United States.

In the necessarily limited space of this article, the view of this controversy presented has been selected because least known; and its discussion elicits a branch of the subject unexplored by general literature, regarding which inquiries are in every mouth. Counter-arguments should be presented before any conclusion is ventured in regard to the policy of legalizing labor-contracts. Where right dwells, each must for himself determine. If this article assists general information, provoking a search for truth in whosesoever sack it may be found, all will be accomplished that the writer intended.

APPENDIX V.

Early migrations.—Origin of the Chinese race, philosophy of their early development, with an inquiry into the evidences of their American origin; suggesting the great antiquity of races on the American continent.—Read before the California Academy of Sciences, May 3, 1876

By Charles Wolcott Brooks,
Member of the California Academy of Sciences.

In searching for the origin of any race, the careful student is led to the barrier of prehistoric ages, where, amid the scanty remnants of remote antiquity, he seeks the missing links of a chain whose farther end has passed from the vision of general observers.

All ethnologists must recognize the importance of reviewing the early stages of religious belief current among any people, and laws governing its development, in any systematic study of their earliest origin.

Every act of man and every change in nature is self-recording, and although it may require the wisdom of a God to read the record, it yet exists, capable of being deciphered, and contributing to history.

With the advance of scientific knowledge, the human line of division between so-called historic and prehistoric ages is gradually receding. Science and historical criticism are opening many fields long hid in myth and conjecture. Much now classed as ancient mythology is but the lingering remnants of very ancient history, preserved and distorted by tradition. Most ancient nations in their written histories have aimed as far as possible to ignore all antecedent civilizations, claiming for their own deified ancestry the origin of all men. Barbaric conquerors, filled with the spirit of battle, were early deified as gods; their descendants, accepted as demi-gods, were founders of reigning dynasties, and naturally sought protection by surrounding their origin with the supernatural. Transformations are frequent in the mythology of all nations, for religion, in whatever stage of its development, ever remains a grand, progressive, moral science. Many ancient forms of pagan worship glided silently into even Chris-

tian rites, when martyrs, canonized as saints, noiselessly replaced the divinities of former systems.

As most early gods were ancient heroes deified, their worship was a natural manifestation of a low order of patriotism, which selfishly detested all nations but one chosen people. Each nation seems to have created its own god in the image of its highest ideal. Early ideas of God have been successively adjusted to the intellectual capacity of each progressive age, whose highest ideal has ever been the natural limit to its powers of mental or spiritual conception, possible under existing conditions of development.

Modern science and its civilizing arts have refined our personal conceptions and raised our ideal, by extending our limits of comprehension. Our own conceptions of the Great Architect, the Intelligent Mind of the Universe, as they exist to-day, are as much nobler than those of the ancients, as the magnificent enginery of this nineteenth century excels the rude implements of early ages.

Notwithstanding this tendency to ignore antecedent civilizations, the most ancient peoples of antiquity, at the period of their very earliest records, show plainly that civilized life existed before their time.

In speaking of civilization at early periods, it is evident we cannot mean that of the printing press, telegraph, and steam, as known in the nineteenth century, for no record of any such exists; but reference is made to a high state of early culture among cities of solid structure, with foreign commerce and mechanic arts, in contradistinction to barbaric, nomadic, or pastoral conditions.

Great maritime empires existed in very remote periods, and both Atlantic and Pacific Oceans were crossed, and races and civilization widely extended in ages still called prehistoric. Whether we study the historical records of Arabian, Phœnician, Chaldean, Assyrian, Egyptian, Persian, Central Asian, Malay, Chinese, Japanese, Central American, or Peruvian nations, we are amazed at the antiquity to which they lead us. Many oriental records now in process of translation, throw much light on the early movements of races. Asia in the far East was long considered the land of enchantment—a name given by superstition to early science. Astronomy was cultivated in Persia B. C. 3209; in India, B. C. 3101; in China, B. C. 2952, and in Egypt, B. C. 2800. Truly, wise men came from far east of Greece and Rome.

In Egypt, India, China, America, and South Pacific Islands, evidences of a primitive civilization are found, which, in some instances, must have run its course long anterior to the age of Homer. Unmistakable traces of a primeval and antehistoric culture of the human race in America exist to mark the lapse of many ages of civilized existence. A knowledge of the western shores of the American continent has long existed in both China and Japan. That a restricted communication has existed by sea across the Pacific does not admit of question. When treating of the origin of the Japanese races several historical instances of their early trans-Pacific voyages will be described and discussed.

In comparatively modern times, enthusiastic specialists, versed in Hebrew traditions, have sought to locate the primeval source of all knowledge and culture upon the high table-lands of Asia, where they pictured the radiant morning of civilization as immediately succeeding the completion of a created world, perfected in all its parts, including man, the most complex being and climax of creation.

In a search after the origin of any race, we are first led to define a belief in the origin of man. I accept the hypothesis of universal evolution by a slow process of cosmic development, from matter which includes within itself the elements of all atmospheric, mineral, vegetable, and animal existence, but latent until its energies are quickened by that progressive life-principle which ceaselessly radiates from the Great Intelligent Mind of the Universe, and is everywhere essential to awaken development.

This hypothesis, clearly within the scope of human thought, is able to stand the test of human reason, and now seems tangibly demonstrated, especially in the connected chain of fossils recently discovered and arranged by Professor Marsh, which visibly illustrate, by an incontrovertible record of natural history, the evolution of the *eques* or horse family, anchitherium, hipparion, &c.

All material things appear connected together by gradational forms, from the superior mental culture of man, the highest animal, to the protozoan or lowest speck of gelatinous matter in which life manifests itself to human perception, onward through untold ages of mineral existence and cosmic conditions, ever in exact keeping with its pace of progress. All things that develop have life. Earth has labored to fit itself for the abode of man, and its labors are progressing successfully. Man came by regular stages of gradation from the monad, and his mental development keeps pace with and is restrained by physical surroundings. Immutable natural laws, universally and eternally in force, do not admit of any sudden, special creation of man, nor do they indicate that all forms of animal life could have been created at the same time. What has once occurred will, under similar conditions, occur elsewhere.

Man is the result of all inferior types, whose capabilities are within himself, making him a compendium of all created things. Fossil remains, found in different forma-

tions, are plainly revealing the stages of progressive transformation, each successive one having all the attributes of its predecessor, with more added. Crustaceous animals are succeeded by fishes, running into the saurian, thence into birds, next marsupials, followed by the mammalia, up to man. Animal development has unfolded, and is continually improving as the physical conditions of the globe are improved and refined, and higher conditions rendered possible.

Mind is an attribute of matter, each being instrumental and necessary to develop the other. Goethe says: "Mind cannot exist without matter, nor active matter without mind."

The man of cultivated mind has reached more than a mere physical being, having developed within himself a portion of that superior intelligence, the germ of which he inherits from the Mind of the Universe. The human mind is unmistakably progressive, and progression is an eternal principle. Hence, mind, the highest refinement of matter in man, is eternal. Our greatest revelation from the Infinite is in His works, where nature matures a supply for every want she creates. The power to conceive of immortality, therefore, implies ability to attain it. This glorious truth is instinctively felt and recognized by every branch of the human race.

The origin of man has been gradually, yet hastily, traced as the result of a constantly progressive life-principle, awakening development in matter, successively evolving from cosmic conditions, minerals, plants, and all the lower forms of animal life, up to its climax, intelligent humanity. In man is to be found the highest physical ultimate of matter, endowed with that further refinement, a moral and progressive spirit, capable of ultimately unfolding his full physical and mental capacities. In human evolution we can but outline the origin of existing physical forms, which periodically change with constantly modifying conditions. The immortal quickening principle which we inherit, can only be traced to the Infinite.

The animating principle of all existences appears like a purer and more highly refined essence or form of electric force; equally manifest in mental and physical development, and exactly adjusted in all its different degrees to successive stages of progressive refinement. Natural law is universal. In the material process of electrotyping, man follows nature's own method of building up metallic forms. The progressive life-principle of the human mind, in common with endless varieties of electric phenomena, manifests universal consistency in the positive and negative phases of a subtle activity. Some correlation with a central intelligence seems reasonably indicated, whence these mutually radiate as developing powers; alike in kind, varying only in degree of force, purity, and refinement.

It appears probable that the ancestors of the earlier types of mankind were evolved, by gradual development, near the oldest parts of continents, along their central summits, upon such portions as first acquired a soil after emerging from a hot primeval sea. Primitive man, at first a speechless animal, may have appeared as a distinct variety of the animal kingdom, in the case of a single pair, from which all human races have multiplied, and differentiated according to the surrounding conditions of their local abode. If so, the physical conditions of certain localities have been far more favorable to the advancement of certain races than others, and early human history must be by *race* and not by *nations*, as communities of individuals come but with the first steps to culture.

Within the limits of races best known, languages and families of languages are found, which preclude any common linguistic origin. It therefore follows, that if man constitutes but a single family in the order of primates, represented by a single *genus*, the formation of language must have commenced after the still speechless primordial man had diverged into races, and differentiation had set in. With the development of ideas in the mind, however rude at first, and organs capable of articulation in the body, language was a consequent result, under the operation of universal law. The great intelligent principle of the universe pervades the entire world, as our mind fills our whole physical frame. The manifestation of this principle we call life, which all things possess in greater or less degree.

Development is ever progressive; although mutability appears to mark every advance, yet no breach of continuity has occurred. Every order has proceeded by natural process from another antecedent. The superimposed strata which constitute the crust of the earth, form a gauge of relative time, for which human chronology scarcely affords a unit of measure. It is perfectly certain that during the Cretaceous epoch, a comparatively recent period in the world's history, none of the physical features existed, which mark the present surface of the globe. Continents have undergone movements of elevation and depression, their shore-lines sunk under the ocean, and sea-beaches have been transferred far into the interior of pre-existing continents. All dry land has been submerged, excepting recent volcanic products and metamorphosed rocks. These introductoty facts are necessary to ethnological research.

A cooling sphere, having acquired a solid crust around a nucleus of fiery liquid, in parting with its heat by radiation into space must contract, distorting its outward surface by pressure, raising mountain ridges and depressing corresponding valleys, where

the first seas became located. Sun and moon, obedient to the law that bodies move to each other in proportion to their masses, and inversely as the squares of their distances, attracted tidal movements in molten fluids under the crust, in hot salt seas, and the thick unrefined atmosphere above. Fluids, as well as other matter, were more gross during their primitive states. Rupture and reformation succeeded one another, until the primitive igneous period of angular Azoic granite became sufficiently hardened to withstand the ordinary pressure of inward forces, gradually preparing to furnish physical conditions suitable to begin the evolution of animal life in its most elementary forms, corresponding with the imperfect condition of existing elements.

During the mighty struggles of the unrefined elements internal convulsions sent the hot salt sea surging over a large portion of the surface, and sedimentary deposits formed new stratifications. Substances impregnating the waters united in forming crystals. The waters, having raged from point to point, were obliged to seek an equilibrium, and retired to the valleys, forming various oceans, seas, lakes, and rivers.

In the early Carboniferous period which succeeded, the extra nitrogen and carbon were rapidly absorbed from the air, and the density of all exterior elements greatly reduced. A period was thus established where, under favorable auspices and in limited localities, the very imperfect initiatorial orders of vegetable and animal life appeared. An infinity of embryo existences are contained within the crust of the earth, awaiting the slow process of development. Life generated at the initial period was of the very lowest order, unable to support or reproduce itself to any considerable extent. From this threshold of progression conditions became sufficiently advanced to admit of the systematic reproduction of species; the age of spontaneous generation having performed its limited duty in the general ripening of the globe may have ceased and passed away with conditions which sustained it, and matter, within itself, matured the power to reproduce its kind, endowed with a progressive principle destined eventually to evolve its ultimates. This hypothesis explains why spontaneous generation may have had its day and subsequently ceased.

Crinoides, conchiferæ, crustacea, polypi, and *polyparia* successively appear as elements are advanced to the necessary conditions to sustain such forms of life. The systematic development of *flora* and *fauna*, in successive ages, extends in an orderly chain, from their dim and distant beginning to our own time, through universal changes of atmosphere, climate, and oscillations of temperature. A continual unbroken chain of organisms has extended from Palæozoic formations to those of our day, governed by law that knows no change. Each species has gradually evolved from its predecessor in an antecedent age by a gradual modification of its parts, culminating in the age it characterizes, and fades away in succeeding ones.

Change is everywhere the soul of nature. The race which first acquired the human form, and became properly entitled to be called man, probably ascended from one original type, which has since diversified, and may in this age be divided into five distinct *varieties* (not types) generally classified as Caucasian, *white;* Mongolians, *yellow;* Malayans, *brown;* Americans, *red;* and Negroes, *black.*

As white and black are apparent opposites, and science shows the white race to be superiorly developed, it is fair to presume that primitive man was black; subsequent nations, brown; their branches, red; from these sprang the yellow, and thence the white. Under local changes of atmospherical and physical conditions of climate, food, &c., the original black became modified to a permanent brown. In like manner one shade and color after another became permanently established. As with complexion, so also with stature, symmetry, and strength. Proper use develops, while disuse brings decay.

Some anatomists have claimed that color may be produced by the arrest of utero-gestation, or is governed by its relative duration in races, thus "causing the ultimate portions of the blood to become so assimilated with the cellular and serous tissues of the fœtus as to render the body variously colored—black, brown, red, or copper color." *Lusus naturæ* have illustrated this fact.

The present of any race depends largely upon the physical conditions of the soil they inhabit. When these remain unaltered, the race cannot advance, unless it can develop, by brain power, sufficient ingenuity to overcome the drawbacks to advancement, such as draining marshes, heating dwellings, importing ice, &c., thus growing, in spite of natural restraint, faster than the slow process of natural evolutionary changes would permit.

Modifications in different types of vegetable or animal life neither progress equally nor evenly. There is no intrinsic necessity that they should undergo modifications at all, unless conditions change, or in the case of man who invents ways of surmounting natural conditions. To him the extreme north becomes habitable by the use of warm clothing, artificial heat and light during long winter nights. By a restless spirit pressing him forward and a judicious control of elements, he is enabled to obtain artificial conditions far in advance of the physical condition of his habitation, and thus prenaturally exalt and develop himself and his race. With the loss of these conditions the highly-developed man would perish or relapse into a comparatively barbaric state, to where his development would exactly agree with his actual physical surroundings.

Darwin unmistakably illustrates the tendency of all forms to variations, which, when once produced, join in equal battle to survive and supplant their progenitors and all others. The fittest will maintain itself and the others perish, the parent and derived forms being equally dependent upon their individual adaptability to surrounding conditions. Thus, certain localities still exist in the condition of ages long past, where inferior races yet flourish and find themselves better off, more competent to deal with difficulties in their way, than any variation derived from their type. While conditions continue unchanged they remain unsupplanted by other forms, and their type becomes very pronounced. Exact reproductions are rare. Amid infinite similitude there is infinite diversity; and imperfection is a vast fact, which must always be taken into account in all hypotheses. "Animal beauty arises from the perfect balance of physical parts and the rhythm and perfection of their action." It is probable that no perceptible change has taken place in the Chinese race for many years, because in that time the incomplete changes of physical condition in their country have not admitted of it. Wheat found in tombs with Egyptian mummies, when brought from darkness into sunlight and planted in congenial soil, grew and produced wonderfully, but could never have developed without a change of conditions. Change is imperative to progress.

A complete knowledge of embryology furnishes an unerring record of the origin and development of any form of animal life; for the embryo of higher types, while in process of maturing, pass successively through a recapitulation of all forms by which their species ascended by evolution to their present condition. Since conception, each human being has passed rapidly through modifications, the counterpart of the graduated forms through which his race has been slowly built up and his present condition reached. Thus, we have a history of human evolution republished in every case of reproduction.

Man, as traced by his embryotic development, commenced, when in darkness, the cohesion of two or more gelatinous molecules, impelled by a constantly-progressive life-principle, united to form a microscopic zoösperm, capable of preserving its new condition in a thick and heated liquid. The proportionate duration of early life in warm water is revealed by the first nine months of his existence, during which many successive but correlated forms are assumed. Dr. Cohnstein, of Berlin, (quoted in the Lancet, May, 1875,) "has determined by means of the thermometer that the temperature proper to the *fœtus in utero* is higher than that of the mother." The hot salt sea in which early life developed is here typified. The period of atmospheric air having arrived at birth, emerging into light, his aquatic life ends, and becomes terrestrial and aerial. New elements of food are supplied, and the mode of nutrition changed. For a while his food continues liquid, and he sees, hears, and notices but little. By degrees he arrives at a consciousness of the solid world, first rolling, then creeping, seal-like on four limbs, then sits upon his haunches, and finally walks erect, at first tremblingly, then playfully, but firmly at last. This reveals how nature required successive physical conditions to acquire progressive results. Each being owes his present bodily form to ascent through a parentage each change of which has passed away, after accomplishing its intended purpose, a culmination reached by degrees, through countless generations of improvement.

In due time children acquire teeth, and another change of food ensues, and hair usually darkens. A second set of incisor and carnivorous teeth soon mark another stage of progress, and youth succeeds childhood, bringing an expanded development of bodily form, passions, and intellectual power. No individual can reproduce until he reaches the full maturity of the type to which he at present belongs, which prevents the race from receding by reproducing a lower type. Leaves grow out or drop off, but never grow back. Nature never retrogrades; advance or perish is law to the individual.

Man can imitate any animal of his species, but no animal can follow man beyond its developed powers. Many traits, exemplified in lower animals, are successively developed in children, and overcome by proper control: such as gluttony, cunning, and deceit—the latter a lingering trait of weakness, general with inferior races. They repeat the antics of a very active and mischievous race; their first attempts at drawing resemble the rude figures made by our primeval ancestry and present wild tribes; furthermore, like "children of the forest," our younger children have not reached the age of self-cleanliness.

The impulsive ferocity of youth and cooler maturity of age are but characteristic types of human transformation in the evolutionary procession. Our lives acquire a double significance when we find we are building an inheritance for every one of our descendants while our race continues.

In our growth, we re-evolve, concisely, the story of our race's lineage, as in "*the house that Jack built*" each succeeding verse comprehends all its predecessors. Our present bodies now barely float; for, as man acquired his upright stature, his frame must have increased in weight and hardened into greater rigidity; while the pelvis, to sustain additional weight thus put upon it, enlarged, thickened, and increased his gravity.

The head of the human species seems originally to have been large in proportion to the body, exhibiting a promising germ thus early advanced, a fact to which the race may owe its present superiority; and, possibly, this early development of the organ capable of acquiring knowledge may account for peculiar sufferings, visited upon woman, more particularly among the most intellectually developed,

The highest type of man has been artificially advanced beyond the condition of some portions of the physical world. Miasmatic swamps are yet insufficiently reclaimed by time to permit a white man's existence where they continue. Their present condition would involve his speedy illness and dissolution. Lower organizations, congenial to and in harmony with such conditions of physical development, may exist and flourish there; but more refined types of humanity require the most perfected physical conditions for their perfect enjoyment and highest attainments.

Centripetal law has consolidated the Chinese into a positive and exclusive people, who delight in ignoring the centrifugal or complimentary force which induces dispersions. They have long clung to unique customs and dress, resisting change or improvement. In their stereotyped form of frozen civilization, differentiation has been arrested and a peculiar type intensified. Unalterable fixedness in forms of belief and habits concreted by centuries furnish convincing evidence of great antiquity. The black races are ethnologically far less developed, and having no fixed belief to displace, are more readily converted to any religious sect.

We cannot avoid admitting that the Chinese are one of the oldest families of the ancient world; yet they are by no means the oldest. Until the seventh century before the Christian era they were perfect strangers to every form of idolatry. Pure Chinese appear like a race absolutely distinct from nations by whom they are surrounded, differing in physical characteristics of form, color, and expression; in language, in their written characters, their literature, and religious observances. Unchanged by foreign conquests, by extensive intermixture with any foreign race, they have developed within themselves, preserving and perhaps intensifying their type; governed and civilized by the principles contained in their own classic literature, and in their pure and excellent book, the Chou-king, compiled fully 3,000 years ago from their more ancient literature, much as many suppose Moses to have compiled the Pentateuch, or as Herodotus compiled early Grecian history.

China has her ancient picture-writings, but no ancient idols. She has her literature older than the Sanscrit races. When the great pyramid of Menes was built, in the fourth dynasty of Egypt, B. C. 3893, we find one vast and expanded system of idolatry throughout Asia, and the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, all worshiping emblems, more or less types of the sun or solar principle; China, standing alone—far back in the twilight of history—is a solitary exception on the continent of Asia.

Language is a test of social contact, not of race. Undoubtedly the first expression of human thoughts was by configurations of countenance, such as smiles and scowls, indicating pleasure, dread, or anger. With the invention of complicated forms in language, capable of complete expression without emotion, came deceit, frequently followed by loss of harmonious social relations, and developing combativeness. No primitive history at present known conveys any reliable account of an aboriginal language much anterior to that of China, although that of the ancient people of Yucatan and adjoining American nations, as shown by picture-writings on their monuments, appears to have been more ancient.

Both peoples, in common with the Egyptians, expressed thoughts by picture-writing and in hieroglyphics. While other surviving nations improved upon this original style, by developing the phonetic, inhabitants of China alone became exclusively confirmed in their monosyllabic language, and their manner of vocal communication is still very peculiar and spasmodic in sound and utterance. Their hieroglyphics, which, in early ages, expressed a single substantial thought, were subsequently assumed as syllabic representations, and became synthetic or compound forms of expression. Thus, to-day, 216 Chinese radicals are made use of, in over 50,000 ideographic combinations.

To investigate this subject requires extensive research in a multitude of directions—physiological, linguistic, religious, traditional, geographical, and migratorial—for it is often by their mutual comparison only that satisfactory results are reached. The wider view we can compass, the clearer our understanding of general laws. There is in force a law of decreasing vitality, as well as of evolution, both alike depending upon the refinement of surrounding conditions. Great disturbances have affected the earth's surface and all living things, since the Tertiary period, when our present zoology fairly started into being. To all these considerations must be added the ancient migrations which the different families of mankind have passed through, under the changing conditions imposed upon them by geographical and climatic necessities, and thus a systematic arrangement of facts is finally indicated. Physical geography teaches us that of the two great elements, water and land, the latter, which is matter in a more advanced form, is far superior in the animal and vegetable life to which it gives origin; likewise, that low and swampy land is fatal to health and the highest development of man. Geology and palæontology show this to have been equally true of the flora and fauna in ancient days.

Neither tropical Africa nor Asia is adapted to the Anglo-Saxon constitution; every white colony there has been wasted by sickness and death; yet this is the native and natural climate of the dark races, who are there as much at home as is the polar bear on the shores of Greenland. When at Saigon, on the Meikong River, I was told by an officer of the French colony that 24 per cent. of French troops stationed there died annually. The British occupation of low lands in the southern portion of India is scarcely more than a military possession, so far as Europeans are concerned, who cannot long live there, but would soon become extinct but for the constant influx of fresh immigration. There, a European struggles for existence, a prey to fever and dysentery, and is unequal to severe labor. White women, as a rule, are especial sufferers, rallying but poorly from any illness. White men must yield the tropics to the dark races. The reverse is also true; negroes are not comfortable in the frigid zone. The American residents of New England States, as at present constituted, have a continual fight with existing conditions of climate, and their survivors and descendants, now in process of acclimatization as a race, are assuming a somewhat typical form.

Whenever we examine nature, we find a perfect adaptation of animals to the circumstances under which they live. The constitutional temperaments of the different races seem to vary. The dark races are less developed than the white; they have a less nervous sensibility, for their physical organization is less delicate. Van Amridge says: "The dark races expire less carbonic acid from their lungs than the white, but transpire the fetid matter chiefly by the skin." According to Dr. Knox, the nerves of their limbs are one-third less than the Saxon of equal height. Great differences of shape in the pelvis of different races have been classified by Drs. Vrolik and Weber, who thus report the four principal races: "The European is oval; the American, round; the Mongolian, square; and African, oblong."

The characteristics most relied on for the discrimination of races are the color of the skin, structure of the hair, and conformation of the skull and skeleton. Transitions from one to the other are so gradual that it seems almost impossible to draw any exact and arbitrary line of inter-demarkation. We now see the various branches of mankind confined to distinct localities, mainly bounded by isothermal lines, with distinction of form and color, with different social relations, religions, governments, habits, and intellectual powers. Wherever men have migrated, they appear to have found and displaced an aboriginal nation, and no record is believed to exist of any people ever migrating to a land which they found entirely destitute of inhabitants, in some of the various stages of human development. Adelung reckons the total population of the earth as 1,288,000,000, professing 1,100 forms of religion, among which there exist 3,664 known languages or dialects, viz: 937 Asiatic, 587 European, 276 African, 1,624 American. These are significant facts.

Sir Charles Lyell is inclined to admit that an imperfect form of man was living when the Tertiary strata were deposited. Agassiz, who pronounced America the oldest continent extant, measured the coral growth during a given number of years along the southern half of Florida, which, he asserts, has been formed by accretion during the geological period known as Recent, and must have required not less than 135,000 years to form. We may arrange epochs in their order of sequence, but not of date, for in contemplating the vastness of such a past, the mind becomes lost in amazement at the vista opened into antiquity. The histories of China contain records of the past which modern chronologies have insufficient room to measure. The limits of history are steadily receding, and Greece and Rome are taking their proper positions in a comparatively modern era. Science is developing unanswerable proofs of the greater antiquity of the human race than current ecclesiastical histories have been supposed to allow. Greater freedom in chronology is absolutely necessary. No sound religious principles have aught to fear from true interpreters of antiquity. Truth, in all its natural simplicity, is susceptible of proof, and reason is its steadfast supporter. Nature's own religion is grander than any human conception. In the dark ages, mysteries, miracles, and absolute imposture stood in the way of absolute truth. Evolution gives to the Infinite higher attributes, and more nearly connects him with all created things. The God of the true scientist is grander and more comprehensible to mankind. It takes us half our lives to unlearn and eradicate errors honestly taught us in youth, with perfect good faith and intention, which persistently cling to us until displaced by the sound reasoning powers of maturer years. Each conscience is but the result of its own moral education. It is composed of ideas it has fed on. Many imbibe hereditarily the opinions of their forefathers, and venerate them because they were first upon their mind, which circumstance alone produces to them an unsophisticated conviction of their truthfulness. None are free but those whom Truth makes free:

"Most men by education are misled,
They so believe because they so are bred;
The priest continues what the nurse began,
And so the child imposes on the man."

America was undoubtedly peopled many ages before Julius Cæsar landed in barbaric Britain, and many of the colossal structures, whose ruins still excite the wonder of the

wandering Indians of Central America and Peru doubtless passed from use long before the Tartar conquerors in Central Asia drove their hordes eastward, or Attila and his Huns swept his legions westward, from the great wall of China and the steppes of ancient Tartary.

Chinese historians assert that in the fifth year of the reign of Yao, B. C. 2353, strangers from the south, of the family of Yoüe-Tchang, brought, as a present from a maritime kingdom in southern seas, a great turtle, three feet long by three feet wide, and very old, on whose back was written a history of the world, from its commencement to that time, which Yao ordered transcribed and preserved. Turtles have long had a peculiar religious significance in Japan, and also among American aborigines at Copan, where a splendid stone altar of great antiquity, in the image of a similar tortoise, yet remains.

Chinese culture, dwelling apart in the southeastern extremity of Asia, has developed and retained distinctive national types, coldly conservative, while nations less peculiar, and perhaps more adventurous, rose, scattered, and passed away almost by scores. The isolation of their peculiar civilization must have resulted from the physical conformation of the spot they occupied, encircled by protecting ranges of mountains and forbidding natural barriers.

Eminent Chinese historians (after describing the fabulous and mythical ages, which are imperfect and idealized recollections of events, peoples, eras, and civilizations; and renowned individuals whose exact history had become confused, extinct, or legendary when their first authentic records of ancient history were penned,) come to the reign of men. Greek history appears limited when looking beyond into oriental records, and proves but a scanty stream leading to a broad ocean beyond.

The deified rulers are naturally the most ancient, and are succeeded by demi-god descendants, in a sort of middle age. The advent of conquering heroes from a foreign soil, by introducing a new element into history, may have changed the national era. A careful study of the various ancient histories of the world has led me to infer that, generally, rulers who are said to have descended from the gods were merely successful invaders of the country where they died, and were there canonized or deified. Being born in a foreign land, no local record existed of their parentage, and it was easy to ascribe their origin to supernatural causes; while their death being among the people whose traditions have come down to us, was witnessed and recorded.

All scholars experience difficulty in tracing up and locating ancient places, as most of them were given new and foreign names by conquerors and explorers. Since the days of Tyre and Sidon, and the ancient and long-continued sway of the South Arabians declined, and gave way to the rise of great monarchies in Western Asia and India, places have received new rulers and taken new names. This is true throughout history, of all countries, and is more recently illustrated to us in the saintly names given by Spanish and Portuguese explorers; or headlands and islands renamed for British seamen and their patrons. A less troublesome impediment to accurate identification is found in translated names.

The progress of science and linguistic and historic researches continually supplements our knowledge of the mighty past, whose history must now be worked back by degrees, and every fact capable of yielding testimony preserved and utilized. Chinese records, extending to B. C. 3588, may yet render valuable aid in perpetuating much that was destroyed in the lost libraries of Phœnicia, Chaldea, and Egypt. The first era of Chinese history is without dates, capable of being accurately fixed by any measure known to us at the present time. So of Methuselah's age. We cannot believe that the duration of human life changed suddenly from hundreds of years to three-score years and ten. The change, if at all, was in the human measure. During our present century, the average longevity of Great Britain has increased nearly ten years. The true "*elixir of life*" is a scientific knowledge of the limits of our being, and wisdom to use our powers so as to obtain their utmost capabilities. Wisdom is the best use of knowledge.

This early Chinese era consisted of three dynasties, who successively, with their descendants, ruled the kingdom of China, whose dominion had not then spread into an empire, and the aggregate terms of their reigns must have extended over a long period of time. This period may represent the rule of early Asiatic aborigines, developed upon the soil of China.

Chinese historians commence their second and more authentic era with the reign of a sovereign named Tai Ko Fokee, or Great King Stranger. He commenced his reign B. C. 3588, and from this founder of their line of monarchs they have preserved a national history and true chronological succession of their rulers. His name seems to imply that he was a foreign conqueror, who occupied the country, and doubtless, at the time of his conquest, took no pains to preserve the records of superseded dynasties, which come to us only in the form of tradition.

The pictorial representations of King Fokee which have come down to us, represent him with two small horns, similar to those associated with the representations of Moses, the Hebrew lawgiver. He and his successor are said to have introduced into China

the hieroglyphic characters for picture-writing, somewhat similar to those found in Central America, and from whence the ideograms now in use are conceded to have been derived. He taught his people the motion of heavenly bodies, the twelve celestial signs, and divided their time into years and months, besides bringing them a knowledge of many other useful arts and sciences. The sudden advent of so much new knowledge, brought by one man, indicates that he came from far away—from a country with which no previous communication had existed. As he introduced a new measure of time, we can but estimate the duration of eleven reigns which preceded him.

Probably the solar day was the earliest measure of time; then the lunar month; and, lastly, the solar year. The various words used in all languages, and interpreted to us years, meant simply the *periods of time* which at the moment constituted its measure. Thus, if Metl uselah lived 969 periods of time when the lunar month was the accepted measure, he died at 74½ years of age, which is not improbable.

The great Chinese history of Tse-ma Chi-ang, written B. C. 122, and purporting to be an accurate transcript of all earlier existing histories, which it was desirable to consolidate and preserve, narrates events chronologically from the reign of Hoang-Ti, which commenced B. C. 2697, when he was eleven years old. During his minority the kingdom was governed by wise and prudent counselors, who, it says, took great care of the young monarch, and educated him in all the useful arts and sciences then known. It is recorded that during his reign physicians first learned to feel the pulse; the magnetic needle was first used, pointing to the south; and civilization greatly advanced. He lived a useful life, was greatly respected, and died at a ripe old age. During a portion of his reign, a powerful revolt was successfully put down, indicating a mixed race, with the antagonisms of conflicting opinions. Five of his descendants succeeded, in turn, to his throne. Then came Tai Yao, followed by Yuti Tsi Yune, B. C. 2294, during whose reign a great deluge occurred in Asia, which flooded fifteen provinces of China and drowned great numbers of inhabitants. Some portions of the country remained under water for several years thereafter.

This rupture of a natural barrier, which held in check some extensive inland basin of water, existing at a higher level, occurred just fifty-four years after Archbishop Usher fixes the arch-catastrophe of Hebrew tradition, and was doubtless, like the Noachian flood, a crisis in the physical history of the region where it occurred. It is highly probable that the great interior alkaline deserts of North America, where the successive water-lines around the surfaces of every elevation of its various levels clearly indicate the former presence of vast inland basins of water, have, at some remote period, been in like manner drawn off and precipitated upon lower levels of this continent in their journey toward the common level of the ocean. This is also shown by the presence of ancient river-beds across the present summits of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Nothing seems to impede the execution of unerring physical laws; and in the consideration of general history, natural science shows no relation between such physical calamities and personal guilt.

B. C. 2233, the next Emperor, Ta Yu, caused canals to be cut to convey to the sea the immense bodies of water, which, during the reign of his predecessor, had been precipitated upon and overflowed so large a part of China. By this means many deep river-beds were finally cut, and continued to be worn away by the receding waters until the whole country was freed from inundation.

His eleventh descendant and successor was a tyrant, and was banished in the fifty-second year of his age, and King Ching Tang came to the throne B. C. 1766, and died 1753 B. C. During his reign, a great famine existed in China, which, the records say, lasted seven years. Joseph's famine in Egypt occurred B. C. 1707, or forty-six years after this date. These coincidences are merely cited as suggestive to historical students.

It is desirable that the historical records of all ancient nations should be sought out and compared; and to our linguistic and archæological students on the Pacific the early histories of China and Japan should be made the subject of careful study. Much mental and social cultivation existed in Asia when Europe was yet in her dark and undeveloped ages. China and Japan, as well as all the nations of Asia, yet contain many ancient records that may well repay careful study, revealing traces of a civilization whose history is incredibly remote. Ere the ancient respect for sacred records has become impaired, and they are cast aside or destroyed in the ecstacy of a new-found religion, or the mechanical wonders of a scientific civilization, earnest and reliable students may acquire much important testimony among the archives of India, China, and Japan. Few ancient races have preserved a literature of equal value with the Chinese. The great past of prehistoric humanity bears traces of activity and commercial intercourse throughout Asia.

About five thousand years before the Christian era, the Sanskrit branch of the Aryan race invaded and occupied Northern India, while the Arabian Cushites, dwelling in Arabia, held control of Southern Arabia. These South Arabians held innumerable colonies, and were unrivaled in power and commercial dominion. They early established great influence as a maritime people along the coast of Southwestern Asia,

colonizing much of the Asiatic seaboard in the deepest antiquity, not, however, including the present Chinese territory, but exercised a widespread influence from the extremes of India even to Norway, acting an important part as pioneers in spreading and developing early civilization. The nomadic tribes of Asia have been classed as of Semitic origin.

China, although well known, and mentioned in the ancient Sanskrit writings under the name of Yama, was never included in statements of the migrations of races and peoples throughout Western Asia, Hindostan, and the islands of the Indian Sea. In remote antiquity, the Chinese nation appears to have lived within itself, cut off from active communication with any neighboring people.

According to Arabian traditions, Ad was the primeval father of the pure Arabians, and built a city in Arabia, which became great and powerful. The Adites are referred to in the earliest dawn of Arabian history as enterprising, rich, and powerful, having great cities of wonderful magnificence. They were skillful builders, rich in gold, silver, and precious stones, showing them acquainted with metals. Numerous appliances of our civilization had their origin far back in the obscurity of ages now prehistoric, and Adam may be but the Hebrew tradition of the ancient Adites of Arabia, who must themselves have had a long line of ancestry to have developed and acquired such civilization. Adam was perhaps simply the ideal embodiment of *a beginning of humanity*, typified to the Hebrews by an Adite patriarch, beyond the experience of their own history, into which he was adopted by Moses, *as the ancestor of their race.* It was an effort to extend their national lineage far back to an original First Cause. The distinctive Hebrew race descended from Abraham, that magnificent sheik, the mighty Mesopotamian prince; Israel's ancestral hero and first distinctive Hebrew personality; great grandsire of the princely Joseph, lord chancellor of Egypt, prime minister of the first Sesostris, and monotheistic chief of an illustrious line. Thus he stands, in bold relief, on the canvas of tradition, as a great leader of human kind in the period comprised in the first essays of Hebrew literature.

Our opinion of the general inaccessibility of China from other parts of the continent of Asia, in early times, is confirmed by a passage in the history of Besorus, relating the conquests of the Arabian sovereign Schamar Iarasch, Abou Karib, who reigned over Chaldea, and 245 years before the rise of the Assyrian empire carried his arms, B. C. 1518, into Central Asia, occupied Samarcand, and for a long time attempted, without success, the invasion of China. Humboldt describes an Himyatic inscription existing at Samarcand in the fourteenth century, in characters expressing, "In the name of God, Schamar Iarasch has erected this edifice to the sun, his Lord." All facts go to show that migrations over Central Asia, from Arabia across the continent, must have passed north of China, (which country seems to have maintained her individuality nearly intact,) and reached the shores of the Pacific near the peninsula of Corea, which is still inhabited by a populous nation, quite unlike the Chinese race. Many aborigines of Central Asia were doubtless driven toward the coast by these Arabian conquerors. These South Arabians were a people older than the Aryans. The great ages of Cushite civilization, to which we are told they succeeded, closed at a period which was very ancient when the book of Job, the oldest book of the Hebrew Scriptures, was penned as a Persian poem.

Testimony is universal that the oldest nations succeeded older pre-existing peoples, and generally received their highest ideas from abroad, showing a descent of ideas as well as of blood. A constant admixture of races, peoples, and nations has been successively going on for ages. It is only in some secluded spot that we may, at this late day, discover traces of anything approaching to an early type, with slight recent admixture. Such specimens, if they exist at all, cannot but be extremely rare, and, like the Miauts of China and some remnants in the Tyrolese Alps, inhabit regions virtually inaccessible.

The huge stone structures, cities, and temples, being unearthed in Yucatan, argue an enormous early population. The ruins of Copan, and disintegrating pyramids of Palenque, are convincing proof of a great prehistoric race in Central America, at an immensely early period, which must have occupied the same relative positions toward North and South America that Asia Minor did, in remote ages, to Central Asia and Africa. The peculiar construction of all the arches found among the buried cities of Yucatan may lead to the discovery of races cognate to its early inhabitants. The same principle of arch was used in very early times by Egyptians, Greeks, and Etrurians.

Notwithstanding the frequent disastrous fires, and destruction of records by conquerors and founders of dynasties, who have annihilated much valuable material, China, Japan, and the interior of India have many copies and manuscript translations of very ancient works and histories, long retained among their sacred treasuries, rich archæological prizes for modern explorers to unearth, equal in interest to the lost history of Iran, mentioned in the Dabistan and other Asiatic writings.

By an extended research into ancient histories, many plausible reasons are found, which argue the possibility, and almost probability, that some early aborigines of the

pure Chinese race may have crossed by sea from the coast of Peru to China in an early or remote age of the world. Recent travelers in Peru inform us that its aboriginal races have, like our North American Indians, become nearly extinct; and the only remaining traces are found among the China-chola, a mixed result from Spanish and Portuguese ancestors. Last year my attention was called to an article in a South American paper, describing the remnant of a race of aboriginal Mongolians or Chinese, found among the high table-lands upon the western slope of the Andes.

Phœnicians and Egyptians, who each received hieroglyphical characters from a common source, originating in an older people, ascribe them to Taut. The Chinese ascribe them to Tai Ko Fokee, their Great Stranger King, who reigned B. C. 3588. Many curious coincidences point to the supposition that he may have brought them from Peru or Central America, where, among ruins still existing, there has been discovered much early picture-writing, closely corresponding to early Chinese characters, comprising the 216 radical ideographs now used. Thus, heaven is expressed by three horizontal lines, slightly curved; and earth by a cross within a circle. In discoveries at Copan is a figure strikingly resembling the Chinese symbol of Fokee, both nations representing him like Moses, as a lawgiver, with two small horns. Many figures on Peruvian water-vessels, of great antiquity, are identical with those found in Egyptian temples; birds' heads, for example, attached to figures resembling a comma, but intended to represent tongues; and other remarkable coincidences. Either one people learned from the other, or both acquired these forms from a common source. Many physico-geographical facts favor the hypothesis that it is more rational to conclude that Egypt received them from America, through China—possibly through Fokee, or some predecessor in very remote ages. Recent scientific explorations are reported to have exhumed sacred Chinese mottoes, carved on tombs in Egypt—counterparts of phrases in use to-day—revealing the existence of an intercourse when China was ruled by kings anterior to Moses.

The present written language of China is undoubtedly an imported method, advanced from such picture-writings as those of the ancient Peruvians, or primitive hieroglyphical signs of ancient Egypt. Among some nations mental progress evolved a simple alphabet, while others remained content with the increasing complications of ideographic signs for syllables and objects. Egypt, like China, was tenacious of her individual peculiarities, and long retained her hieroglyphic type. She finally abandoned it, while China clung to but improved it.

The South Arabians, and their descendants, the Phœnicians, having an extended commerce established throughout the Indian Ocean, with every known shore, undoubtedly passed more readily into a simple phonetic alphabet, better adapted to the practical wants of a commercial people. Tablets have been discovered among their ancient ruins, by which the various changes are readily traced.

Chinese characters, so long surrounded by the ultra conservatism of an impenetrable isolation, have undoubtedly developed from these common forms of natural objects, and subsequently been adapted to easy and rapid writing, with a peculiar style of brush, and their manner of holding it.

The consideration of whether the Chinese people originally developed in Asia or abroad, bears an important relation to the origin of the Japanese race, the subject we are ultimately investigating and shall consider in our next paper. In seeking the initial points whence migrations have diverged, we naturally gather all possibilities, whence we select probabilities, in the hope of finally eliciting absolute truth. We shall be compelled to limit this already lengthy paper to setting forth certain fundamental principles useful in research, and to a collection of evidence, the full discussion of which will necessarily remain for a future occasion.

Without in any manner indorsing the following hypothesis, we shall simply aim to shadow forth a few *possibilities* which the consideration of many curious facts have suggested during the laborious details of an elaborate search.

How came the Chinese—a people so ancient, so reserved, and so wholly unlike their surrounding neighbors, or indeed any other race upon the continent of Asia—to be thus alone in this corner of a continent, walled in apart from all neighboring races? We may reasonably doubt the assumption of any spontaneous growth in the country they now inhabit. Conjectured migrations among still speechless societies, at an epoch anterior to the formation of nations, are beyond our present ability to trace. We can only surmise whether each continent evolved a type of manhood separately, or whether all higher races have resulted from the various differentiations and dispersions from a single locality, of a common ancestor already developed up to the lowest types of a speechless animal, tending to manhood.

Our best researches indicate an enormous antiquity for man on the American continent, and an advance in general form and brain capacity, with, doubtless, a modification of color, since a very early period. In very remote times, there appear to have existed at least two very distinct populations, differing, in fact, more widely than any existing aborigines of the continent. Portions of North America had been occupied by races far more advanced than its occupants when recently discovered by Europeans.

Originating, perhaps, at a very early period in the elevated centers of the American continent, wave after wave of races may have rolled eastward and westward, or northward and southward, to a certain extent, only identified in America to-day by slight signs that mark the nearly extinct descendants of the people with which they amalgamated.

Dogmatic theology retreats before scientific truth. No one will at this day pronounce the self-registering records of nature grave heresies. They are vastly more enduring, authentic, and reliable testimony than the precarious text of human narrators. It seems a crime against true religion to hang the integrity of its moral principles upon the validity of statistics in any book which merely illustrates, by historical parables, the early development of its traditional ideas. The innate virtue of its pure principles is unharmed by legendary or dogmatic absurdities.

The Chinese have an immense antiquity. They are a peculiar people, very marked in their features, and have multiplied so that at present their population and area of production are so balanced that any marked increase would precipitate a famine, and thus equalize conditions. They not only practice economy, but enjoy it, having learned in centuries to live upon the minimum and enjoy the maximum of life.

All other civilizations and emigrations throughout Asia appear to have moved from Asia Minor and the high central portions of the north and west. The Chinese appear as an isolated people, and have long preserved the peculiar type of a race wholly unlike any other on the continent of Asia. Their country is situated upon the southeastern extremity of the continent, and hemmed in on the west and north by a chain of mountains practically impassable, and now made more so by the great wall, 1,250 miles in length, with which, B. C. 220, they sought to complete their isolation.

If this people did not develop from the soil they now occupy, we must search for the most probable mode of access by which their earliest ancestry reached their present home. In this stage of the world, all nations are more or less composite.

The southern and southeastern portions of China border upon the ocean, and if the earliest Chinese came from an opposite direction, they must have reached their country by water. If so, it may account for their skilled boatmen, who have lived upon the water from time immemorial, and for the enormous fleets of junks, generally of large dimensions, which they possess. A taste early cultivated may have come down through many centuries.

If we first seek for testimony from Chinese records, we find they ascribe their own origin to the southern portion of China. In order to ascertain how they could have reached there by sea, and the direction whence they probably came, we must study natural causes, and seek among winds and currents for the first natural distributing agents, whose influence on navigation has been but recently overcome by clipper-ships and steamers of modern construction.

The Pacific is a wide ocean to cross, and fair winds must have been relied upon, for muscles could never have paddled a direct course for such a distance. Where, therefore, is the country from which they could follow a fair, fixed wind in a straight course, and be brought to land upon the southern coast of China, where they claim to have originated?

We find in the South Pacific, between the southern tropics and the equator, a perpetual trade-wind blowing from the southeast. Toward the tropics, it blows more nearly from the south, hauling gradually into the eastward as it approaches the equator. This constant breeze would drive a vessel kept before the wind from a point anywhere on the coast of Peru, about in the neighborhood of the Chincha Islands, by a slightly curved but almost direct line as far as the equator, in the direct course for the coast of China.

In the North Pacific Ocean, between the tropics and equator, the northeast trade-wind exists, as the almost complementary counterpart of winds in the southern hemisphere, likewise blowing more northerly near its northern limit, and uniting in an almost due easterly wind near the equator. Thus the southeast and northeast trade-winds meet, and frequently blow into each other along a parallel line, making a continuous fair wind, uniting them at the equator, and consequently forming an uninterrupted motive power, to their western limit.

Now, if a large junk were started from the coast of Peru, near Central America, and kept off before these fair winds, there is a strong probability that in sixty days she would strike the southern coast of China, about where early Chinese traditions place the origin of their race. This evidence, of natural causes, apparently points to Peru as the possible home of the Chinese ancestral race. What has Peru to offer in support of such a hypothesis?

In Heaviside's American Antiquities, published in 1868, we find that "some of the western tribes of Brazil are so like the Chinese in feature as to be almost identical." There is thus a *possibility* shown that the ancestry of China may have embarked in large vessels as emigrants, perhaps from the vicinity of the Chincha Islands, or proceeded with a large fleet, like the early Chinese expedition against Japan, or that of Julius Cæsar against Britain, or the Welsh Prince Madog and his party, who sailed from Ireland and landed in America A. D. 1170, and, in like manner, in the dateless antecedure

of history, crossed from the neighborhood of Peru to the country now known to us as China. The very name Chincha has a Chinese sound, and reads China, with two letters dropped.

For upward of twenty centuries, Chinese junks are known to have been large, fast, and strong; their people skillful mariners, excellent carpenters, and marine architects. They early possessed the mechanical skill to build junks of comparatively great tonnage, capable of conveying large amounts of cargo and great numbers of passengers. If the measurements of Noah's ark are correctly interpreted, she was larger than any ship of our day. Ship-building, as we have shown in a previous paper, is a very ancient art, known long before the days of Tarshish. We have no history of its absolute inception. Monuments on land endure to perpetuate the memory of a race, but ships are of their nature perishable. A race that could build the magnificent temples and pyramids of Palenque and Copan in Yucatan could certainly have their fleets upon the Pacific Ocean in ages long before any existing record. The construction of a Peruvian or Central American fleet of large vessels, in early ages, capable of transferring to China, if not 100,000 people, certainly quite sufficient to establish a colony, would require far less skill or enterprise than that which raised the pyramids of either Central America or Egypt.

China had bronzes in perfection during her very earliest ages, and may have introduced them into Western Europe and Asia. Among the most ancient relics found in Peru are bronze and iron implements. Many Peruvian and Central American antiquities resemble, not modern Chinese, but their most ancient writings and figures. It is not impossible that Cadmus's alphabet, as well as the hieroglyphics of Egypt, may have been suggested and developed from the ancient American hieroglyphics now coming to light, showing such similarity and apparent connection, and which many scholars already consider as the early models, not the results, of Egyptian figures and Chinese ideographic characters.

The Toltec race in America had a god with one arm; so had the Egyptians. They deified Fo, whom they represent with two small horns, similar to those associated with figures of Moses, the Hebrew lawgiver; instructed Chib-ca Indians in Bogota to paint the cross and trigrams used on their inscriptions; and in China, the Chinese historians ascribe to Fohi many new things, among others, how to paint identical figures of trigrams, like those found among the ruins of Central America. With time and perseverance, it may yet be discovered that a knowledge of hieroglyphics came from Peru or Central America to China, a people whose growing commercial intercourse may have spread their knowledge to the ancient monarchies of Egypt.

The recital of facts may be greatly extended, showing a wonderful chain of evidence, which it is hard to conceive can be entirely accidental and coincidental, unless we take the extremely broad and apparently untenable ground, boldly asserting that primitive humanity, through the action of common laws and natural forces, wherever placed, evolves like forms, customs, and necessary results, irrespective of variable conditions and individual fancy or free will. Chinese ideas concerning the Tchin, or original eight persons of a supernatural nature who escaped from the sea, point to an origin from beyond seas, or to an early piscatorial age. B. C. 3588, Tai-ko-Fokee, a king of China from abroad, was deified. China has her ancient pictorial writings.

Fernando Montesino, a Spanish historian, who visited Peru and published his work from 1508 to 1547, says Peru was thickly populated, and had a catalogue of 101 monarchs, with notes of the memorable events of their reign, extending to B. C. 2,655.

Hawks, in his Peruvian antiquities, says that before the Spanish conquest, in the most eminent period of the dynasty of the Incas, the vast empire of Peru contained eleven million inhabitants, which rapidly diminished, until the census of 1580 shows but 8,280,000, and now the valleys of the Peruvian coast contain barely a fifth of what they contained under the Incas. The total present population by census of 1875 amounts to only 2,720,735 souls. A light native is still called a *China-Chola*.

The feast of souls practiced in Central America appears to have been derived from the same source as that of the ancient Egyptians. The Jesuits of the Propaganda report these ceremonies as anciently in practice in China. The ruins of ancient temples found in Central America resemble in form, space, and massive walls, *without roof*, the most ancient temples of Egypt, and many of the carvings are singularly alike.

Traditionary histories among the different groups of the Polynesian Islands indicate that the Hawaiian race came there from the south. The Hawaiian Islands are nearly in the direct line from Peru to China.

While the majority of Hawaiians are probably descended from Malays, their early traditions tell us of the landing of men belonging to a race whiter than their own upon the southern island of Hawaii, many centuries ago, whom they were at first inclined to consider as gods, but who finally settled among them, and from their wisdom were elevated to high positions. These men undoubtedly came from Central America or Peru, and may have been from the ancient Peruvian empire, or the later kingdom of the Incas, or from that early civilization whose traces yet remain in Yucatan.

It has been sufficiently demonstrated that even frail canoes and boats, either by acci-

dent or design, have performed voyages across wide oceans. In 1819, Kotsebue found at Radack group four natives of the Caroline Islands, who had been driven eastward in a canoe 1,500 miles. In 1849, men came from Honolulu to San Francisco, 2,300 miles, in whale-boats. And, more recently, the boisterous Atlantic Ocean has been crossed from New York to Liverpool by a solitary man in a dory.

A dozen of the crew of the clipper-ship Golden Light, burned in the South Pacific about 1865, just west of Cape Horn, reached Hawaii in eighty one days in a whale-boat under sail, and would have run upon the reef at Laopahoihoi, but for natives, who swam off to rescue these exhausted people, all of whom survived.

While we have cited facts showing it reasonable to suppose that early Peruvians or Central Americans may have come to China by the aid of continuous fair winds, it is no less necessary to show the almost insurmountable difficulties which exist during a greater part of the year to impede their return by sea. To beat back against strong trade-winds and the long regular seas of the Pacific would be a task in which they would surpass our best modern clippers, which now can only make the voyage by running far north and crossing from Japan to the coast of California, upon the arc of a great circle, and sailing thence southerly, close hauled on the wind, to the neighborhood of Tahiti in the South Pacific, which must then be crossed in an easterly direction, south of the trade-winds, which in turn enable them to make northing and reach the coast of Peru. Such a return voyage would require the most skillful knowledge of winds, coasts, and scientific navigation, such as we have only possessed in comparatively recent times, and would also require exceedingly strong and weatherly vessels. There seems, therefore, less likelihood that any Chinese ever reached Peru in prehistoric times by such a route.

Intercourse appears to have existed more recently, but how far it was reciprocal remains to be seen. If it was commercial, it was more likely to have been, as reciprocity is the foundation of trade.

In our search for objections to the theory we are exploring, we, however, find other possible channels of return communication. During the southwest monsoon a fleet of junks might possibly have left China and followed the Kuro-Shiwo, or warm stream that flows along the coast of Japan, with summer winds across to the northwestern coast of America, near our own harbor, and thence gradually have worked its way southward to Central America, keeping along in sight of the coast until it reached the calm belt around Panama. The Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg makes this statement: "There was a constant tradition among the people who dwelt on the Pacific Ocean that people from distant nations beyond the Pacific formerly came to trade at the ports of Coatulco and Pechugui, which belonged to the kingdom of Tehuantepec, in Central America." Baldwin tells us, in his Pre-historic Times, that "the traditions of Peru told of a people who came to that country by sea, and landed on the Pacific coast." These may have been from the great maritime empire of the Malays, whose dialects have permeated almost every island in the Pacific Oceans. Lang says: "South Sea Islanders exhibit indubitable evidences of an Asiatic origin."

The continent of Asia affords more facilities for reaching Polynesia than America, although stragglers from the latter have doubtless added to its island races and thus created a mixture of customs which, to some extent, may indicate a partial derivation from both. Probabilities favor Asia, both from certain affinities of tongue, striking resemblance in manners, idols, and physical formation.

Commercial intercourse, although not direct, existed and was maintained between China and Egypt B. C. 2000. Chinese traditions claim for their people the first use in Asia of ships and the earliest knowledge of navigation and astronomy. Their people first acquired the mariner's compass, and believed the sacred magnetic influences proceeded from heaven, which they located in the south, and from which they claimed to have come. To this day the heads of Chinese compasses point south.

In Peru, the oldest civilization was the most advanced, and had the highest style of art and mechanical skill. "Her people had an accurate measure of the solar year, a knowledge of the art of writing, and made paper of hemp or banana leaves B. C. 1800." The aboriginal Peruvians have had their dark as well as bright ages in history. They may have retrograded, while their possible offshoot, the Chinese, progressed. Young colonies often grow and prosper, while their progenitors reach a climax and die out. Dissolution is the counterchange which every material aggregate evolved sooner or later undergoes. Evolution and dissolution bring to us ever-changing but eternally-advancing forms in their cycles of transformation.

The establishment of a race may be possible from a single pair of strongly-marked distinctive characteristics, whose descendants have continually intermarried. Hebrew patriarchs founded nations, and nations thus springing from a single man of pronounced character, whose descendants remained united and isolated, have often developed strong and peculiar personal characteristics, which have pervaded and stamped themselves upon the race thus descended. Mixed or cosmopolitan races, never possess uniform characteristics as clearly defined.

It seems more reasonable to infer that a fleet from the neighborhood of Peru may

have reached China with the first immigration, perhaps bearing a hero-sovereign and an invading army, which, once landed, found China agreeable, and, being unable to return against those perpetual winds which brought them so swiftly, were compelled to establish themselves in new territory.

Writers on Central America have expressed a decided opinion that the peculiar character of its ancient civilization, manners, customs, and general structure of the ancient language, point very strongly to a common origin between the Indo-Chinese nations of Eastern Asia and the ancient civilization of America, which appears, in some remarkable particulars, to have been of an Egyptian cast. The Coptic or ancient Egyptian language, however, seems to have been monosyllabic. Hieroglyphic writing is of three kinds: figurative, symbolical, and phonetic. Hubert H. Bancroft, in his Native Races of the Pacific States, vol. v, f. 39, says: "Analogies have been or are thought to exist between the languages of several of the American tribes and that of the Chinese. But it is to Mexico, Central America, and, as we shall hereafter see, to Peru, that we must look for these linguistic affinities, and not to the northwestern coasts, [of America,] where we should naturally expect to find them most evident." Count Stolberg, quoted by Humboldt, is of the opinion that the Peruvian cult is that of Vishnu, one of the Brahmin trinity, when he appears in the form of Krishna, or the Sun.

Mexican kings, who reigned previous to the Spanish conquest, all added TZIN to their names as a reverential affix. It resembles in sound a dynasty of China, the Tsin dynasty, which reigned from B. C. 249 to B. C. 205. Tai Ko Foki, the great stranger king of China B. C. 3588, or later Hoang Tai, may have landed from such a fleet, and been called by conquest, or through the reverence of superior knowledge, to reign over them. The descendants of these early settlers may have remained clannish, keeping apart, as an entirely distinctive race, from the Miauts or original aborigines, naturally following the customs of their forefathers, and thus have increased and grown into a mighty nation, unlike all people around them.

During many centuries of growth China, like Japan and Corea, became a sealed empire, when no possible admixture of foreign blood could occur. It seems to have become an established habit with these nations to periodically close their ports to foreign intercourse. Some similarities of race exist between some types of the Coreans and Japanese, while the Chinese are quite singular and unlike. Their oriental peculiarities, which strike the casual observer, are their dress, shaved heads and queues, habits, odor, and guttural language. Chinese are the only nation on the continent of Asia that use chairs and tables. Isolated nations, like hermits, cannot escape being distinguished by eccentric habits. Now, if the high civilization of Peru, which was in full tide B. C. 1800, and probably many centuries before, crossed to China in very early days, bringing its accurate measure of the solar year and the arts of making paper and writing, all the necessary material was furnished China for the production of correct and reliable historic records. In reviewing Chinese early history, we have found that B. C. Tai Ko Foki, their great stranger king, introduced a knowledge of these things, with hieroglyphic characters, and first divided time for them into lunar months and solar years. And we have shown that the authentic comprehensible history of China begins with his reign.

Now we inquire, did Foki, with all his valuable knowledge, come from Peru B. C. 3588 and settle among a pre-existing people, perhaps similar to, if not the aboriginal, Miautz, long since driven from the plains of China into the almost inaccessible fastnesses of its mountain barriers?

A knowledge of days aleady existed among the sun-worshipers of Asia, who, doubtless, kept their records in days; but the introduction of a scale measuring by months and years placed their history on a footing we can comprehend; and the introduction of the art of writing enabled them to perpetuate it by enduring records. When we discover the measures of time used to gauge ancient histories before these improvements were introduced, we shall doubtless find their records reasonably authentic. We have as little understood their stupendous figures as strangers conceived the value of a Brazilian rea, some one thousand of which make a sum equal to the United States dollar; and accounts involving such currency bear the formidable aspect of immense sums to the uninformed. With advancing centuries, the measure of time doubtless lengthens.

After the children of Israel left Egypt, where the solar year was known, records of extreme longevity disappear, and ordinary terms of life are adhered to. We should judge cautiously and refrain from any interpretation at variance with human reason and common sense. The lunar changes, without doubt, were employed in the measurement of time in all warm climates before the introduction of the solar year. The colder the winter, the more marked the year became as a measure of time. Day and night would naturally suggest themselves as the first measure. Peruvians, Chinese, Egyptians, Hebrews, Japanese, Polynesians, and others, all attribute great longevity to their earliest ancestry until the introduction of higher mathematics and the solar year.

The oldest histories preserved to us become what, in our day, we call authentic, when

their nations acquired the art of writing, and divided time in a regular and uniform manner by the solar year.

The first and fabulous epochs of most histories begin with dynasties of deified warriors. The tendency to deification exists among all early nations, and we need not go out of our own history to prove it. Edmond the Confessor, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who died as late as 1243, was canonized as a saint; only a differentiated form of the same tendency. The gods of antiquity were partly impersonifications of natural forces and partly deified men. They often bear the same relation to facts that shadows do to forms, being at worst but simple distortions of the truth. Few nations can examine impartially the substratum of their ancestral religious creeds. How often do we find in dogmatic theology the imprint of early paganism? The Hawaiian nation is supposed to have a considerable antiquity. From time immemorial there have been persons appointed by the government to preserve unimpaired the genealogy of their kings, which in 1863 embraced the names of more than seventy. Allow an average reign of twenty-five years; this would throw their history back 1,750 years, to A. D. 117, or earlier—say to about the Christian era.

It was a custom throughout the islands of the Pacific to exterminate their enemies, either by killing or setting them adrift in canoes. The latter practice not only led to the peopling of the various Polynesian islands, but was also a cause which led to cannibalism, for want compelled the exiles to subsist on each other, and a taste once indulged in was continued by survivors who succeeded in reaching some island, and thus cannibalism became established. North American Indians have never been cannibals.

When Spaniards first visited America, the western equatorial regions of the continent were the seats of extensive, flourishing, and powerful empires, whose inhabitants were well acquainted with the science of government, and had evinced considerable progress in art. Roads fifteen hundred miles long remain in Peru, relics of the past, as ancient as the Appian way. In very remote times social etiquette was observed and universally respected. The early Peruvians constructed suspension-bridges across frightful ravines, and moved blocks of stone as huge as the Sphinxes and Memnons of Egypt. They built aqueducts of baked clay and constructed dikes and causeways, and preserved a memory of past events by picture-writing. They had a language of ceremony or deference, with reverential nouns and verbs, with which inferiors addressed superiors—a feature of resemblance to the Chinese in Eastern Asia.

Ruins of extensive cities and fortifications are now found in Yucatan and regions of Central America; the elevated plains of Bogota and *Cundinamarca;* the open valleys of Peru, and the lofty, secluded, and highly fertile tracts of Chili. These colossal remains of ancient primitive civilizations are passing from the memory of a degenerate offspring, who now behold with indolent amazement these interesting relics of their illustrious predecessors. The origin, history, and fate of these powerful nations of America, who have left behind them such colossal memorials of an ancient civilization, is a study of profound interest. Stones, thirty by eighteen by six feet, are squared and hewn and reared with utmost exactness. Their style of arch is peculiar. Temples, pyramids, tumuli, and fortifications, with remains of buildings of singularly massive architecture, often exquisitely carved, betoken a civilized antiquity.

It seems impossible that these people should have passed from the continent of Asia by Behring's Straits, for no traces of any such people remain anywhere along that route.

Pyramids of remote antiquity are found in India, China, and Tahiti, as well as in Egypt and South America. Those of Egypt are in the best state of preservation and perhaps therefore the most recent.

The learned Bavarian, Dr. Von Martius, regards the evidence incontrovertible "of the existence of the *aborigines of America* long anterior to the period assigned in Hebrew chronology for the creation of the world;" a race whose utter dissolution manifests that it either bore within itself the germ of extinction or attempted an existence under most fatally unfavorable conditions.

Dr. Clarke says: "No race of human kind has yet obtained a permanent foothold upon the American continent. The Asiatics trace back their life in Asia so far, that the distance between to-day and their recorded starting-point seems like a geologic epoch. The descendants of the Ptolemies still cultivate the banks of the Nile. The race that peopled Northern Europe when Greece and Rome were young, not only retains its ancient place and power, but makes itself felt and heard throughout the world. On the American continent, races have been born, developed, and disappeared. The causes of their disappearance are undiscovered. We only know that they are gone." It remains to be seen if the Anglo-Saxon race, which has ventured upon a continent which has proved the tomb of antecedent races, can produce a physique capable of meeting successfully, and advancing under, the demands that our climate and type of civilization make upon it. This is an interesting query.

If we have been utterly confounded in contemplating the stupendous monuments of Egyptian magnificence, which continue to defy the ravages of time, what shall be said

of remains of more ancient pyramids and colossal figures in America, of a style and character analogous to those of ancient Egypt, whose very stones are crumbling to decay, and on whose flinty sides verdure has crept over the dust of ages, until ancient and gigantic forests have acquired root-hold, and grown over their very summits? Many an Alexander and Napoleon of prehistoric times has gone to his rest, and left no record, capable of enduring to the age we live in, to mark the glory of his empire. Many mummies are found in Peru, enveloped in bandages of fine cloth, while the bodies of kings are admirably preserved by means of a secret known only to the royal family.

In the far distance of remote antiquity, successive peoples have risen to importance and passed away, long ages before the birth of those from whom the faintest ray of civilization has remained to cast even a feeble reflection of its pale light upon the fading pages of our most ancient historic records.

A period has undoubtedly existed, in the primitive history of our earth, when the necessary equilibrium between its external and internal forces has been lost; when the external pressure on the crust became diminished by the sublimation and recomposition of external elements, which, when refined and advanced, were unequal in density to the expansive force of igneous materials confined in the interior mass. The solid enveloping crust of our sphere is the medium constantly acted upon, by these contending forces, in seeking a state of equilibrium. Geologists direct us to many prominences in which the upheaved strata, on one side, is abruptly broken, and, on the other, gently inclined. Such ruptures could not have been gradual, for in places the whole combined strata is fractured, depressing portions, and raising others to immense heights. Earth's surface, to-day, bears unmistakable evidence, to every thoughtful student, that eruptive catastrophes have materially changed its geological features—especially the levels. Many areas, formerly submerged, are now dry, and known as alluvial formations. Seas have changed position, and rivers acquired new courses. New land has been formed, and mountain-ranges reared by upheaval. Recent deep-sea soundings of the United States steamer Tuscarora—commander, Belknap—clearly illustrate how largely the bed of the Pacific Ocean—once but an extended valley, running, perhaps, from the Arctic to the Caribbean Sea—may have augmented its area by a comparatively moderate depression. During the glacial period, immense icebergs were produced at the poles, and as they increased in bulk, during a succession of cold winters, they accumulated an enormous volume of water—human life is considered to have been extant at this period—and when a succession of warm summers, produced by the perpendicularity of the earth's axis to the plane of the ecliptic, succeeded in reducing these huge accumulations of polar ice, its volume retired, covering many valleys not previously submerged. This could have given rise to the legend of a flood, which may have occurred, but could not have been universal, for a sufficient amount of water does not exist to cover the highest mountains, and submerge the entire earth.

A sudden and eruptive convulsion of earth's crust during the Tertiary, near the close of the Cretaceous period, whether separate or conjointly with a flood, must necessarily have destroyed a large majority of partially-developed men, struggling to evolve the higher human types. Portions of Asia, Africa, and Australia are supposed to have been elevated; while Europe, the extreme northern portions of America, the Caribbean sea, and the beds of certain oceans, were depressed. The effects must have been most forcible around the poles and south of the equator. Dead river-beds which cross the highest mountain-ranges of the Pacific coast, and yield so largely of gold to hydraulic washing, clearly confirm radical changes in the physical conditions and levels of this coast.

The surviving remnants of these catastrophes in Asia, Africa, Yucatan, and a few scattering tribes of North America, thenceforth appear as the progenitors of all living nations. It is only from this period that we can hope to trace the early history of humanity. Previous beings, if in harmony with physical conditions, must have been generally in the incipient stages of human evolution. In Central America alone, we find ruins whose hoary antiquity seems to claim for its inhabitants the earliest civilization of which any traces remain. It is fair to infer that the pyramids of Yucatan were antediluvian and escaped inundation, as did the cities of Palenque and Copan. These elaborately-constructed cities of Central America exhibit conceptions of beauty which, as early specimens of a gradually unfolding art, appear to antedate all similar structures extant.

Plausible grounds of inference exist, that the earliest manifestations of culture known to us was among the primitive settlers of Central America, who, having acquired mechanical invention, art, and the rudiments of science, built dwellings and temples, which yet endure as testimony of their progress. Although their minds were doubtless uncultivated in those higher branches of knowledge and refinement which insure perpetuity to national life, they seem to have led the world in the early use of language, and the adoption of picture-writing to record and communicate ideas.

The sun, which was long the national emblem of Central American nations, is the absolute basis of mythology. It seems probable that Yucatan once extended over the

present bed of the Gulf of Mexico, including the West Indian islands. The Caribs may be a degenerate remnant of some aboriginal race. The ancestors of our North American Indians were very uncultivated in their physical, mental, and social condition.

Long before Egypt, the progenitor of Greece and Europe, was settled, the inhabitants of Yucatan appear by their monuments to have been well advanced in general intellectual attainments, and to have led all known nations in art and science. Why may not a branch of this people have emigrated to China and Egypt, and there have become a large and advanced nation?

Many things unite to prove that China, at the opening of her treaty ports to European trade, was unmistakably retrograding in the physical as well as social organization of her people. Her highest prosperity is thought to have been reached about the reign of Genghis Khan.

Agassiz tells us that, geologically considered, America is the oldest continent. If so, why should we not look to it as the spot where the human race first gained ascendency, and acquired its primeval home? If its primitive races have died out, and stone pyramids crumbled beneath the dust, is it not a strong argument in favor of her antiquity? In Asia, traces yet remain of original races, whose earlier civilization in America, under different physical conditions, *has had time* to culminate, dissolve, and *fade from sight*. When, in the early development of America, progress was sufficient to facilitate emigration, why may she not have furnished population to Asia? In submitting this question, with evidence calculated to warrant further study, and outlining various channels for investigation, we aim to attract for it that scientific attention which, as an ethnological problem, it fairly deserves, hoping some satisfactory answer may be attempted before facilities for interrogation, yet available among American aborigines, shall have passed away forever.

This imperfect collection of facts is laid before the Academy in its present condition, not in any way to ask for present indorsement, but to awaken new sources of inquiry among thoughtful ethnologists, which may ultimately lead to a discovery of the truth. A large mass of additional facts bearing upon this subject require more labor than I have yet found time to bestow, and would also unreasonably swell this already lengthy paper, which is offered as a simple inquiry, suggested to careful and technical scientists, who, by comparing physical, embryological, and linguistic characteristics, pertinent histories, and traditions, may in future establish or disprove the possibilities here shadowed forth.

APPENDIX W.

OAKLAND, *November* 8, 1876.

To the honorable members of the Congressional Commission to Investigate the Subject of Chinese Immigration.

GENTLEMEN: In view of the object of your visit to this coast, I deem it no presumption to address you freely, as follows:

I came to California in 1849 as a minister of the gospel, to make here my permanent home; and now for more than twenty years I have been acting as traveling editor of the Pacific, the oldest weekly paper of the far West. I have had, therefore, the opportunity to know fully the facts pertaining to the subject on which I write. I believe the influx of vast numbers of Chinese into our country to be fraught with immense evils to Americans in every light in which it may be viewed. This is true as to the desirable homogeneity of our population, as to our moral character, as to our political status, our military strength, our acquisition of wealth, our social relationships, and all our civil and religious institutions. Yet, to trace out the influence in these several respects would require a time and space circumstances at present forbid. But there is a line of thought, more or less comprehending the whole, which I have not seen traced out by any one. This I wish, in short, to attempt to your honorable commission.

This line is that of a parallel and a contrast between African slavery and Chinese immigration, commonly called coolyism. First, this parallel is seen in their origin and manner of coming to this country, *i. e.*, to America. Neither of them, excepting a very few, come of themselves; but scheming, wealthy English and American capitalists, as companies or individual adventurers, made it their object solely for the money to bring them into America. From Africa this was done by physical compulsion. From China it is done by moral compulsion, in that, by every plausible representation, they have been induced to come. The motive of the capitalists was alone that of making money—solely this, with no regard to the good of any one. A second parallel is in the arguments used in America in favor of their coming—the African formerly, the Chinese at present: that this country is an asylum for people from all parts of the world; that it is large

and needs more population; that laborers are scarce, and otherwise cannot be had; that the price of labor is high and needs to be reduced, so that we may increase our productions; that it is a benefit to the heathen that they may be elevated by our influence; that they are better off with us than in their native land; that here they can be christianized, and go back to convert their countrymen; that there is a Providence in it for good; hence, let them come. These and other arguments used are identically the same in the two cases. But as to slavery, their fallacy is now most apparent; they may become still more so in respect to the Chinese. A third parallel is seen in their results. They both render honest labor peculiarly degrading, disreputable for our sons and daughters, a mark of inferiority to be avoided at almost any hazard. The moral and other evils of the prevalence of such a sentiment are above full description. Then, as to those who must work, the competition between them and the cheap labor of slaves and of Chinese is sure to reduce them far towards the condition of slaves and coolies in the poverty of living as a low, ignorant, despised class of "poor white trash."

They both introduce systems of heathen vice and immoralities fearfully corrupting to our youth and general population. They both come as races of men distinct from ourselves, to become permanent residents among us, with habits, customs, ideas, and prejudices different from ours, and so in conflict with us as to occasion jealousies of race and conflicts of people, fearfully distracting and dangerous to the stability of our institutions. They both constitute a class of cheap laborers, to be employed by large monopolists and land-holders, excluding permanently a working white population and desirable immigrants from Christian lands, thus diminishing our wealth, weakening our military force, scattering our population, interfering with the establishing of schools, and all neighborhood social, moral, and religious institutions.

This is a rapid sketch of some of the parallels of evils between slavery and coolyism. But the *contrast* between them exhibits evils of coolyism much greater than those of slavery. Some of these contrasts are as follows:

Slavery gave the master power to destroy all the distinctive heathenism which the African brought with him, and he did destroy it. But coolyism gives the employer no such power, and he does not do it. Slavery changed the whole early-acquired character of the African, leaving almost or quite nothing of his idolatrous religion, language, customs, habits, morals, tastes, and prejudices, educating him and elevating him up to a whole new character, as an American Christian citizen, in the use of the American language, with American feelings, views, and aspirations.

Coolyism, with very slight exceptions, leaves the Chinese just what they were in their native land, with all their idolatry, immorality, vice, and heathen customs, habits, dress, tastes, prejudices, and most unacquirable language—a large, distinct class of people, adverse to all that is American. Slavery rendered impossible any clanship or race combination among Africans in conflict with our interests or our Government; but coolyism gives the Chinese full opportunity to unite all their energies in any schemes they may devise in their supposed interests, to enforce and perpetuate their numerical influence, their heathen worship, their idolatrous customs, their temple ceremonies, their degrading habits, immoralities, vices, dress, prostitution, language, and every feature of abomination so common in their own country.

Already they have a perfect government among themselves distinct from our own, with their laws, their secret courts of trial, and their police, executive, and other officers, the object of which is to perpetuate their race peculiarities, their clanship interests, and their religion, with terrible sanctions of law, even the death penalty, to enforce their regulations.

They are managing a perfect and increasingly efficient "*imperium in imperio*," to enforce obedience to their requirements, however adverse to American interests or government. They now number full 150,000 in our country, of whom about 130,000 are in California, being nearly one-sixth of our whole population. Others in large numbers are coming, amounting (when unchecked by intimidation) to 25,000 a year. Very few of these ever change in character, to become Americanized. Only about 500 in the last twenty-five years have renounced their native heathenism to profess Christianity. Thus do they remain and rapidly increase in our country, a vast united class, distinct from us in all important characteristics, tastes, habits, and language, exerting an influence adverse to our interests, soon, if unrestrained, to number 5,000,000, or even 10,000,000. It becomes inevitable that they must ultimately vote and hold office. Then wards in our cities and sections of country containing majorities of them, true already of many places, must have the administration of our laws through Chinese officers, heathen in their views, clannish in their judgment, corrupt in their decisions. The evils inevitable from a large influx of Chinese must be immensely greater than those resulting from that of the African. As to slavery, only one evil of it was greater than that of coolyism. That one evil was, it gave power and sanction to the white man to trample upon every human and divine right of the African as an intelligent being. In every other respect coolyism is the more injurious to our real interests.

I have no hesitation in expressing my strongest convictions of the immense evils sure to result from large influx of Chinese to our country. Some good men have said,

Providence will prevent all evil and bring good out of their coming. We need to have no apprehension from them." As well might "He who spake as never man spake" say to the tempter upon the pinnacle of the temple, "Providence will prevent all evil and bring good out of it. I need have no apprehension, and will let myself fall."

It is wicked presumption to be indifferent to evils and leave the results to Providence. It is false Christianity and false common sense to neglect the exercise of good human judgment and corresponding action in view of impending evil. God requires perception, reason, good judgment, and judicious, earnest action, just as though all depended alone upon ourselves, and then, after this, then and only then, trust in the divine disposal. Hence, gentlemen, I write you in the full strength of my conviction, that it is the duty of the American people and Government to look the evils of Chinese immigration into our country squarely in the face, to realize the facts and probable evil results in the case, and to put forth effectual efforts, through the treaty-making power and congressional regulations, to prevent any further large influx of Chinese into the country, and insure a rational steady diminution of the numbers who are already here.

Thus freely addressing you, gentlemen of the commission, on the important subject before you, and before the American people, I subscribe myself

Yours, truly,

S. V. BLAKESLEE.

APPENDIX X.

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Peking, June 30, 1876.

DEAR SIR: I have received a letter of April 20, 1876, in which the secretary of the senatorial committee recently appointed by the legislature to inquire about Chinese immigration into California and the United States presents a series of inquiries, under sixteen heads, relating to its extent and results.

These questions are exhaustive in their range, and I am unable to answer some of them at all, and others only approximately, owing to my residence in this city for the last fourteen years, while the emigration has gone from Hong-Kong, and the emigrants are natives of that region, distant nearly two thousand miles from this.

I suppose, however, that you have addressed these queries to competent persons in that part of China, also, and perhaps, too, to well-informed Chinese living in California, so that from all sources you can hardly fail to get reliable data and opinions, which will enable the committee to come to an intelligent conclusion.

I make no delay in sending you my views upon this important topic, as it certainly is a matter of grave results, to the people of California especially, as well as to the United States in general.

1st. The emigrants who have gone to California are the natives of the province of Kwangtung, to such an extent that it is safe to refer more than nine-tenths of the whole to it.

The whole area of this province is reckoned at about 80,000 square miles, (same as that of Oregon;) but the largest portion of the emigrants go from its most populous prefecture of Kangehan, in which the city of Canton and colony of Macao lie. This prefecture, which contains fourteen districts, may be roughly estimated at one-tenth or more of the whole province, and for population, resources, and energy of its inhabitants, is the leading division.

They speak generally the same dialect, and as they have peculiar facilities for intercourse through the great number of creeks and canals which intersect it, and connect with the Pearl River and the sea-coast, in their admirable boats, they are very well acquainted with each other's movements, wants, and industries.

It is from this region, which has also been more or less connected with foreign trade for the last three centuries, that emigration has flowed to California and Australia more than from other parts; and to this familiarity with that trade by having shared in its benefits is, in a measure, to be ascribed the readiness with which its inhabitants have gone.

If the clause in this inquiry—"What do you know of the extent of that emigration?"—refers to the area of country from which it proceeds, I can only give a guess that it hardly exceeds 15,000 square miles, and this includes portions of the adjoining prefectures.

2d. The population of the province of Kwangtung, according to the best information, is about twenty millions, and I should reckon the population of this particular region which furnishes the emigrants at not less than five millions. Foreigners have not that

ready access to the official returns of local censuses which will enable them to compare them with the population personally observed, even on a small area, and thus ascertain what degree of accuracy can be fairly ascribed to the census; but as this region is exceedingly fertile and accessible, this estimate of five millions is no doubt within the truth.

The city of Canton contains a million, and there are other larger cities.

3d. The Chinese Empire is both in theory and fact a centralized government, whose sway extends over the whole of its vast area as one power, each of the eighteen provinces being controlled by the imperial authority in Peking.

The administration of a province is noways distinct or independent of that authority, and all its members are appointed through the board of civil office at the capital; none of them are permitted to hold any important position in the civil service of a province if natives of it.

There is a large liberty allowed to the highest functionaries of a province in the exercise of the powers intrusted to them, limited chiefly to their executive duties, though they do act in a legislative and judicial way too, for these three departments are not very carefully defined or restrained in this country.

However, as emigration is now perfectly free and the old restrictions have not the least authority, no provincial officer would presume to issue any regulation to limit or guide it where it is voluntary.

In China, laws fall into disuse and are not formally abrogated as with us, so that old statutes and edicts are frequently re-enacted or re-issued, according to the needs of the time, the caprices of the magistrate, or in compliance of the orders of his superiors.

The idea of good government in China is to maintain the peace of the country, collect the revenue, disburse the sums due to those on the civil and military lists, and remit to Peking the proportion of taxes assessed on the region, if the soldiers who may be in the field do not require the whole.

The promotion of industry, opening or reopening roads, clearing water-courses, establishing schools, developing mines, encouraging mechanical or other arts by granting patents, or, in fine, performing the duties of a government solicitous to elevate its subjects and win their loyalty by consulting their welfare—none of these things have yet really entered into the minds of the rulers of this land as part of their proper responsibilities.

There is a radical difference between the governments of Christian countries and this of China in respect to the rights of the people contrasted with the privileges and duties of their rulers, for in this country the rights may be generally stated to be all on the part of the latter, and the duties all incumbent on the former. The Peking government is composed of a large body of officers and placemen, arranged under several boards and councils, with a vast body of underlings, whose highest members conduct the affairs of state, under the direct control of the Emperor, and the subordinates are employed in the capital or appointed to vacant posts in the provinces.

The eighteen provinces are primarily governed by eight tsung-tuh, or governor-generals, and sixteen fu-tai, or governors; and there are altogether ten separate jurisdictions among them, each amenable directly to the court of Peking. A principle of responsibility by which an officer's position, and even life, can be jeoparded by the conduct of his inferior permeates the whole system, and somewhat cripples its efficiency as it leads every individual officer to shirk danger, and throw the risk of results on his subordinates.

Each governorship being independent, a sedition in one province is not presently felt in the next, and its authorities endeavor as best they can to put it down without depending for aid on their neighbors, who do not usually act until orders come from Peking; but in fact each province is not much more than able to take care of its own affairs.

The loyalty of the Chinese people to their present government, among all ranks, grows out of a general conviction that it is the best for all; and when rebels endeavor to destroy it they allege that the administration is so corrupt that it can no longer be endured and rebellion is the only remedy.

The system has worked so well, however, that none of the high provincial grandees have rebelled against their sovereign during the last 250 years, although wielding great resources in men, wealth, and material.

You ask me to give an outline of the government of the empire, &c., but the topic is too wide for an outline, and as I do not see its relevancy to the main subject of this reply, I must refer you to the Middle Kingdom, (vol. i, pp. 296, 343, sqq.,) where ampler discussion can be found than I have leasure now to go into.

There is a general desire on the part of the government, no doubt, to retain its subjects in their own land, and in the minds of educated men every one who leaves it is held to take the worst choice. He leaves the known for the unknown, and goes into savage regions where no imperial protection can ever reach him.

This public sentiment tends to restrain emigration, and, in fact, at the distance of

one hundred or two hundred miles from the coast few go abroad. The people near the sea, or along the frontiers, have emigrated within the last century as they have found opportunity, and few of them have ever returned; so that it is not a new or sudden impulse which possesses them.

On the north they pass into Mongolia and Manchooria, where vast tracts invite their tillage.

On the south they go into Luçon, Borneo, Singapore, and islands in the Archipelago, where they trade and farm, ply their handicrafts, and gradually settle down. On the southwest they find their way into Siam, Burmah, India, and farther on, everywhere adding to the wealth of the land by their thrift and industry.

In some parts of Borneo and Maylaysia they form small self-governing settlements, but usually they are loyal to the local authority, while fond of retaining their national identity and language by uniting themselves into companies or societies for mutual aid and protection.

In Manchooria they are still within their own emperor's domain; but there, as elsewhere, their plodding toil gives them a superiority, and distinguishes them from all other Asiatics. I have no data on which to calculate the amount of this emigration, for no one can follow it up and get statistics, but it is probably less now than it was forty years ago, owing to the departures for other countries, America, Cuba, Australia, &c.

4th. So far as I know, emigrant-ships have very seldom gone to California, sailing direct from any port in China; if so, they probably sailed from Whampoa. It is the security which the emigrants have, that if they embark at Hong-Kong they will not be carried elsewhere, that has its influence in centering the business there, and the other fact, that their own rulers cannot interfere in a foreign port. To say that Hong-Kong is a British colony is to assure you that the Chinese government has not the least jurisdiction over it, and no power to restrain or interfere with immigration from it, any more than it has from Japan or Manila.

It is not easy to say what "relation" it has to China, for the question is indefinite. Politically they are totally independent, and the Chinese court has not even a consular agent there, but its proximity to Canton, and the large trade and travel between it and the mainland, involve very considerable intercourse in steamboats and small native craft, which has been of a peaceful character, and, on the whole, beneficial. The two steamers plying between Canton and Hong-Kong daily often carry a thousand passengers.

The officials at Canton have never, so far as I know, shown any desire to interfere with their countrymen going to Hong-Kong, nor have the British tried to detain them. Such an attempt on either part would be very unwise, and, if attempted, would be disregarded, if not altogether futile.

5th. The class of Chinese which emigrate in the main are from the agricultural and working portions of society, and probably not 2 per cent. are from the literary class.

They are such as depend on their daily labor for daily food and raiment, and are induced to go abroad from hearing of the high wages in other lands—high, compared with the pittance they can get at home.

There is no caste among the Chinese, no privileged class or titled aristocracy on the one hand claiming rights over their serfs or slaves on the other, and therefore no power inheres in the hands of one portion of society to ship off their drones or their criminals, their paupers or their useless slaves, to other lands, and thus get rid of them.

Those who arrive in California are free men, poor, ignorant, and uncivilized indeed, easily governed, and not disposed to make in any way, but hoping to get a good price for their labor. Born and brought up under heathenish influences, their notions of morality and law are low and cannot be fairly judged by the Christian code; but in their own land they are taught obedience to parents, and are not inclined to riot or robbery.

In these emigrants one sees a class of men on the whole above the average of their countrymen over the whole empire, especially in enterprise, ability to read their own language, and skill in mechanics. I consider the Cantonese as the superior portion of the Chinese race, at least superior to those of the northern provinces. The average wages of these men at home may be reckoned at less than three dollars a month rather than more; but their clothes cost them little in so warm a climate and is not to be reckoned, food and rent being the chief items. These men, too, are not addicted to drinking, but the practice of smoking opium is increasing among them, and is carried with them wherever they go.

6th. I know nothing of the existence of any contracts made in China by which emigrants are shipped to America. I have never seen such a contract, nor heard one described as containing stipulations by which one party bound himself to work for the other at certain wages for a specified time.

I suppose reference is made to the agreement entered into between the agent who charters the ship and the poorer passengers, that any advances made to the latter for their passage-money shall be refunded as they earn it. I was a passenger in an emigrant ship to San Francisco in 1860, and I was told that a large proportion of the 318

Chinese on board had entered into such an agreement, and that they were bound to work out and pay back the advances made in Hong-Kong for all or part of their passage-money to the Gold Hills, as they called California.

A similar system is in force in the emigration business to Singapore and Borneo, and I was told by the United States consul at the former place that he had himself once gone on board a junk arrived in the harbor with laborers, and engaged several for his plantation, for whom he was obliged to pay a large sum in advance to re-imburse the captain for their passage-money. Every man thus engaged worked out his advance.

I suppose such a contract as this might be made with most of the men going to California, and you can easily learn the nature and mode of employment in the State itself. In respect to the emigration to the United States and to Australia, I think it is reasonable to infer that their names of Old and New Gold Hills (*Kăn Kăm Shan* and *Săn Kăm Shan*) have served as a temptation and stimulus to persons inclined to try their fortunes abroad, and explains the increase thither more than we are perhaps aware. If a man was debating where to go, such a name would naturally turn his choice.

7th. In relation to the six companies whose organization is referred to, I only know of their existence, and have been told that they exercise various intermediary functions between their countrymen in the United States and in Hong-Kong, but I have no definite information upon the matter.

8th. The word "cooly" is of Hindoo origin, and means a day-laborer. It is used in China chiefly by foreigners, though it has a currency at the coast ports among the natives to designate a common laborer—one who goes out to day's work, runs and serves as a menial in a shop or household, or can be hired for a job where unskilled labor is only expected.

The term "cooly-trade" is only given to the business of obtaining men to go abroad under a written engagement to work at certain price for a number of years, and signing such contract before sailing to the country designated.

The term was very early applied to the agency established in Calcutta to contract for and send Bengalese to the Mauritius as farm-hands to supply the place of the negro slaves recently emancipated; and it has gone on for about forty years, until at present this portion of the population exceeds that of all other classes.

The cooly-trade began in Canton about the year 1848, and has only been stopped within two years by the refusal of the Portuguese authorities of Macao to allow ships carrying Chinese laborers to leave port. In former years ships were loaded with these laborers at Canton, Amoy, Swatow, Shanghai, and perhaps elsewhere along the coast, as well as at Hong-Kong, but owing to the atrocities which were found to grow out of the business, chiefly arising from the manner of engaging and shipping them, the governments of Great Britain and the United States forbade their flags to be used to cover the trade.

Gradually the whole business centered in Macao, where finally only Spanish and Peruvian agents resided to secure laborers, in any way it could be done, for Cuba and Peru, the only countries to which latterly they were taken. It is this business alone which is called the cooly-trade, known in Chinese as *chao kung* or hiring workmen, and in the common talk at Canton as *mai chu tsai*, or sold as a pig, ("in a basket,") in allusion to the way in which the men were carried off and never returned.

This term is not employed in the Burlingame treaty, so the Chinese officials had no need to ask its meaning; but Article V of that compact is designed to prevent it by an agreement between the high contracting powers to pass laws making it a penal offense for their subjects respectively to take laborers to other countries against their free consent.

The phrase "to take laborers" is even stronger in Chinese than it is in English, for *mien kiang tai wang* involves the idea of actual constraint to make them go. For ten years or so previous to 1872, the difference between the cooly-trade at Macao and the emigrant business at Hong-Kong was so well known and observed among the native population on the adjacent main-land, that it was enough for them to hear whence a man sailed to know whether he was bound or free, whether he would ever be heard from and return home or not. I lived in Macao during the existence of the cooly-trade in its earlier and less repulsive days, and I saw enough to convince me that it was accompanied, even up to 1859, with so much that was illegal and inhuman in the way of intimidation, cajolery, and actual kidnaping, that it could not safely be allowed, for these outrages were necessary accompaniments of every attempt to load ships with laborers.

It is this traffic alone which is known as the cooly-trade, and I think it is certain that no ship ever arrived in California with Chinese who had been engaged to go there as contract-laborers, and I think, too, that hundreds, perhaps thousands, have been deluded into accepting contracts as coolies, from an idea that they were to be taken, if they were not actually told so, to the gold hills. Their ignorance was their destruction.

9th. The answers to the inquiries under this head respecting emigration from Hong-Kong can only be answered there in a satisfactory manner. Chinese laws are

inoperative at Hong-Kong; but it is allowable to engage contract-laborers at any open port in China for other countries, except Peru and Portugal, under regulations calculated to insure their good treatment, and return when their contracts are fulfilled.

10th. The distinction made in this inquiry between the Chinese and the provincial governments does not exist, and the expression tends to mislead. The sentiment among the educated classes of this country is adverse to emigration, and very few of them go; their opinion, too, influences and deters others, as has been already stated under the third answer, but it would not be very effectual if there was more knowledge of other lands among their countrymen. Along the coasts south of Shanghai the sea-faring habits of the people have long familiarized them with emigrating. As they began to trade with Manila, Batavia, Siam, or Singapore, and settle, their countrymen at home began to look there for employment when out of it.

The people of Amoy went to Manila and Batavia, those from Swatow to Bangkok; those from Kiayingchaw (north of it) to Borneo, and from other towns in the vicinity of the last two to Singapore.

It is not alone their better knowledge of these places and the emigrants living there which induces the people of these various towns thus to follow their leaders; the strongest inducement is that there alone they can be easily understood, as the dialect is the same. An Amoy man would hardly even think of going to a place where Canton or Shanghai men lived, for he could not be understood by them; and this feature of Chinese emigration applies to California.

Those who are now in the State are from Kwangchaw, and there is not much fear that natives from other regions, who speak another dialect, will go there, even if they could expect to make their way against the Cantonese.

The peculiarities of dialect have great power in the country itself in deciding where a man goes, and exert a still stronger influence upon emigration abroad.

11th. I have no means of ascertaining how many Chinese have emigrated to the United States, or have subsequently returned home, and therefore have no answer to make.

12th. The social position of women in China cannot properly be compared with what it is in civilized countries, for the acceptance of the Christian religion has wrought a radical change in the standing granted to her; but in comparison with her treatment in Mohammedan and other pagan countries, as India, Japan, Persia, Egypt, Burmah, &c., she stands higher, her legal rights are probably better guarded by law and custom, and her education and influence in the family are fully as great. In these particulars I think she has reached as high a point in China as is possible, without the elevating and purifying principles of Christianity; but the difference between that point and what we expect and strive for in female culture is still very great.

16th. No English word exactly describes the marriage relations allowed by Chinese laws, and it has been a subject of discussion whether polygamy or monogamy is the best word.

No Chinese is allowed to take a tsi or wife while he has one already living, for this would be regarded as bigamy, and illegal; but he can bring one, two, or more women into his house as tsich or concubines, while the tsi is living as his acknowledged wife. She is betrothed with certain legal formalities, followed by an exchange of presents, and, what is the most important and final act, with a public procession through the streets; while the tsich is taken privately, and stands in her husband's family in the same position that Hagar did in Abraham's, except that her legal rights are more secure, and she cannot be sent out of the house without very good cause.

In point of fact very few Chinese have more than the tsi, and then she is usually the chief agent in bringing in a tsich. The children of both women are equal, and no shadow of aspersion is ever brought against the family on this ground. The practice of infanticide is chiefly confined to girls, but is frowned upon by the best part of society, and is neither countenanced, permitted, nor legalized. Laws are constantly issued against it, tracts are circulated against it gratuitously, denouncing it as murder, a crime sure to be visited with Heaven's retribution, and nobody defends it. The extent to which it is practiced, the places where it prevails, and the causes which induce its commission, are all points which have attracted much attention among foreigners; for it is generally believed here that the ideas entertained abroad as to its extent are exaggerated, and the Chinese people as a whole unjustly stigmatized.

Though entirely illegal, public opinion can only frown upon it, its commission passes unpunished, and even the guilty parents are not afraid to own their dark deeds.

Prostitution stands in rather a different position in China than in western lands, for the unhappy women who follow this life were most of them taken into the bagnios when mere girls, sold at an early age by their relatives on account of poverty, it may be, or stolen from their homes by pimps.

There is not, therefore, usually that fall from virtue that is involved in this kind of life in Christian lands; these women are generally gathered in special communities in large towns somewhat separated from other parts, and though their position is degraded, they occasionally get husbands. Street-walkers are unknown. Very few of

the emigrants to California have taken their families, and the same rule holds good among those who have gone to Siam, Singapore, or Australia, for Chinese women refuse to leave their homes and families to go anywhere, and the men do not urge them.

Even in this city of Peking there are thousands of shop-keepers, artisans, and official underlings, or servants, whose families remain in the adjoining provinces, or prefectures, while they carry on business even to old age, making an annual visit home. Much more, then, would the women decline to cross the seas, and the large withdrawal of young men from the maritime districts, of whom the emigration chiefly consists, has left behind such a disproportion of women, that it has been adduced to account for the prevalence of infanticide which the inhabitants of Amoy, Hingwa, and other places in Fuh-kien, do not hesitate to confess exists among them.

Even with a large increase of knowledge, I do not think that Chinese married women of respectability could be induced to emigrate to much extent; it is not the custom; their husbands can get other women if they choose where they are going; they will manage to support themselves; their little feet disable them from traveling with ease; in short, like the Shunamite, they prefer to dwell among their own people, and, not unfrequently, too, prefer to have their husbands go off.

I have heard that most of the "female Chinese" (as they are termed in this inquiry) who have gone to California have been public women, but I have no knowledge as to their numbers, or whether any of them go back to Hong-Kong.

13th. In reply to the various points grouped under this head, I am unable to give much information derived from personal contact with returned emigrants.

The affection which a returned miner or washerman would have for the Government of the United States would depend upon the way he had been treated by the people; and in early times this was usually not such as to encourage him to go back.

Few of these men had such an education in their own language as would fit them to write an account of their experience and describe the country they went to, so as to make known its institutions, its extent, its productions, and its resources even if they wished to do so, and yet their contact with their countrymen and friends has no doubt diffused a certain knowledge of the United States throughout the province.

It must have been rather a favorable report or the emigration would have diminished and not increased. Among the mass of Chinese throughout the whole land, I have no doubt the United States is regarded as favorably as any other foreign country, perhaps more so; but this involves very little knowledge after all, so ignorant are they of the condition and position of outside regions; yet this better knowledge is only partially owing to the returned emigrants. I do not suppose that the Chinese usually go to California with a settled intention to return or to stay, but go there as they go to Siam—to better their condition, get work, or see what they can. Most foreigners come to China for much the same reasons.

They are for the most part too old to learn English, and seldom attempt to learn to read it.

Thrifty and economical at home from necessity, they carry these habits with them, lay up all they can, and send or take home their earnings as they can.

Of the tens of thousands who have returned from Kwangtung, only a very few come into contact with foreigners, and still fewer are able to give an intelligent opinion on such subjects as our American institutions and people, tell the difference between an alien and a citizen, or decide whether they had any affection or regard for the country or not. It is unreasonable to expect it in the great majority of cases in the sense which I think this question involves. Nor would the officials ever think of inquiring from them about the land of their sojourn, and the emigrant himself would keep aloof from his rulers.

It may be assumed with respect to most of this class that they hope and intend to return home when they have made money enough, so far as they make any definite decision; but none go, I would think, with the design of becoming permanent citizens in the same sense that European emigrants choose to settle in the United States. They have never discussed the question, and have little idea what is involved in it.

14th. I have no means of answering this inquiry, as it involves an examination of the shipping-reports at Hong-Kong, or a comparison of the censuses taken in California and elsewhere.

15th. The purport of this inquiry as to the effect upon California and the United States of the Chinese emigration upon commerce, industry, and morals, opens a wide range of remark.

Its advantages to commerce depend a good deal upon the extent of their trade, and if that increases as their numbers increase, it swells the total of the port of San Francisco.

The transportation of so many people to and fro of itself gives employment to ships and merchants to no small extent; and these people themselves make a trade, so that I should think it is impossible to doubt that they have been a benefit to the general commerce of the State.

No complaint is made that Chinese firms settled there refuse to submit to the im-

ports and taxes levied on their trade, although they have managed to keep it pretty closely in their own hands so far as supplying their own people with Chinese goods. All these goods would never have been wanted, and much other collateral traffic would never have existed, if there were no immigrants; but these remarks are so self-evident that I fear that I have failed to see the real bearing of the inquiry. If its aim is to ascertain whether the gold and silver carried home by these people is a loss to the State, I should say it was not.

They have earned it by their industry and left its equivalent in their labor, and as it is one of the common products of the country the supply is greater than the needs require for carrying on its business, as the comparatively high prices of labor and living show, and its outflow does no injury therefore to any interest in it.

The riches of California consist to a very limited extent in its precious metals, and it is because she has so much wealth in other things that she retains so great a proportion of the mineral products which are not wanted to buy those other things from abroad. The Chinese can never impoverish California by carrying home their earnings.

The real point in this question is, probably, whether the effect of their presence upon the industry of the country is good or not; whether it interferes with the labor already there so as to entail damage upon the interests connected therewith; and the condition and needs of that industry should decide the answer.

That the Chinese laborer was once in demand and even necessary, every one who crosses by the Pacific Railroad will acknowledge; for without him it would not have been built when most needed. Other public and private works were begun because he was ready to do them, and were completed, or are now going on, because he is still there. Labor, like gold and silver, naturally seeks the best market, and no laws can prevent capitalists from employing it to the neglect of that which is higher priced. The competition in the labor market must equalize itself, and will do so sooner or later, unless force or discriminating protection is brought in to prevent it—an issue that is very improbable in the United States. Chinese industry will soon rise in value as the immigrants become skilled in doing what is wanted of them. If the complaint is now that they depreciate other kinds, the same cry was heard in the Atlantic States thirty years ago; but prices found their natural level.

I have heard the suggestion that a ready means of excluding the Chinese would be to abrogate the existing treaty between us and them, especially Article V of the Burlingame treaty.

Not to lay stress upon the fact that this portion of the treaty was urged upon the Chinese authorities by our own Government, and they accepted with some hesitation, allowing fourteen months to elapse before they would exchange the ratifications, it may be accepted as certain that even if this fifth article was abrogated it would have little or no effect upon the emigration.

The imperial government can no more control the movements of its subjects, or keep them within its territories, than the President can restrain those of our citizens; neither power can control or limit emigration or travel. Moreover, as few or no Chinese go to the United States from China itself, and no treaty between these two countries could influence emigration from British territory, or prevent ships loading at Hong-Kong from receiving passengers, the proposition shows how little the question has been studied. It would furthermore be a strange proposal to make to the court of Peking, to abrogate an article in a treaty almost forced on its acceptance, less than ten years ago, because the Emperor's subjects had acted on its suggestions more extensively than we expected.

He might well reply that the whole treaty had better be made void, for he had found by troublesome experience that the clauses and articles giving us the right of consular jurisdiction over our own citizens, the privilege of travel in his dominions, the permission to propagate Christian doctrines among his subjects, the liberty for ministers to reside at Peking, and other stipulations forced upon him in 1858, were all in the highest degree objectionable, injurious, and derogatory.

He would gladly have all the treaties become a dead letter, and if one power came with a proposal to amend one article, there might be hope that the yoke imposed by these treaties might be taken off.

The mere proposal by us to substitute another article regulating or limiting free emigration from China to America in place of this Article V, would be humiliating in the extreme, and a moment's thought will show how useless it would be if it could be arranged. The emigration to our country is the result of wider intercourse between this and that; here an overflowing population has found out that a demand exists there for labor, and its application in our fields and shops will certainly benefit our industry. The struggle in China is rather between the machine-manfactured goods of western lands and the manufactured fabrics of native make, and the former seem to be gradually winning; but the struggle in the Pacific States just now seems to be between Christian civilized labor, with its higher and better demands for the soul and body, and Pagan unskilled labor, nurtured in a lower grade and content with less.

The tendency would be to elevate the latter, and such results have already been seen in some degree, for the emigrants soon seek higher knowledge and have more wants.

The fear that they will injure the industry of the State seems, too, judging by the past experience, somewhat to be based on the complaints of those who are now out of work in this time of general depression, and those who can make themselves heard in public meetings and the newspapers, which the Chinese cannot do easily. They wish to find a reason why the demand for their labor has ceased, and take this immigration as the excuse and the cause.

It will cease as soon as it finds no demand, and the laborers will stay at home or go elsewhere; for in California they begin to feel that there is a social ban upon them, a disfavor like that with which the official and educated class of their own country look upon foreigners. There is nothing to be said in behalf of such a sentiment on either side; but the American has the least excuse for it, and happily is doing very much to remove it, by teaching his visitors, and diffusing truth among their countrymen at home.

Our whole country can easily give employment to a few myriads of industrious Chinese, and if those who come over were landed at half a dozen separate ports instead of all coming in at one, their presence would probably cause little remark, and they would quickly settle over the land.

The effect of this immigration on the morals of the Americans among whom it comes depends almost wholly upon what they themselves do.

If the higher civilization and Christian energy of the American people in California cannot devise means to remove the ignorance, abate the prejudices, and convert the paganism of these people thus brought to their doors, it is weak indeed. But these efforts of Christian benevolence cannot do everything necessary in the case; law and force must aid them. For instance, I may refer to the crowding of so many people into lodgings quite insufficient; and if no means are taken by the authorities of the State or city to prevent or remedy the evils arising from the Chinese herding together in houses, where neither air, light, nor cleanliness prevail to render them fit for human habitations, I do not see which is most to blame, or which is likely to suffer most. The Chinese are quite ignorant of the laws of hygiene, and in their own land they die and sicken from neglecting them, and will do so until they learn and follow a better way. How much more are they likely to live regardless of consequences in other lands, where they have no power usually to better themselves in these respects, but are compelled to live as their landlords make them.

The morals of a community suffer when its members live in too-confined or badly-ventilated houses, and it is certainly within the functions of the local authorities and boards of health to compel the Chinese to live so as not to endanger the lives, health, and best interests of themselves or their neighbors.

One means of preventing injury in these respects, and its benefits would extend much wider than the improvement of houses, is to educate a number of Americans in the Chinese language for official interpreters and translators. The Chinese cannot reasonably be blamed for their misfortune in not knowing how to speak English on their arrival, and it is prudent to meet the difficulty arising from this fact, by having men prepared to help them to understand their new relations.

These interpreters would be the medium through which the Chinese can reach the authorities directly, either to state their grievances or learn what are the laws which affect them, and act generally as Government agents in making known its orders.

The fact that such interpreters exist would encourage well-disposed Chinese, ignorant of our language, to state their matters directly to the rulers, and to feel that, in cases of difficulty, they would not be left to the mercy of one of their countrymen who did know it. Laws could be promulgated in Chinese, written and oral evidence be taken in courts, when there was reason to fear it was altered or misunderstood, and that direct oversight maintained over this alien population which would effect much good, restrain many, and encourage others.

In such a case prevention of evil is the function of a good government, and it seems to me that one of the most likely means to diminish the injury to morals alluded to in this inquiry, is to train up competent American interpreters and translators, and give them permanent positions in the local government.

Such men are found to be necessary in Hong-Kong, Macao, Singapore, Batavia, and other places where Chinese are under foreign sway, and they are more needed perhaps in California, and it is my belief that no satisfactory or intelligent relations can be established with the mass of Chinese immigrants until they are brought into direct contact with the rulers.

The fact that hundreds of them read and write English well does not do away with the necessity of having our own people as well acquainted with Chinese.

In respect to the effect of Chinese immigration as a whole, I think they are beneficial to commerce and industry in a high degree. In respect to morals, they will probably be detrimental unless measures are taken by the people, and people in California

to remove the ignorance of these strangers, restrain their vices, and treat them justly. If we who live in China had been treated as badly as they have been in the United States, I think a war would have ensued to defend us in the possession of our treaty-rights, or we should have had to leave the country.

The murders, the robberies, and the cruelties practiced upon the Chinese in that State up to March, 1862, as set forth in a memorial from them to the legislature, have been unknown in this land.

The contrast is not to our credit.

To prevent the extension of opium-smoking among them; to learn thoroughly the working of their companies and guilds; to encourage them to bring their families; to make known to them, in their own language or otherwise, whatever will help them to become better in every way—all these duties need to be fulfilled to prevent them from injuring "the social condition of the State," as the legislativere solution appointing this committee expresses it.

In the providence of God they have been brought into the midst of a Christian community, and their condition imposes many new duties upon that community, which, if not fulfilled, will entail bad results.

16th. The Chinese, in their own country, take pains and go to much expense to have their dead buried in the family-tomb.

It arises from a desire, common in all lands and ages, to be gathered after death to one's fathers in the ancestral sepulcher, but is perhaps stronger among this people than elsewhere, in consequence of the prevalence of ancestral worship.

The practice of removing the bodies of those who die in other provinces to their paternal vaults depends more upon the means of the parties than upon any tenet of religious faith. All would like to do it, and thousands do carry it out, but those who have not the money content themselves with placing the coffin in houses erected for this purpose in every large city, there to remain until the family has the means and opportunity to remove it, which, in most cases, is never.

If the legislature should pass a law prohibiting coffins containing dead bodies to be exported, it would not, probably, have the least effect to dissuade men from starting for the gold hills.

None of the intending emigrants would expect to come under its operation; and those living in the State wishing to send away such coffins would quietly submit to what could not be helped, wondering, meanwhile, why such an act was forbidden to Chinese in the United States, when Americans in China were free to do it. But I cannot suppose such a prohibition is intended.

So far as I know, emigrants to Siam and the Indian Archipelago do not send the bodies of their dead back to China, but the majority of them marry and settle where they find employment, which adequately explains the different usage. I suppose that the extent to which the repatriation of the dead from California is carried, has been partly owing to the existence of societies organized for the purpose, and that the societies arose from the condition of most of the emigrants, whose wandering life led them to subscribe regular sums to defray the expense in case of their death. They had, in many cases, left families behind them, and were disinclined to be buried in a foreign country, where no relative would ever worship at their tombs. It was comparatively easy to send home the coffins of former members, and the society was pledged to do so if it took in subscriptions. I do not know whether the practice exists among the emigrants to Australia.

The above are the direct answers to the sixteen inquiries sent to me in your letter, and contain the information which I am able to give on the subjects referred to, or the opinions which I have formed. I must state, however, that on some of the points brought up my information is very likely to be imperfect, and, consequently, my opinion must be taken on those points for what it is worth; this remark applies to the answers respecting the Chinese in California, rather than those connected with them in their own land.

In view of the whole subject, it is proper to add a few observations respecting two features of this immigration which distinguish it from that arriving in the Atlantic States, and make it objectionable in comparison; perhaps lie at the basis of the dislike felt toward the Chinese by our own countrymen who have no interest in the labor question.

It is this question which, more than all others, excites the strong prejudice against them; and it is to their credit, it seems to me, that they have given so few grounds for complaint by infractions of law.

Their strange language and profound ignorance of our customs, government, religion, and speech, is the first of the two features, and tends to alienate them from the body of our citizens.

Many of the points which a new-comer arriving from Hong-Kong wishes to have explained, can only be described by one of his countrymen, whose opportunities have

probably been few to learn their nature and bearing, and his ignorance tends to perpetuate and strengthen that of his querist.

The latter, therefore, enters upon his new life in our country with some disadvantage, though the action of the companies, and more extended intercourse with his comrade, by degrees remove the chief difficulties of his position.

Yet the Chinese language tends to prevent its talkers from assimilating with the people of other lands, who are often repelled by its uncouth sounds, and seldom have the time or the inclination to study and learn its intricate characters.

Such has been the case among the Siamese and Malays, few of whom have learned Chinese, while the Chinese get a smattering of their languages, and then pride themselves on their superiority in being able to read and write their own.

This tends to keep up a clannish spirit among the immigrants, and throughout the whole Indian Archipelago, Malacca, and Siam, they remain distinct to this day, and take special pains to keep so. On their part it is to be said, that unless they had combined in some way, and had some bond of union to resist the injustice of native rajahs and employers in those regions, they would have found life a slavery, and their industry a temptation to further oppression; and then, too, they found themselves to be the superior race, even in Java, and in Luçonia to a considerable extent, over the native laborers.

Their language is so curious in its construction that it affords almost no help in learning another, and thus the sounds and sense of our alphabetic languages are alike sealed up until they can get the aid of the living voice to convey the one and explain the other.

All the English they learn at first must be *viva voce*, and this disability tends to prevent the largest portion of the immigrants even learning more than a few words. This is bad for them, and it prevents those who wish to teach and help them from attempting to master their language. The new-comers feel their isolation and weakness often, and doubtless are now and then sore because they have been unjustly treated, owing to the impossibility of explaining matters. I do not know how the difficulty is to be got over, for they must remain more or less distinct from other people as long as they know no other language, and are necessarily compelled to come more or less under the control of their countrymen who do.

I know that thousands are learning to read and talk English, through the benevolent labors of Christian men and women, and thereby the evil is measurably lessened; yet it is a drawback to Chinese immigration that lies beyond the reach of laws and ordinances to remedy.

The arrival on our shores of so many men, none of whom bring their families, and few of whom are married, is the second objectionable feature of this immigration.

It throws them together in denser communities than is advisable, strengthens their worse peculiarities, because it prevents them from coming in contact with those who would make them better. They naturally keep in small communities, because they are so helpless as individuals, at least until they have been long enough in the country to talk so as to explain their wants.

This, combined with their low ideas of morality, tends to neutralize the meliorating and elevating influences which would by degrees affect them if they were settlers with their families. As a whole, there is no prospect of their getting wives in the United States, and this adds a certain force to their longing to return home. In their own land they are remarkably domestic, and their regard for parents, wives, and children forms a redeeming trait in the national character; while, in California, even those who would like to keep house are, as it were, unable to do so. How to obviate this objection attending the immigration needs an intimate acquaintance with the Chinese themselves on the spot; and I venture no suggestion. I have heard two modes mentioned, one a discriminating poll-tax against those who remained unmarried after a certain number of years; the other to grant certain privileges to those who brought their families; but both are probably impracticable.

Few persons probably wish to pass any regulations looking to their coming to or remaining in the country. Yet they are likely to come, and it is a boast of our nation that we offer a place for the people of every clime, and the boast is a just one. The evils hitherto attending the presence of the Chinese have been less than the benefits, and indirectly we rather aggravated the evils by not doing something to segregate them, and to some degree prevent overcrowding.

These municipal and sanitary regulations require constant oversight in their execution, and strict measures to repress and remove the evils of overcrowding, but the end in view is worth the effort to reach it. The tendency of the immigrants is to cluster together in houses and shops, partly from such being their habit at home, where they sleep and live out of doors much of the time, and partly from economy and necessity in our country, as they have no choice most of the time where they can lodge. Their employers, too, mostly care very little how laborers hired for a season may get along, if they seem satisfied and do their work.

In the letter now before me a request is made for "such official documents and papers

as may be within my control which will throwlight upon the subject," but I have none. The subject of Chinese immigration has never come before this legation for any action.

A well-written paper giving some important facts, by Daniel Cleveland, will be found in Diplomatic Correspondence for 1868, Part I, pp. 530–544, and is probably already known to you.

With great respect, I remain your obedient servant,

S. WELLS WILLIAMS.

Hon. CREED HAYMOND,
Chairman of Senatorial Chinese Investigating Committee.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

	Page.
Anthony, George W	928–930
Armstrong, Edward J	743, 744
Arnoup, John	1061, 1062
Avery, Francis	844–853
Babcock, William F	708–719
Badlam, Alexander	252–260
Recalled	995–997
Bainbridge, Arnop	219–229
Bassett, James M	1138–1141
Beals, Henry C	616–624
Bigelow, Henry H	969–974
Blair, Matthew	987–995
Blake, Maurice C	272–275
Blakeslee, Rev. Samuel V	1028–1043
Brier, Rev. William M	569–585
Briggs, Rev. Martin C	765, 766
Brooks, Benjamin S	901–928
Brooks, Charles Wolcott	941–951
Brown, Thomas	797–799
Bryant, Andrew J	180–187
Buchanan, William G	332–338
Cadiz, Joseph G	1135–1138
Campbell, Alexander	732–743
Castle, Frederick L	860–862
Clarke, Alfred	143–145
Recalled	146–156
Clarke, Henry K. W	688–708
Coolidge, Joseph A	489–496
Colton, David D	599–606
Condon, John D	346–351
Cortage, Edward L	359–363
Coryell, John R	986, 987
Crocker, Charles	666–688
Dameron, James P	1043–1059
Deal, Rev. David	443, 444
Degroot, Henry	1103–1114
Douglas, Charles D	932–936
Duffield, George W	209–219
Durkee, John L	997–1000
Dwinelle, John W	1067–1079
Dwinelle, Samuel H	747–753
Dye, William M	660–666
Easterby, Anthony W	744–747
Ellis, Henry H	156–173
Estee, Morris M	1000–1010
Evans, West	720–723
Foulke, Lewis M	1128–1135
Francis, Rev. John	484–489
Gallego, Romulus C	1063–1066
George, Henry	275–290
Gibbs, Cornelius B. S	530–532

Page.

Gibbs, Frederick A 199–209
Gibson, Rev. Otis 145, 146
Recalled 396–436, 496–504, 512
Gillespie, Robert H 356–359
Gray, Giles H 387–396

Haight, Henry H 290–300
Hart, Henry 883–893
Hastings, S. Clinton 585–598
Hayes, Miss Maggie 338–341
Hayes, Michael 365, 366
Heydenfeldt, Solomon 504–512
Heynemann, Herman 532–542
Hill, John H 796, 797
Hollister, William W 766–795
Recalled 843, 844, 931
Horner, John M 799–801
Recalled 822–825
Humphrey, Patrick H 940, 941
Humphreys, Mrs. Henry J 343, 344
Hyatt, Thomas H 753–763

Jackson, Thomas W 1121–1128
Jessup, William H 816–822
Jones, Charles T 1079–1086
Jones, Simon L 815, 816

King, Cameron H 261–272
King Thomas H 92–126
Recalled 1111–1121
Kirkpatrick, John 974–976

Lake, Delos 1010–1014
Lancaster, Charles S 341, 343
Lessler, Morris 930, 931
Recalled 932
Loomis, Rev. Augustus W 444–484
Louderback, Davis 187–190
Low, Frederick F 65–92

Macondray, Frederick W 853, 860
Mahony, Cornelius A 382–387
Marshall, Levin 351–354
McCarty, Dennis 363–365
McHenry, John 930
McLennan, Donald 606–616
Meares, John L 126–143
Mellon, John 300–308
Morgenthau, Max 801–815
Muther, Frank 312–321

O'Donnell, Charles C 1095–1100
Olmsted, William N 825–842

Patterson, James 1060, 1061
Peck, Charles S 728–732
Peckham, Robert F 552–568
Peterson, Charles H 1086–1090
Phillips, Stephen H 976–986
Pixley, Frank M 366–378

Reed, Rev. Hiram W 878–883
Robert, George D 436–443
Rodgers, John 1020–1028
Rogers, James R 229–235
Russell, Joel 1090–1095

Page.
Scott, Irving M 1014–1016
Seaman, Vernon 548–552
Recalled 568
Shearer, Rev. Frederic E 631–643
Sherk, Jacob B 624–631
Silverberg, Herman 378–382
Smith, Mrs. Anna F 897–901
Smith, Michael A 190–199
Recalled 1142–1146
Sneath, Richard G 542–548
Sonntag, Charles 893–897
Stein, Fritz 345
Stock, Ernest C 325–331
Stout, Arthur B 643–660
Recalled 862–878
Strobridge, James H 723–728
Stuart, John 763–765
Swift, John F 951–968
Swift, Mrs. Sophronia 244–252

Tobin, John T 235–244
Tucker, George W 936–939

Vale, William 1100–1102
Vinton, William 308–312
Vreeland, Ezekiel B 173–180

Westine, Erric 354–356
Wheeler, Alfred 512–529
recalled 795, 796
Wheeler, Edward D 1016–1020
Winn, Albert M 321–325
Woods, David C 1062, 1063

INDEX.

Ability of the Chinese, 601, 603–606.
Ablutions, 645.
Address of the six companies, 39.
Advantages of Chinese labor, (see Labor.)
Ages of Chinese in this country, 489.
Agricultural lands, exhaustion of, in California, 52, 53, 55, 1067–1070, 1075.
statistics of, 55, 56, 57.
Agriculture, ruinous course of, in California, 769, 777.
Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad, employment of Chinese in construction of, 551.
Anthony, George W., a witness, 928–930; former vice-consul at Bangkok, 928; character of the Chinese, 928, 929; Chinese and Japanese compared, 929, 930.
Alexander & Co., cigar-manufacturers, refuse to employ white married men, 318, 319.
Alien population, Chinese an, 963, 964.
Almshouse report, 403.
Americans in China, rights of, 72, 73.
treatment of, 497, 858.
trial of, 1085.
American institutions, Chinese regard for, 16, 17.
Ancestors, Chinese worship tablets of, 13.
Anti-cooly mass-meeting, 849–851.
Anti-cooly unions, character of, 56, 926, 927, 934.
constitution and by-laws of, 261–264, 1169–1172.
in San José, 308.
object of the, 936.
origin of, 54.
Apprentices, boys as, 348, 1016.
Armstrong, Edward J., a witness, 743, 744; report of legislative committee in 1862 on Chinese population, 743, 744; actions in court in which Chinese appear as parties, 744.
Arnoup, John, a witness, 1061, 1062; journalist, 1061; natural qualities of the Chinese, 1061; effect of Chinese on wages of white labor, 1061, 1062.
Arrests and convictions, 60, 61, 157, 158, 164.
Arrivals of Chinese in California, 549, 551, 568, 569, 611, 856, 857.
Arrivals and departures of Chinese, 619, 620, 760, 764.
table of, 1176, 1177, 1196.
Arts, progress of China in the, 408.
Asiatic and European immigration, 398, 491–495.
Assassination of Chinese, 32, 94.
informers, 24.
Assaults upon Chinese, 649–651.
Assimilation of Chinese, 31, 74, 228, 229, 321, 642, 643, 738, 811, 1010, 1011, 1017, 1018, 1067.
Atheists, Chinese, 13.
Avery, Francis, a witness, 844–853; California Pacific Railroad, 844; demand for labor, 845; Chinese as domestic servants, 845, 846, 852, 853; anti-cooly mass-meeting, 849–851; effigy-burning, 849, 850, 852; population of San Francisco, 851; white servants, 853.

Babcock, William F., a witness, 708–719; merchant, 708; material benefit of Chinese labor, 708; views on Chinese immigration, 708–710; immigration from the East, 711; character of the Chinese, 711, 712, 717; Chinese competition, 712–714, 718, 719; cleanliness of the Chinese, 715; trade with China, 715, 716; laundry business carried on by Chinese, 717, 718; character of the white laboring classes, 719.
Badlam, Alexander, a witness, 252–260, 995–997; assessor, 252; number of Chinese engaged in manufacturing, 252, 253; Chinese quarters, 253, 259, 260; value of property owned by Chinese, 254; mode of collecting the poll-tax from the Chinese, 254–256; effect of Chinese upon real estate, 255; Chinese as laborers, 257–259; collection of poll-tax, 995–997; value of property upon which Chinese pay taxes, 995; fraudulant tax-receipts, 997.
Bags, manufacture of, 539, 1063.
grain, importation of, 801.

Bailey, Mr. D. H., United States consul at Hong-Kong, 25.
views of, on immigration of Chinese women for immoral purposes, 457.
Bainbridge, Arnop, a witness, 219–229; police-officer, 219; Chinese quarter, 219–221; Chinese prostitution, 221; opium-smoking among the Chinese, 221, 222; gambling, 222–224; economy of Chinese, 224, 225; Chinese hospitals, 225; food used by Chinese, 226; Chinese physicians, 227, 228; assimilation of Chinese, 228, 229.
Bassett, James M., a witness, 1138–1141; editor Los Angeles Herald, 1138; views on Chinese immigration, 1138, 1139; effect of elective franchise on Chinese, 1139–1141; murder of Chinese at Los Angeles, 1140; employment of Chinese in Los Angeles, 1141.
Beals, Henry C., a witness, 616–624; Commercial Herald, 616; manufacture of cordage, 617, 618; manufacture of boots and shoes, 618; ginseng, 618; manufacture of cigars, 618, 619; trade with China, 619; arrivals and departures of Chinese, 619, 620; Chinese quarter, 620; fruit-culture, 620; Chinese prostitutes, 621; character of Chinese as laborers, 621; experience with servant-girls, 621–623; views on Chinese immigration, 624; articles on Chinese question from Commercial Herald, 1184–1189.
Bed of Chinese, how composed, 197.
Bee, F. A., argument of, attorney of the six companies, 34–50; class legislation, 34, 38, 47; rapid strides of California, 35; Burlingame treaty, 35, 36; inhuman treatment of Chinese, 37; address of Chinese six companies, 38, 39; labor in California and character of the same, 39, 40, 41; Chinatown compared with Five Points, New York, 41; trade with China, 41, 42; cheap labor, 43, 44; character of Chinese as laborers, 44, 45; losses by the Chinese, 45; letters of the Chinese six companies asking protection, 46, 47; queue and cubic-air ordinances, 47, 48; house-servants, 48; Chinese classics, 65.
Ben Wong, 27.
Bigelow, Henry H., a witness, 969–974; manager of Home Mutual Insurance Company, 969; effect of presence of Chinese upon rates of insurance, 969; comparison between Chinese labor and negro slavery, 969; Chinese as insurers of property, 969, 970; material advantage of Chinese labor, 970; contract-labor, 970, 971; effect of Chinese upon white labor, 971, 972; fires in the Chinese quarter, 972, 973; character of the Chinese as dealers, 973; hoodlums, 974.
Blair, Matthew, a witness, 987–995; hay and grain dealer, 987; lack of employment for white labor, 988; employment of Chinese, 988–991; labor-saving machinery compared with Chinese labor, 992–994; character of Chinese labor, 994, 995.
Blake, Maurice C., a witness, 272–275; judge of municipal criminal court, 272; character of Chinese as witnesses, 272–274; views on Chinese immigration, 273; Chinese interpreters in courts, 275.
Blakeslee, Rev. Samuel V., extract from letter of, 577, 578.
a witness, 1028–1043; demoralizing effect of Chinese, 1027; popular opinion on Chinese question, 1029, 1030; labor interests, 1030; morals of San Francisco, 1031, 1037, 1038; Chinese as laborers, 1031; cost of living in California, 1033; prejudice of race, 1033; injurious effect of large landed estates, 1033, 1034, 1039, 1040; Irish population, 1035, 1041, 1043; the Chinaman and negro compared, 1036, 1037; prostitution, 1038, 1039; English chartists, 1041; religion of the Chinese, 1042; letter to the commission, 1241–1243.
Boat-people, Chinese, 415.
Bondage, prostitutes held in, 22.
Bootmakers, Chinese as, 805.
Boots and shoes, manufacture of, 618.
Boys as apprentices, 348, 1016.
bad effect of Chinese prostitutes on white, 1062, 1063.
displacement of white, by Chinese, 80, 81.
experience with white, 553, 554, 816, 817, 819.
employment of, 570, 571.
character of, in San Francisco, 862.
Brain-capacity of different races, 1052.
Brier, Rev. William W., a witness, 569–585; fruit-raiser, 569; character of the Chinese, 569, 581; employment of boys, 570, 571; advantages of Chinese labor in fruit-raising, 571; effect of Chinese immigration, 572, 575, 576, 584; white girls as domestic servants, 572, 573; wages of labor, 573, 574; extract from letter of Rev. S. V. Blakeslee, 578; political aspect of Chinese question, 578; Chinese six companies, 579; labor-contracts, 580; Chinese as land-owners, 580, 581; religious aspect of Chinese question, 582, 583; European immigration, 583.
Briggs, Rev. Martin C., a witness, 765, 766; employment of white labor, 765; popular sentiment in regard to Chinese, 766; views on Chinese immigration, 766.

Brooks, B. S., argument in behalf of the Chinese, 50–63; opposition to new improvements, 50; competition, 50, 51; character of white laborers in the State, 51; exhaustion of agricultural lands in California, 52, 53, 55; California in favor of Chinese immigration, 54; beneficial effects of Chinese labor, 54, 55; statistics of agricultural lands, 55, 56, 57; character of the anti-cooly association, 56; population and extent of China, 57, 58; cleanliness of the Chinese, 59, 60; statistics of arrests, 60, 61; use of opium, 61; smells in Chinatown, 61; small-pox, 61, 62; class legislation, 62, 63.

Brooks, Benjamin S., a witness, 901–928; lawyer, 901; interest taken in Chinese question, 901, 902; influence of Chinese labor, 902, 918, 919; fidelity of the Chinese in keeping contracts, 903, 904; convictions among the Chinese, 904; sentiment against the Chinese, 904, 905, 908, 910, 917; Chinese as citizens, 905; views on Chinese immigration, 906, 907, 917; lands of the State, 906; patriotism of the Chinese, 907, 908; definition of bummer, 909; inducements for Chinese immigration, 911; treatment of the Chinese, 911, 912; partiality of juries, 912, 914, 916; outrages upon Chinese, 913; burglaries by Chinese, 913; jumping claims in the mines, 914, 915; Chinese as emigrants, 920; Chinese civilization, 921, 922; popular opinion on Chinese question, 922–926; character of anti-cooly clubs, 926, 927; avenues of employment opened by Chinese, 927, 928.

Brooks, Charles Wolcott, a witness, 941–951; former agent of Japanese government, 941; Chinaman and negro compared, 942; definition of the word cooly, 942; pigeon English, 942, 943; cooly traffic, 943; Chinese code of laws, 943; laws governing population, 943, 944; origin of Chinese and Japanese races, 944, 945; religion of China, 945; Fung Shuy, spiritualism, 945, 946; settlement on the line of the Union Pacific Railroad, 946, 947, 949; character of the Cantonese, 947; inducements to Chinese to return to China, 948; trade with China, 948; bullion trade, 948, 949; character of laborers on Union Pacific Road, 949, 950; significance of the queue, 950, 951; Chinese labor problem, 1215–1224; origin of Chinese race, 1224–1241.

Broom-making, effect of Chinese competition upon, 367.

Brooms, shipment of, to foreign ports, 358.

Brown, Thomas, a witness, 797–799; banker, 797; character of Chinese merchants, 797; bullion market, 798; Chinese as domestic servants, 798; effect of Chinese quarter on real estate, 799.

Browne, Robert, case of the, 759, 760.

Bryant, Andrew J., a witness, 180–187; mayor of San Francisco, 180; Chinese population, 180; Chinese tribunals, 181; Chinese quarter, 181; Chinese prostitution, 181, 182; Chinese lepers, 182; wages of laborers, 182, 183, 185; immigration from the East, 183, 184; value of money, 186; Chinese as factory-operatives, 187.

Buchanan, William G., a witness, 332–338; shoemaker, 332; wages of shoemakers, 332; injurious effect of Chinese competition on white immigration, 333; change from Chinese labor to white labor in Ernstein's shoe-factory, 333, 335; comparative efficiency of the Chinese as shoemakers, 334, 336; mechanics work in shop with Chinese, 335; co-operative union, 336–338.

Buddhism, origin of, 26, 27, 69.

Buddhist religion, doctrines of the, 69, 70. (See religion of Chinese.)

Buell, R. T., experience with Chinese labor, 545, 547.

Bullion, export of, 536, 948.
market, 798.

Bummer, definition of, 909.

Bummerism, 786, 787, 792, 794.

Burchard, Father, 27.

Burglaries by Chinese, 913.

Burial of Chinese, ceremony of, 16.

Burlingame treaty, benefits of, 35.
text of, 1182, 1183.
views on, 1023.

Business tact of Chinese, 89.

Cadiz, Joseph G., a witness, 1135, 1138; Chinese in Peru, 1135–1137; character of the Chinese, 1138.

California, law of, in regard to immigration of Chinese and Japanese, 1147, 1148.
population of Chinese in, report of legislative committee, 1189, 1195.
resolution of Senate of, on Chinese immigration, 9.
trade of, tabular statements, 1203, 1206.

Campbell, Alexander, a witness, 732–743; formerly district judge, 732; views on immigration of Chinese labor, 733, 737; Chinese as domestic servants, 733; opening up of Salinas plains, 734; Chinese as laundrymen, 735; treatment of Chinese, 736, 739, 740; religion of the Chinese, 736, 737; assimilation of the Chinese, 738; Chinese as gardeners, 739; effect of Chinese on white labor, 741, 742; increase of Chinese in California, 743.

Candle-trade, 806–808, 810, 813, 814.
Canton (Kwang-tung) Province, pirates and river-thieves from vicinity of, 25.
source of immigration, 21, 66, 445.
Cantonese boatmen, 857.
character of the, 947.
Capital, necessity of cheap, 1067, 1068, 1074.
Cash, Chinese coin, 411, 412, 1072, 1073.
Castle, Frederick L., a witness, 860–862; merchant, 860; trade with Chinese, 861; Chinese as fruit-dealers, 861; character of white boys, 862.
Caucasian race, supremacy of, 865.
Caucasians, Order of, 1088–1090.
Cemetery, number of graves of Chinamen in the San Francisco, 932, 1215.
Central Pacific Railroad, demand for laborers on the, 15.
employment of Chinese in the construction of the, 522, 523, 528, 666, 667, 723–725, 790.
number of Chinese employed on, 77.
wages paid to laborers on, 79, 80.
Certificate of emigration-officer, 1164.
Chartists, English, 1041.
Cheese, manufacture of, 547, 548.
Children, admission refused to Chinese, in public schools, 432, 433.
condition of white, in San Francisco, 246, 250.
China, character of Chinese in, 24, 235, 550.
civilization of, 294, 295.
class of emigrants from, 756, 757.
comparison between, and Africa, 371, 372, 373–375.
cost of living in, 833.
currency of, 411, 412.
dishonesty of Chinese in, 1127.
feeling of government of, in regard to immigration, 497, 498
form of government in, 1056, 1057.
habits of living in 411, 412.
imperial government of, 119, 297, 298, 417, 418, 502, 503.
method of printing in, 408.
missionaries in, 422.
mode in which Chinese emigrate from, 883, 884.
modes of punishment in, 236–238.
morals of, 236.
plurality of wives in, 499.
pox, 1063.
progress of, in the arts, 408.
prostitution in, 829, 830.
resources of, in regard to population, 321.
slavery unknown in, 428.
trade with, 100, 120, 619, 715, 716, 763, 764, 825, 832, 853, 854, 861, 1055.
treatment of foreigners in, 858.
treaty with, 284, 285, 456, 461, 482, 968.
Chinatown, health of, 208.
property in, 654, 655.
Chinese, admitted to testify in the courts, 292.
as citizens, 287, 288, 291, 292.
character of the, 377, 378, 379, 380, 406, 407, 432, 445, 486, 489, 490, 517, 569, 581, 690, 692, 711, 712, 717, 726, 727, 774, 821, 928, 930, 958, 965, 1002, 1003, 1025, 1071, 1138.
compared with the negroes, 293, 294.
education among the, 89, 289, 114, 119.
immigration of the, governed by demand for labor, 514, 516, 519, 537.
intention of, to return to China, 16, 17, 385, 446, 636, 637, 839.
labor, as compared with labor-saving machinery, 278, 279, 540, 541.
labor problem, 1215–1224.
pecuniary motives of, 16, 71.
persecution of, 367, 369, 370.
popular sentiment regarding, 54, 324, 325, 671, 701–703, 705.
voluntary immigration of, 15, 404, 405.
Chinese quarters in San Francisco, condition of, 20, 21, 41, 61, 136, 143, 159–161, 168, 181, 191, 195, 196, 209–211, 213–221, 229–232, 253, 259, 260, 327, 620, 648, 649, 812, 813.
effect of, on real estate, 19.
extension of, 610–612.
fires in, 61, 644, 661, 972, 973, 998–1000.
number of Chinese who sleep in one room in, 19.

Chinese quarters in San Francisco, population of, 19.
report on character of, regarding fire, 998.
Chinese towns, local government of, 1125, 1126.
Cholo, definition of, 386.
Cholos and peons, 386.
Christian influences upon Chinese, 453, 454, 457–459, 465, 633, 634, 639.
churches, Chinese members of, 1172, 1176.
Christianity, conversion of Chinese to, 159, 413, 415–439, 488, 878, 880.
influence of, upon the Chinese, 1172–1176.
Christianize, attempt to, Chinese a failure, 325.
Christians, number of Chinese, 27.
Cigar-makers, nationality of, in San Francisco, 316.
number of Chinese, in San Francisco, 312, 313.
uncleanly habits of Chinese, 314, 315.
wages of, 313, 314.
white, prevented from coming to California on account of Chinese, 316, 317.
Cigar-manufacturers, 316, 317, 318, 319, 618, 619.
as compared with the East, 313.
refusal of, to employ married men, 318, 319.
Cigar-stamps used to distinguish when made by white labor, 319.
Cigar-trade, 805, 806.
mode of learning among Chinese, 317.
mode of learning among whites, 315.
Citizens, Chinese as, 287, 288, 291, 292, 456, 518, 772, 875, 905, 984, 1003, 1004, 1011, 1133.
City authorities of San Francisco, action of, 649.
Civilization, Chinese, 271, 401, 402, 413, 499, 594, 921, 922.
Chinese and European, compared, 368.
effect of Chinese upon our, 562.
of China, 294, 295.
Clarke, Alfred, a witness, 143, 156; clerk in police department, 143; number of Chinese, 143; Chinese quarter, 143; crime among the Chinese, 144; Chinese prostitutes, 144, 148, 152; contracts for prostitution, 145, 147, 151; head-money for Chinese women, 149; Hip-ye-tung, 150, 152, 154; cubic-air ordinance, 154, 155; Chinese disputes settled among themselves, 155, 156.
Clarke, Henry K. W., a witness, 688–708; lawyer, 688; employment of Chinese, 688, 689, 692, 693; character of the Chinese, 690, 692; effort to have Chinese naturalized, 690, 691; Chinese in placer-mining, 691; regulation of Chinese immigrants, 693–696, 700; habits of the Chinese, 697, 698; Chinese as witnesses, 699; opposition to Chinese, 701; popular sentiment in favor of Chinese, 701–703, 705; position of the press on the Chinese question, 703–705; outrages upon the Chinese, 706; political aspect of the Chinese question, 706, 707; standing of, at the bar, 735, 749.
Class legislation, 34, 38.
Cleanliness of Chinese, 20, 59, 60, 405, 412, 712.
Cleanliness of Chinese houses, 531.
want of, by the Chinese, 1112, 1126.
Clothing of Chinese, 1125.
Code of laws, Chinese, 943.
Cole & Co., employment of Chinese convict-labor, 347.
Colton, David D., a witness, 599–606; vice-president Southern Pacific, 599; Oriental and Occidental Steamship Company, 599; importation of Chinese women, 599; construction of Southern Pacific, 599, 600, 604; effect of construction of lateral roads, 600; Chinese immigration governed by demand for labor, 600, 601; effect of Chinese upon immigration from the East, 601, 606; ability of Chinese, 601, 603–606; Chinese merchants, 602; hostility to the Chinese, 602; collection of foreign miners' tax, 603.
Commerce between China and San Francisco, tabular statement of, 1147.
in China, 89, 90.
with China, (see Trade with China.)
Commercial Herald, articles on Chinese question from, 1184–1189.
Commissioner of immigration, report of, 1148–1163.
Committee, legislative, investigation of, 212.
Companies, Chinese six, 23, 111–114, 125, 405, 406, 420, 446–448, 473, 579, 593.
address of, 39.
arrangement between Pacific Mail Steamship Company and, 24, 82, 83.
Chinese controlled by, 318.
letters of, asking protection, 46, 47.
permit required of, to return, 24, 82, 83.
Comparison between the Chinese and the negro, 289, 293, 294, 942, 953, 955, 956, 969, 1004, 1036, 1037, 1133–1135.

Comparison between the Chinese and the French peasantry, 500, 501.
Japanese, 929, 930, 983, 984.
other foreign immigration, 509, 511, 541, 542.
Chinese labor and white labor, 681, 682, 728, 758.
Competency of Chinese, 16.
Competition, Chinese, 50, 51, 267–269, 286, 333, 346, 348, 349, 352, 355, 361, 367, 524-527, 529, 537, 538, 683, 684, 712–714, 718, 719, 730, 781, 782, 836–838, 900, 956, 1105–1108.
of Chinese in living, 1118–1121.
with eastern manufacturers, 563–565.
Comprador, business of the, 830, 831, 1123.
honesty of the Chinese, 419.
Condon, John D., a witness, 346–351; cabinet-maker, 346; effect of Chinese competition, 346, 348, 349; wages of Chinese, 346, 347; Chinese convict-labor, 347; tyranny of Chinese employers, 347; boys as apprentices, 348; trades-unions, 348; injurious tendency of Chinese labor, 350, 351.
Conflict, irrepressible, between whites and Chinese, 587.
Confucius, doctrines of, 13, 69, 70, 500, 501, 512, 1056.
Constitution of Anti-Chinese Union, 261–264.
Consul, duties of, in regard to shipment of prostitutes, 987.
Consular fees, 93, 888–891.
Contracts, employment of Chinese under, 436, 437, 442, 443.
faithfulness of Chinese, 831, 903, 904.
for prostitution, 145, 147.
labor, 15, 32, 428, 429, 511, 591, 592, 970, 971.
to refund passage-money, 82.
translation of Chinese, for prostitution, 145, 146.
Conversion of Chinese to Christianity, 159.
Convict-labor, Chinese, 347.
Convictions among the Chinese, 904.
Cook Leung, 27.
Coolidge, Joseph A., a witness, 489–496; secretary and manager of merchants' exchange, 489; character of Chinese, 489, 490; treatment of the merchant class, 490; views on Chinese immigration, 491; Chinese and European civilization compared, 491–495; supposed effect of conferring elective franchise upon the Chinese, 492; cause of hoodlumism, 495, 496.
Coolie, contractors, 1115, 1116.
definition of the term, 66, 760, 826, 942.
legislation in regard to importation of, 826.
traffic, 95–97, 101, 102, 109, 121–124, 383, 384, 757, 758–761, 939, 943.
Coolies, character of Chinese, 93.
Cope, Judge, 29.
Coryell, John R., a witness, 986, 987; former consular clerk in Shanghai, 986; character of Chinese women who come to this country, 986, 987; Page law, 987; duties of the consul in regard to shipment of prostitutes, 987.
Costume of the Chinese, 819.
Cotton, California, 567, 568, 614, 615.
Cordage, manufacture of, 617, 618.
Cortage, Edward L., a witness, 359–363; broom-maker, 359; personal experience as to low wages, 360; eastern prices compared, 360; Chinese competition, 361; opposition of mechanics to Chinese, 362.
Court, actions in, in which Chinese appear as parties, 744.
Courts, Chinese admitted to testify in the, 292.
perjury in the, 404, 749, 1086.
Crime among the Chinese, 144, 173, 1079.
protected by the Chinese, 232.
Criminals, Chinese, 189, 190, 875, 876.
Crocker, Charles, a witness, 666–668; railroad contractor, 666; construction of Central Pacific, 666, 667; effect of Chinese immigration, 667, 670; Chinese labor, 668, 676; habits of the Chinese, 668, 669; labor-strike of Chinese, 669; popular sentiment regarding Chinese, 671; sale of interest in Central Pacific, 672, 686; Oriental Steamship Line, 673; contract-labor, 674, 675; Chinese as voters, 679; feeling against Chinese, 680, 687; Chinese and white labor compared, 681, 682; Chinese competition, 683, 684; number of Chinese, 685.
Cubic-air ordinance, 47, 62, 154, 155, 201, 202, 205–208, 234, 235, 477, 1143–1145.
explanation of, 655, 659, 660.
Cunningham, T. A., view on the Chinese question, 1092.
Currency of China, 411, 412.
question, the effect of the, 962, 963.
Cutting & Co., 862.

Dairy labor, 545.
Dameron, James P., a witness, 1043–1059; lawyer, 1043; views on the difference of races, 1043–1049; Chinese language, 1049; brain capacity of different races, 1052; prostitution of Chinese women, 1053; effect of elective franchise on the Chinese, 1054; China trade, 1055; teachings of Confucius, 1056; form of Chinese government, 1056, 1057; Chinese incapable of self-government, 1058, 1059.
Davis, Horace, position of, on Chinese question, 41, 849.
Deal, Rev. David, a witness, 443, 444; memorial of Methodist Ministerial Association, 443, 444; success of missionary efforts among the Chinese, 444.
Dealers, character of Chinese as, 973.
Dealings, character of the Chinese in, 815, 887.
Debtors, Chinamen as, not allowed to return, 178, 179.
Debts, payment of, before returning to China, 82, 91.
Degroot, Henry, a witness, 1103–1114; miner, 1103; effect of Chinese as miners, 1103, 1104; Chinese quarter in mining-towns, 1104; effect of Chinese competition, 1105–1108; collection of foreign-miners' tax, 1108; employment of white labor, 1109–1111; Chinese mining-claims, 1111–1113; Chinese as hydraulic miners, 1113, 1114.
Demoralizing effect of Chinese, 1029.
Denicke Brothers, cigar-manufacturers, 319.
Deposits of gold in the mines, injurious effect upon, 366.
Dialects, Chinese, 98, 397, 407, 445.
Diet of Chinese, 74, 226, 793–795, 882, 883, 1077.
Diplomacy of the Chinese, 497, 498.
Diseases among prostitutes, (Chinese,) 14.
among white boys, 14.
venereal, 97.
Dishonesty of Chinese in China, 1127.
Displacement by Chinese of whites, 48, 80, 83, 533, 1064.
Disputes, Chinese, settled among themselves, 155, 156.
Dixon, Hepworth, opinion of Chinese quarter by, 327.
Docility of the Chinese, 885.
Domestic servants, Chinese as, 249, 505, 733, 798, 845, 846, 852, 853, 898, 1013, 1014.
white girls as, 572, 573, 773, 774, 811, 812.
scarcity of, in California, 595.
Doolittle, Rev. Mr., 13, 26.
Dore, J. P., death of, in China, 550.
Douglas, Charles D., a witness, 932–936; action of anti-cooly clubs in regard to employers of Chinese, 932–934; composition of anti-cooly clubs, 934; antagonism to the Chinese, 934, 935; objects of the anti-Chinese union, 936.
Durkee, John L., a witness, 997–1000; fire-marshal, 997; report on character of Chinese quarters regarding fire, 998; fires in Chinatown, 998–1000.
Dutch ship, incident of a, picked up at sea, 938.
Dwinelle, John W., a witness, 1067–1079; lawyer, 1067; non-assimilation of the Chinese, 1067; land-tilling system of California agriculture, 1067–1070, 1075; necessity of cheap capital, 1067, 1068, 1074; moral hybridism of the Chinese, 1070; injurious effect of cheap labor, 1070, 1071; character of the Chinese, 1071; effect of labor-saving machinery, 1072; cost of living in China, 1072, 1073; rates of wages, 1073, 1074; French peasantry, 1076, 1078; diet of the Chinese, 1077; French and Chinese literature compared, 1079.
Dwinelle, Samuel H., a witness, 747–753; district judge, 747; views on Chinese immigration, 747; conflict between Chinese and white labor, 747, 748, 750; opposition to the Chinese, 748; perjury in courts, 749; attitude of press on the Chinese question, 750, 752; popular feeling against Chinese, 751, 752.
Dye, William M., a witness, 660–666; insurance solicitor, 660; fires in the Chinese quarter, 661; settlement of losses with Chinese, 661; premium for Chinese insurance, 661, 662; refusal of companies to insure property of Chinese, 662, 664; laundry insurance, 663, 664; amount of insurance paid by Chinese, 666.

East, injurious effect of competition with the, 1024, 1025.
immigration from the, 88, 183, 184, 543, 544, 711, 792.
Easterby, Anthony W., a witness, 744–747; Fresno Navigation Company, 744; popular opinion on Chinese question, 745; character of Chinese as laborers, 745, 746.
Eastern immigration, effect of Chinese on, 543, 544, 588, 601, 606, 967, 1092
Ebb and flow of Chinese immigration, 515, 860.
Economy of Chinese, 224, 225, 460, 476.
Education among the Chinese, 114, 119, 296, 1121.
Effigy, burning of Rev. Otis Gibson in, 849, 850, 852.
Einstein Brothers, shoe-manufacturers, change from Chinese labor to white labor, 333.
Elders of Chinese towns, election and authority of, 502, 503.

Election and authority of Chinese elders, 502, 503.
Elective franchise, supposed effect of conferring, upon the Chinese, 492, 518, 1054, 1139–1141.
Elephantiasis common with Chinese, 13.
Ellis, Henry H., a witness, 156–173; chief of police, 156; arrests and convictions, 157, 158, 164; Chinese prostitutes, 159, 163; conversion of Chinese to Christianity, 159; Chinese quarter, 159–161, 168; Chinese population, 162, 167; Chinese tribunals, 165; hoodlums, 166, 170–173; crimes among the Chinese, 173.
Emigrants, class of, from China, 756, 757, 826, 885, 886, 920, 1096, 1098.
Employers, tyranny of Chinese, 347.
Employment, avenues of, opened by Chinese, 927, 928.
in Southern and Eastern States, 550, 551.
in San José, 553, 556.
of boys, 570, 571.
of Chinese, 448, 449, 454, 624–626, 628, 688, 689, 692, 693, 796, 799, 988–991, 1093.
of Chinese by large land-owners, 931.
of white labor, 765, 1014, 1015, 1060, 1061, 1064–1066, 1109–1111.
of whites and Chinese in San Francisco, tabular statements, 1206–1215,
Estates, effect of large landed, 783–785, 789, 790, 1033, 1034, 1039, 1040.
Estee, Morris M., a witness, 1000, 1010; lawyer, 1000; views on Chinese immigration, 1000, 1001, 1009; character of the Chinese, 1002, 1003; Chinese as citizens, 1003, 1004; the Chinaman and negro compared, 1004, 1005; protection of the Chinese, 1005, 1006; partial legislation against the Chinese, 1006; outrages upon the Chinese, 1007, 1008.
European immigration, 583.
Evans, West, a witness, 720–723; railroad construction, 720; white and Chinese labor compared, 720–722; opposition to the Chinese, 721.
Executive ability of the Chinese, 511.
Export of bullion, 536.
wheat, 777.
Exports of California, 536.
and imports, statistics of, 549.
from China and Japan, 549.

Factory operatives, Chinese as, 187.
Families, Chinese, in San Francisco, 22.
Farming in Alameda County, 799.
in California, 589.
Farms, desirability of division of large, 614.
size of, in California, 843.
Fees, consular, 93. 888–891.
Female children, destruction of, in China, 13, 68, 411, 419
sale of, in China, 236, 237, 410, 762.
Female industries in San Francisco, 244, 245, 247, 251.
Fence laws, 843.
Fidelity of Chinese to contracts, 831, 903, 904.
Field, Judge, decision of, 15, 29, 177.
Fire, report on character of Chinese quarters regarding, 998.
Fires in Chinese quarter, 61, 644, 661, 972, 973, 998–1000.
Five Points, comparison between Chinese quarters and, 20.
Food used by Chinese, 74, 226, 793–795, 882, 883, 1125.
Foreign immigration, comparison between Chinese and other, 509, 511, 541, 542;
missions to Chinese, annual report of, in Presbyterian Church, 1177, 1181.
Foreigners, treatment of, in China, 858.
Foulke, Lewis M., a witness, 1128–1135; supervisor of internal revenue, 1128; views on Chinese immigration, 1129, 1131; frauds on internal revenue by Chinese, 1129; income tax paid by Chinese, 1129, 1130; popular sentiment on Chinese immigration, 1130, 1131; character of Chinese labor, 1131, 1132; Chinese as citizens, 1133; the Chinaman and negro compared, 1133–1135.
Fourth of July (1850) celebration by Chinese, 12.
Francis, Rev. John, a witness, 484–489; mission work among the Chinese, 485, 486; character of the Chinese, 486; the wearing of queues, 487; conversion of Chinese to Christianity, 488; proportionate ages of Chinese in this country, 489.
Free labor, definition of, 270.
Fresno Navigation Company, 744.
Fruit-dealers, Chinese as, 861
Fruit-raising, 560, 561, 620, 796.
advantages of Chinese labor in, 571.
Fry, Colonel, employment of Chinese by, 517.

Fuhkien dialect, 396, 397.
Fung Shuy, spiritualism, 945, 946.

Gallagher, Mr., 24.
Gallego, Romulus C., a witness, 1063, 1066; bag manufacturer, 1063; employment of white labor, 1064–1066; inroads of Chinese into fields occupied by white labor, 1064; white and Chinese labor compared, 1066.
Gambling, Chinese, 10, 151, 191, 192, 196, 222, 224, 240, 309, 829.
Gardeners, Chinese as, 739.
Garroting, 190.
George, Henry, a witness, 275–290; effect of Chinese employment on white labor, 275; rate of wages, 276–278, 282, 283; Chinese labor as compared with labor-saving machinery, 278–279; cheap labor as compared with free trade, 279–280; condition of the white laboring classes, 281–282; trades-unions, 283; treaty with China, 284–285; Chinese competition, 286; ultimate effect of Chinese immigration, 287; Chinese as citizens, 287–288; comparison between the Chinaman and negro, 289; Chinese learning, 289.
Gibbs, Cornelius B. S., a witness, 530–532; adjuster of marine losses, 530; character of Chinese merchants, 530–531; cleanliness of Chinese houses, 531.
Gibbs, Frederick A., a witness, 199–219; supervisor, 199; lepers, 199–201, 202–205; prostitution among the Chinese, 199; cubic-air ordinance, 201, 202, 205–208; health of Chinatown, 208; Chinese quarter, 209, 211, 213, 219; use of opium, 211; Chinese prostitutes, 212; Chinese sick, 213.
Gibson, Rev. Otis, a witness, 145, 146; 396–436; 496–504; 512; translation of Chinese contracts for prostitution, 145, 146; missionary in China, 396; Fuhkien dialect, 396, 397; Sam-yup and Se-yup dialects, 397; return of Chinese prostitutes, 397; views on Asiatic and European immigration, 398; effect of Chinese on value of real estate, 398; reduction of wages by Chinese labor, 398, 399; manufacturing enterprises, 400; Chinese schools, 401; Chinese civilization, 401, 402, 413, 499; prison-statistics, 402; industrial-school report, 403; alms-house report, 403; hospital report, 403, morals of the Chinese, 403; perjury in the courts, 404; voluntary immigration of Chinese, 404, 405; cleanliness of the Chinese, 405, 412; marriage among the Chinese, 405, 409, 416; Chinese Six Companies, 405, 406, 420; Chinese character, 406, 407, 432; dialects, 407; scholarship, 407; progress of China in the arts, 408; method of printing in China, 408; religion of the Chinese, 408; sale of female infants, 410; infanticide, 411, 419; land transportation in China done by human beings, 411; habits of living in China, 411, 412; currency of China, 411, 412; the work of christianizing Chinese, 413–415, 429; Chinese boat-people, 415; condition of Shanghai in 1862, 416; structure of Chinese government, 417, 418, 502, 503; honesty of Chinese compradors, 419; tea-tasters, 419; character of lorchas in coasting trade, 421; treatment of missionaries in China, 422; American and Asiatic labor compared, 423–426, 434, 435; slavery unknown in China, 428; labor contracts, 428, 429; explanation of property owned in Chinatown, 430, 431; opium-smoking among the Chinese, 431, 432; Chinese children refused admission to the public schools, 432, 433; mission schools, 433; missionaries in China, 434; reasons why Chinese immigration should be restricted, 435, 496, 497; supposed effect of naturalization upon Chinamen, 435, 436; modes suggested for restricting Chinese immigration, 497; treatment of Americans in China, 497; diplomacy of the Chinese, 497, 498; feeling of Chinese government in regard to immigration, 497, 498; comprehension of American institutions by Chinese, 498; plurality of wives in China, 499; religion of the Chinese, 500–502, 512; comparison between Chinese and French peasantry, 500, 501; worship of images, 502; intellectual capacity of Chinese, 502; election and authority of Chinese elders, 502, 503; outrages upon Chinese, 503; comparison of Chinese literature with the French, 504; burned in effigy, 849.
Gillespie, Robert H., a witness, 356–359; broom-maker, 356; wages of Chinese compared with white labor, 356, 357; shipment of brooms to foreign ports, 358.
Gilroy factory, employment of white labor in, 316.
Ginseng, 99, 618.
Girls, bearing of the Chinese toward the, 340.
employment of, in fitting (shoe) department, 339.
scarcity of servant, in California, 595.
Glascock, Judge, view of political aspect of Chinese question, 706, 707.
Government of China discourages emigration, 10, 71.
Grain-bags, importation of, 801.
Grants, Mexican, in California, 780.
Graves of Chinamen in the San Francisco cemetery, 932.
Gray, Giles H., a witness, 387–396; surveyor of the port, 387; explanation of Page bill, 387, 388; importation of Chinese women, 388–392, 396; views upon Chinese immigration, 393; enforcement of Page law, 394–396.

Habits of the Chinese, 668, 669, 697, 698, 819.
Haight, Henry H., a witness, 290–300; former governor of California, 290; political and moral objections to the Chinese, 290, 291; Chinese as citizens, 291, 292; Chinese admitted to testify in the courts, 292; compared with the negroes, 293, 294; civilization of China, 294, 295; education of the Chinese, 296; literature, 297; government of China, 297, 298; religion of the Chinese, 298; Chinese as witnesses, 299; treatment of Chinese, 300.
Hart, Henry, a witness, 883–893; agent Pacific Mail Steamship Company, 883; mode in which Chinese emigrate from China, 883, 884; character of the Chinese as emigrants, 885, 886; Chinese as sailors, 885; docility of the Chinese, 885, 893; fairness of the Chinese in dealing, 887; number of Chinese on each ship, 887; stowaways, 887, 888; consular fees, 888–891; Chinese as passengers, 891–893.
Hastings, S. Clinton, a witness, 585–598; former chief-justice of the supreme court, 585; influence of Chinese, 586; admixture of the races, 586, 587, 590; irrepressible conflict between whites and Chinese, 587; Chinese should be excluded, 588; effect on eastern immigration, 588; farming in California, 589: prejudice against Chinese, 589; servility of Chinese labor, 590, 591, 596; peonage, 591; contract-labor, 591, 592; Chinese Six Companies, 593; Chinese voters, 593; civilization of the Chinese, 594; character of Chinese merchants, 595; scarcity of servant-girls in California, 595; injury of lateral railroads, 596–598.
Hayes, Miss Maggie, a witness, 338–341; assistant foreman in shoe-factory, 338; employment of girls in the fitting department, 339; bearing of the Chinese, toward the girls, 340; filthy habits of the Chinese, 340.
Hayes, Michael, a witness, 365, 366; white and Chinese labor in the mines compared, 365; injurious effect of Chinese upon deposits of gold in the mines, 366.
Haymond, Mr., chairman State senate committee on Chinese immigration, 9.
Haywood, sentiment of people of, in regard to Chinese question, 1092, 1093.
Health-officer of San Francisco, 126.
Health of the Chinese, 644.
Heydenfeldt, Solomon, a witness, 504–512; former associate justice of the supreme court, 504; material advantage of Chinese labor, 504; honesty of the Chinese, 504; necessity of Chinese labor, 505; character as domestic servants, 505; views on foreign immigration, 506–508; intermixture of races, 508, 509; comparison between Chinese and other foreign immigrants, 509, 511; character of Chinese merchants, 509, 510; supposed effect of citizenship upon the Chinese, 10; executive ability of the Chinese, 511; comprehension of our institutions by the Chinese, 511; contract-labor, 511.
Heynemann, Herman, a witness, 532–542; importer and manufacturer, 532; Chinese labor displaced by whites, 533; necessity of Chinese labor originally, 533; character of the Chinese as operatives, 534; Chinese labor free, 534; feeling of laboring-class against Chinese, 535, 538; effect of Chinese immigration upon white labor, 535; exports of California, 536; export of bullion, 536; Chinese immigration governed by demand for labor, 537; competition of Chinese, 537, 538; manufacture of bags, 539; comparison between labor-saving machinery and cheap labor, 540, 541; Chinese compared with other foreign immigrants, 541, 542.
Highbinders, 94.
Hill, John H., a witness, 796, 797; fruit-raising, 796; employment of Chinese, 796; popular sentiment in Sonoma County on Chinese question, 797.
Hip-yo-tung, 150, 152–154, 230.
Hollister, William W., a witness, 766–795, 843, 844, 931, 932; farmer, 766; labor question in California, 767, 775; wages of labor, 768, 778, 779; ruinous course of agriculture in California, 769, 777; Chinese as citizens, 772; opium-smoking among the Chinese, 772, 773; opposition to the Chinese, 773; white domestic servants, 773, 774; character of the Chinese, 774; character of white laborers, 775, 781; effect of railroads on the settlement of California, 776, 777; export of wheat, 777; Mexican grants, 780; competition of Chinese labor, 781, 789; effect of large landed estates, 783–785, 789, 790; bummerism, 786, 787, 792, 794; necessity of cheap labor, 789; construction of Central Pacific Railroad, 790; advantages of physical labor, 791; eastern immigrants, 792; diet of the Chinese, 793–795; character of early miners, 793; size of farms in California, 843; fence-laws, 843; employment of Chinese by large land-owners, 931; letter on Chinese question, 1197–1202.
Homestead law, 16, 63.
Honesty of the Chinese, 87, 504.
Hong, definition of, 831.
Hong-Kong, Chinese sail via, 21, 66.
Hoodlum (Holung) Billy, 17.
Hoodlumism, cause of, 495, 496.
Hoodlums, 166, 170–173, 190, 234, 974.
Hop-culture, 624, 625.

Horner, John M., a witness, 799-801, 822-825; farming in Alameda County, 799; employment of Chinese labor, 799; wages of labor, 800; views on Chinese immigration, 800, 801; defense of Chinese labor, 822-824; Chinese as a labor-machine, 824, 825.
Hospital report, 403.
Hospitals among the Chinese, 130, 131, 192, 193, 225, 646, 647.
Hostility to the Chinese, 373, 535, 538, 603. (See, also, Popular sentiment regarding the Chinese question.)
House-servants, wages of, 43.
How Qua, merchant, 840.
portrait-painter, 840.
How Sin, 27.
Hown, Lee Ming, 27.
Hukahs, definition of, 482.
Human life, regard for, among the Chinese, 239.
Humphreys, Mrs. Henry J., a witness, 343, 344; general working-woman, 343; Chinese competition in making ladies' underwear, 343; lack of employment for white women, 343, 344; manufacture of night-gowns, 344.
Humphrey, Patrick H., a witness, 940, 941; quarantine-officer, 940; introduction of small-pox into San Francisco, 940, 941.
Hyatt, Thomas H., a witness, 753-763; formerly United States consul at Amoy, 754; the Chinese problem, 754, 755; class of emigrants from China, 756, 757; cooly-traffic, 757, 758-761; Chinese and white labor compared, 758; definition of cooly, 760; sale of female children in China, 762; trade with China, 763.
Hybridism, moral, of the Chinese, 1070.
Hydraulic miners, Chinese as, 1113, 1114.

Idleness of the Chinese, 309.
Images, worship of, by Chinese, 502.
Immigrants, character of Chinese, 1096, 1098.
comparison between Chinese and other foreign, 509, 511.
eastern, 792.
Immigration, character of, from the East, 88, 183, 184, 543, 544, 711.
ebb and flow of Chinese, 515, 860.
effect of Chinese, 18, 19, 20, 33, 34, 43, 44, 65, 66, 75, 77, 81, 84, 85, 88, 90, 91, 287, 303, 308, 309, 312, 571, 575, 576, 584, 667, 670, 863.
effect of Chinese, in other countries, 1114, 1115.
effect of Chinese upon, from the East, 543, 544, 601, 606.
facility of Chinese, 370, 371.
governed by demand for labor, 514, 516, 519, 537, 600, 601.
possibility of increased, 520, 521, 859.
views upon Chinese, 71, 72, 173-178, 273, 373, 398, 435, 462-470, 491, 496, 497 506-508, 518, 543-545, 624, 708-710, 729, 733, 737, 747, 766, 800, 801, 906 907, 917, 951, 958, 961, 1000, 1001, 1009, 1018, 1019, 1129, 1131, 1138, 1139.
white labor prevented by Chinese, 322, 323.
yearly increase of Chinese, 75, 76, 77, 743.
Immoral habits of the Chinese, 1095.
Imperial government of China, 119.
Improvements, opposition to new, 50.
Income-tax paid by Chinese, 1129, 1130.
Increased Chinese immigration, possibilities of, 520, 521, 859.
Inducements for Chinese to come to this country, 833, 834, 911, 1118, 1124, 1125.
to Chinese to return to China, 948.
Industrial pursuits monopolized by Chinese, 1167-1169.
Industries, how Chinese labor affects, 57.
female, of San Francisco, 244, 245, 247, 251.
Industry of the Chinese, 70, 224, 225, 544.
Infanticide, 411, 419.
Influence of Chinese, 586, 881.
labor, 902, 918, 919.
Influences, Protestant, upon the Chinese, 245, 248.
Influx of Chinese, apprehension of, 1019.
Inoculation compulsory in China, 21.
practiced by Chinese, 21.
Inspectors of Chinese, 137
Institutions, Chinese regard for American, 16, 17.
comprehension of American, by Chinese, 498, 511.
Insurance, amount of, paid by Chinese, 666.
laundry, 663, 664.
losses, settlement of, with Chinese, 661.

Insurance, premium for Chinese, 661, 662.
rates of, effect of the presence of Chinese upon, 969.
Insurers of property, Chinese as, 969, 970.
Intellectual capacity of the Chinese, 462, 502.
Intention of Chinese to return to China, 16, 17, 385, 446, 636, 637, 839, 948.
Internal revenue, frauds on, by Chinese, 1129.
Interpreters, Chinese, in court, 275.
Interrogatories propounded by the joint committee, 2, 3.
Irish, condition of, peasantry, 387.
population, 1035, 1041, 1043.

Jackson, Thomas W., a witness, 1121–1128; foreign commission-agent, 1121; education of Chinese, 1121; want of cleanliness of the Chinese, 1122, 1126; influence of Christianity upon Chinese, 1122–1124; functions of a comprador, 1123; population of China, 1124; inducements for Chinese to come to California, 1124, 1125; food and clothing of Chinese, 1125; local government of Chinese towns, 1125, 1126; suffrage among Chinese, 1126; dishonesty of Chinese in China, 1127; Singapore, 1128.
Japan, Chinese in, 1117.
Japanese and Chinese compared, 929, 930, 983, 984.
Java, Chinese in, 1021, 1025.
Jersey cattle, 546.
Jessup, William H., a witness, 816–822; match-manufacturing, 816; experience in the employment of white boys, 816, 817, 819; labor of girls, 817; Chinese labor, 817, 818, 820; habits of the Chinese as to cleanliness, 819; dress of the Chinese, 819; treatment of the Chinese, 820, 821; character of the Chinese, 821; cheap labor a necessity for competition, 821, 822.
Jones, Charles T., a witness, 1079–1086; district attorney of Sacramento, 1079; crime among the Chinese, 1079; secret tribunals among the Chinese, 1080–1085; trial of American citizens in China, 1085; perjury in courts, 1086.
Jones, Simon L., a witness, 815, 816; auctioneer, 815; character of the Chinese in their dealings, 815; merchant class of Chinese, 816.
Joss-papers, burning of, 16.
Journal of the commission, 1–8.
Joy, Capt. R. H., 25.
Judge of municipal criminal court, testimony of, 272.
Juries, partiality of, 912, 914, 916.
Jurymen, inability of Chinese to become, 19.

King, CameronH., argument of, on behalf of the anti-cooly clubs of the city, 31, 34; views on Chinese immigration, 32; population of Chinese in California, 32; Chinese contracts, 22; prostitution of Chinese women, 33; Chinese modes of living, 33; Chinese competition, 33.
a witness, 261–272; constitution of anti-Chinese union, 261–264; degrading tendency of Chinese labor, 264, 266; proscription of persons employing Chinese, 265; Chinese competition, 267–269; definition of free labor, 270; Chinese civilization, 271; condition of the white laboring class in San Francisco, 272.
King, Thomas H., meeting of, with Mr. Gibson in China, 108, 421, 422.
a witness, 92–126, 1114–1121; merchant, 92; character of Chinese coolies, 93; highbinders, 94; assassinations among the Chinese, 94; cooly-traffic, 95–97, 101, 102, 109, 121–124; Chinese prostitutes, 96, 109–111; small-pox, 96, 105–107; venereal diseases, 97; Chinese dialects, 98; ginseng, 99; trade with China, 100, 120; Chinese gamblers, 101; opium smuggling, 103; Chinese labor, 104; Chinese six companies, 111–114, 125; education among the Chinese, 114, 119; profanity of Chinese, 115; Chinese pirates, 116; imperial government of China, 119; small-footed women, 124; Chinese warfare, 124; effect of Chinese immigration in other countries, 1114, 1115; cooly-contractors, 1115, 1116; Koopmanschap's engagements with Chinese, 1116; Chinese in Japan, 1117; inducements for Chinese to come to this country, 1118; Chinese competition in living, 1118–1121.
Kirkpatrick, John, a witness, 974–976; former sheriff of Sierra County, 974; collection of foreign miners' tax, 975, 976.
Koopmanschap's engagement with Chinese, 1116.

Labor, American and Asiatic, compared, 423–426, 434, 435.
character of, performed by Chinese, 17, 18, 80, 104, 607, 613, 614, 668, 676, 817, 818, 820, 994, 995, 1131, 1132.

Labor, character of, white, 608, 626, 627, 775, 781.
cheap, as compared with free trade, 279, 280.
Chinese, as compared with labor-saving machinery, 278, 279, 824, 825, 992–994.
Chinese convict, 347.
comparison between Chinese and slave, 82, 289, 293, 294, 942, 953, 955, 956, 969.
conflict between Chinese and white, 747, 748, 750.
contract, 428, 429, 445, 446, 470, 511, 554–556, 580, 591, 592, 674, 675, 970, 971.
danger of, when of different race from capitalists, 1021, 1022.
defense of, 822–824.
definition of free, 270.
degrading tendency of Chinese, 264, 266, 322, 323.
demand for, 845.
effect of Chinese, 953, 966, 967, 982, 985, 1070, 1071.
effect of Chinese employment on white, 350, 351, 352, 275, 438, 439, 741, 742, 971, 972.
efficiency of white, compared with Chinese, 363, 365, 379, 681, 682, 720–722, 758, 1066.
employment of Chinese, (see Employment.)
general views on, in California, 767, 775.
influence of Chinese, 902, 918, 919.
interests, 1030.
lack of employment for white, 988.
material advantages of Chinese, 54, 55, 450, 451, 458, 504, 515–517, 524, 529, 556–558, 561, 708, 855, 970.
necessities of cheap, 789, 802, 821, 822.
necessity of Chinese, 505, 789.
necessity originally for Chinese, 533.
not a surplus of, in the State, 91.
of Chinese free, 83, 534.
of girls, 817.
possibility of dispensing with Chinese, 1027.
reliability of Chinese, 437, 438, 440.
respectability of, in China, 71.
saving machinery, the effect of, 1072.
servility of Chinese, 376, 590, 591, 596.
strike of Chinese, 669.
superiority of white, 301, 302.
unreliability of Chinese, 303, 307.
wages for, 768, 778, 779, 800.
want of, in California, 39.
white and Chinese, in the mines compared, 365.
views on Chinese, in California, 978, 979.
Laborers, Chinese, character of, 17, 18, 33, 40, 43, 45, 78, 80, 91, 104, 257–259, 554, 558, 621, 745, 746, 1031.
condition of white, in California, 51, 272, 281, 282, 719, 811, 834.
difficulty of obtaining, 40, 79.
importation of European, 1101, 1102.
wages of, in Canton, 67.
wages of, in San Francisco, 84.
wages of, in State, 182, 183, 185,
Laboring-classes, condition of the white, 1027.
feeling of, against Chinese, 373, 535, 538, 680, 687, 701.
Lake, Delos, a witness, 1010–1014; lawyer, judicial positions, 1010; restrictive legislation desirable, 1010; non-assimilation of the Chinese, 1010, 1011; Chinese as citizens 1011; inability of the law to punish outrages upon Chinese, 1012; popular opinion in regard to Chinese, 1012; Chinese as domestic servants, 1013, 1014.
Lancaster, Charles S., a witness, 341–343; shoemaker, 341; effect of Chinese labor upon emigration of white shoemakers from the East, 341; former prices for making shoes, 342; Chinese shoe factories, 342; reduction of wages, 342, 343.
Land-killing system of California agriculture, 1067–1070, 1075
Land-owners, employment of Chinese by large, 931.
Land transportation in China done by human beings, 411.
holders, Chinese as, 455, 580, 581, 731, 732, 955.
Lands of the State, 906.
Language, Chinese, 1028, 1049.
Laundry business carried on by Chinese, 717, 718.
insurance, 663, 664.
ordinance, 479.
Laundrymen, Chinese as, 735.

Learning, Chinese, 89, 289.
Leby, Mr., employment of Chinese by, 517.
Legislation, class, 34, 38, 62, 63.
in regard to cooly importation, 826.
partial, against the Chinese, 1006.
Legislative committee, report of, in 1862, on Chinese population, 743, 744.
Leprosy among Chinese, 13, 131, 132, 180, 182, 199–201, 202–205, 646, 1100.
Lessler, Morris, a witness, 930, 931, 932; statistics in regard to Chinese in manufactories, 930; graves of Chinamen in the San Francisco cemetery, 932.
Licenses paid by Chinese, 479, 480, 893–897.
Lin Sing vs. Washburn, 29.
Li Po Tai, Chinese physician, 227, 228.
Literature, Chinese, 297.
comparison of Chinese literature with the French, 504, 1079.
Living, Chinese competition in, 1118–1121.
Chinese standard of, 877, 878.
cost of, in California, 1033.
cost of, in China, 411, 412, 1072, 1073.
Logan, Dr. Thomas M., letter addressed to Dr. Stout, 863, 864.
Loomis, Rev. Augustus W., a witness, 444–484; missionary in China, 445; immigration from Canton province, 445; distinct dialects, 445; character of the Chinese who come to California, 445; modes of paying passage money, 445; labor-contracts, 445, 446, 470; temporary sojourn of Chinese in this country, 446; six Chinese companies, 446–448, 473; employment of the Chinese, 448, 449, 454; morals of the Chinese immigrant, 449, 450; advantages of Chinese labor, 450, 451, 458; Chinese prostitutes, 452, 456, 457; taxes paid by Chinese, 452; Christian influences upon Chinese, 453, 454, 457–459, 465; Chinese as land-holders, 455; religion of the Chinese, 455; treaty with China, 456, 461, 482; Chinese as citizens, 456; secondary wives, 457; sanitary and social condition of the Chinese, 459, 460; scholarship, 460; economical habits of the Chinese, 460, 476; treatment of the Chinese in California, 460, 461, 471, 473, 483; intellectual capacity of the Chinese, 462; views upon Chinese immigration, 462–470; advantages of trade with China, 474; smuggling by Chinese, 475, 476; text of cubic-air law, 477; law imposing miners' tax on foreigners, 477, 478, 482; Chinese as witnesses, 478; laundry ordinance, 479; queue ordinance, 479; licenses paid by Chinese, 479, 480; tax paid by Chinese on personal property, 480, 484; poll-tax, 483; threatening letters, 1181.
Lorchas in coasting trade, character of, 421.
Los Angeles, murder of Chinese at, 1140.
employment of Chinese in, 1141.
Loss, comparison of, in dealings with whites and Chinese, 555, 559.
Losses by Chinese, 45.
Lottery drawings, 309–311.
Louderback, David, a witness, 187, 190; attorney and judge of police court, 187; Chinese criminals, 187, 190; garroting, 190; hoodlumism, 190.
Low, F. F., a witness, 65–92; banker, 65; formerly member of Congress, collector of port of San Francisco, governor of California, and minister to China, 65; views on Chinese immigration, 65, 66, 71–73, 75, 76, 86, 88; prostitution, 67; marriage customs in China, Chinese religion, 69; similarity between Buddhism and Catholicism, 69, 70; treatment of Americans in China, 73; population of China, 74; construction of Central Pacific by Chinese labor, 77, 79; views on labor question, 81–85; laws relative to emigration, 85, 86; commerce with China, 89, 90.

Macao, population of, 107.
Macondray, Frederick W., a witness, 853–860; Chinese trade, 853, 854; character of Chinese merchants, 853; physical condition of the Chinese, 854; passage-money of the Chinese, 855, 859; material advantage of the Chinese, 855; arrivals of Chinese, 856, 857; Cantonese boatmen, 857; treatment of foreigners in China, 858; possibilities of increased Chinese immigration, 859; ebb and flow of Chinese immigration, 860.
Mahony, Cornelius A., a witness, 382–387; employment of Chinese in Peru, 382, 383; crimes committed among the Chinese in Peru, 383; cooly traffic, 383, 384; physical condition of the Chinese, 384; inclination to return to China, 385; disregard of the sick, 385; peons and cholos, 386; Peruvian government, 387; condition of Irish peasantry, 387.
Male children, custom relative to, 68.
Manufactories, statistics in regard to Chinese in, 930.
Manufactures, California, 1026.
Manufacturing enterprises, 400.
apathy of the people in regard to home, 802–804, 813–815.
advantages of home, 815.

Manufacturing enterprises, number of Chinese engaged in, 252, 253.
Marriage, system of, by Chinese, 13, 68, 405–409, 416.
Married women, law of China forbidding immigration of, 30.
Marshall, Levin, a witness, 351–354; tailor, 351; injurious effect of Chinese competition, 352; wages formerly paid to tailors, 352; early clothing manufacturing in California, 353, 354.
Mass-meeting, anti-cooly, 849–851.
Match manufacturing, 816.
Mayor of San Francisco, testimony of, 180.
McCarty, Dennis, a witness, 363–365; boot-maker, 363; United Workingmen's Co-operative Association, 363, 364; efficiency of white labor compared with Chinese, 363, 365.
McCoppin, Frank, (representing the senate of the State of California,) argument against Chinese immigration, 9–11; resolution of senate of California, 9; Chinese population, 10; views of Chinese immigation, 10, 11; property owned by Chinese, 10; prostitution and gambling among the Chinese, 10.
McHenry, John, a witness, 930; lawyer, 930; political aspect of Chinese question, 930.
McLennan, Donald, a witness, 606–616; manufactures, 606; character of Chinese labor, 607, 613, 614; character of white labor, 608; advantage of Chinese in preventing strikes, 609; extension of Chinese quarter, 610–612; arrivals of Chinese, 611; division of large farms desirable, 614; California cotton, 614, 615.
Meares, John L., a witness, 126–143; health-officer of San Francisco, 126; Chinese tenements, 126, 129, 130, 137; small-pox, 127–129, 133–135, 138, 139, 141, 143; opium-smoking, 130, 133, 135, 136; hospitals among the Chinese, 130, 131; leprosy, 131, 132; Chinese quarter, 136; inspectors of Chinese, 137; Chinese prostitution, 140, 142, 143.
Mechanics, white, work with Chinese, 335.
opposition of, to Chinese, 362, 721.
Mellon, John, a witness, 300–308; farmer, 300; superiority of white labor, 301, 302; wages of labor, 302, 304–306; injurious effects of Chinese immigration, 303, 308; unreliability of Chinese labor, 303, 307.
Merchants, character of Chinese, 509, 510, 530, 531, 542, 544, 595, 602, 763, 797, 816, 853. 937.
enterprise of Chinese, 198.
treatment of the Chinese, 490.
Methodist Ministerial Association, memorial of, 443, 444.
Mexican grants in California, 780.
Mission-schools, 433.
Missionaries in China, 434.
treatment of, 422.
Missionary efforts, success of, among the Chinese, 444, 485, 486.
Miller, Judge, opinion of, 29.
Miners, character of the early, 793.
Chinese as, 545, 546, 1103, 1104.
Chinese as hydraulic, 1113, 1114.
Miners' tax, collection of foreign, 603, 975, 976, 1108.
law imposing, on foreigners, 477, 478 482.
Mines, jumping claims in the, 914, 915.
Mining claims, Chinese, 1111–1113.
towns, Chinese quarter in, 1104.
Modes of living by Chinese, 19, 21, 22, 33.
Mohawks of London, 190.
Molders' union, competition with, 1014, 1015.
Money, value of, 186.
Monterey County, petitions from, 1086, 1087.
Moral condition of Chinese, 12, 403.
hybridism of Chinese, 1070.
Moral and political objections to the Chinese, 290, 291.
Morals of China, 236.
Chinese immigrants, 449, 450.
San Francisco, 1031, 1037, 1038.
Morgenthau, Max, a witness, 801–815; manufacturer, 801; importation of grain-bags, 801; cheap labor a necessity in manufacturing, 802; apathy of the people in regard to home-manufacturing enterprises, 802–804, 813–815; experience with a tailor, 803, 804; Chinese as boot-makers, 805; cigar-trade, 805, 806; candle-trade, 806–808; 810, 813, 814; wages paid to factory hands, 808, 809; character of the white working-classes, 811; non-assimilation of the Chinese, 811; servant-girls, 811, 812; Chinese quarter, 812, 813; advantages of home manufacturing, 815.
Morrison, Judge, decision of, 29, 176.
Mortality, 645.
Mustard, Chinese trick in pulling, 1095.

Muther, Frank, a witness, 312–321; cigar-maker, 312; number of Chinese cigar-makers in San Francisco, 312, 313; wages of cigar-makers, 313, 314; cigar-manufacture as compared with the East, 313; uncleanly habits of Chinese cigar-makers, 314, 315; bribery of foremen by Chinese to drive out white labor, 315; mode of learning the trade among whites, 315; nationality of cigar-makers of San Francisco, 316; white cigar-makers prevented from coming to California on account of the Chinese, 316, 317; mode of learning the trade among Chinese, 317; Chinese controlled by the six companies, 318; refusal of manufacturers to employ married men, 318, 319; mode of distinguishing cigars made by white labor, 319; stamp used on boxes, 320.

Natural qualities of the Chinese, 1061.
Naturalization laws, 954, 964, 965, 968, 968.
supposed effect of upon Chinamen, 435, 436, 442, 1020.
Negroes, Chinese compared with the, 82, 289, 293, 294, 942, 953, 955, 956, 969, 1004, 1036, 1037, 1133–1135.

Nirvana, 69.
Norton, Judge, 29.

Oath, Chinese regard for an, 13.
O'Donnell, Charles C., a witness, 1095–1100; physician, 1095; immoral habits of the Chinese, 1095; introduction of small-pox into San Francisco, 1095–1097; character of Chinese immigrants, 1096, 1098; popular sentiment in regard to Chinese, 1097; syphilis engendered by Chinese among white boys, 1097, 1098; attitude of republican party on Chinese question, 1099; Chinese lepers, 1100.
Olmsted, William N., a witness, 825–842; merchant, 825; trade with China, 825, 832; signification of the word "cooly," 826; classes of Chinese, 826; legislation in regard to cooly importation, 826; means by which Chinese obtain passage-money, 827, 828; gambling in China, 829; prostitution in China, 829, 830; foreign residents of open ports, 830; business of the comprador, 830, 831; faithfulness of Chinese contracts, 831; definition of "hong," 831; firm-names, 831; cost of living in China, 833; inducements for Chinese to come to this country, 833, 834; character of white laboring classes, 834–836, 838, 839; Chinese competition, 836–838; inclination of Chinese to return to China, 839; Chinese wives, 839, 840; charter-parties, 841, 842.
Opium, use of, by the Chinese, 61, 130, 133, 135, 136, 211, 221, 222, 431, 432, 772, 773, 870.
smoke of, a disinfectant, 61;
smuggling, 103.
Opposition to the Chinese, 680, 687, 701, 721, 748, 751, 752, 773.
Order of Caucasians, 1088–1090.
Oriental and Occidental Steamship Company, 599, 673.
Origin of Chinese race, 1224–1241.
Outrages committed by Chinese, 232.
upon Chinese, 503, 649–651, 706, 913, 1007, 1008.
inability of the law to punish, 1012.

Pacific Mail Steamship Company, 24, 82, 83, 763.
Railroad, California, 844.
Page bill, explanation of, 387, 388,
enforcement of, 394–396, 987.
Passage to China, cost of, 10, 15, 855, 859.
from China, cost of, 520.
money, mode of paying, 445.
means by which Chinese obtain, 827, 828.
Passengers, Chinese as, 891–893, 937.
Patriotism of the Chinese, 907, 908.
Patterson, James, a witness, 1060, 1061; saw-manufacturer, 1060; employment of white labor, 1060, 1061.
Paupers, Chinese, 331.
Peasantry, comparison between Chinese and French, 500, 501.
condition of Irish, 387.
French, 1076, 1078.
Peck, Charles S., a witness, 728–732; drayman, 728; views on Chinese immigration, 729; competition of Chinese labor, 730; Chinese as land-owners, 731, 732.
Peckham, Robert F., a witness, 552–568; woolen manufacturer, 552; employment of Chinese in San José, 553, 556; wages paid to Chinamen, 553; experience with white boys, 553, 554; character of Chinese as laborers, 554, 558; labor-contracts, 554–556; comparison of loss in dealings with whites and Chinese, 555, 558; material advantage of Chinese immigration, 556–558, 561; wages paid to labor in California and the East compared, 557; fruit-raising, 560, 561; effect of Chinese upon our civilization, 562; competition with eastern manufactures, 563–565; products originally brought from the East, 566, 567; California cotton, 567, 568.

Peking, character of, 20.
Peon, definition of, 386.
Peonage, 591.
Peons and cholos, 386.
Perjury in the courts, 404, 749, 1086.
Persecution of the Chinese, 367, 369, 370.
Peru, crimes committed among the Chinese in, 383.
employment of Chinese in, 382, 383–1135, 1137.
government of, 387.
Peterson, Charles H., a witness, 1086–1090; petitions from Monterey County, 1086, 1087; Order of Caucasians, 1088–1090.
Phillips, Stephen H., a witness, 976, 986; former attorney-general of the Sandwich Islands, 976; contract-labor of Chinese in Sandwich Islands, 976, 977, 979, 981, 983; character of population in California, 977; Chinese labor in California, 978, 979; marriage of Chinese to Hawaiian women, 979; absentee system of American inhabitants of the Sandwich Islands, 980, 982; effect of cheap labor, 982, 985; Chinese and Japanese compared, 983, 984; Chinese as citizens, 984; wages paid to Chinese in Sandwich Islands, 986.
Photographs, identification of Chinese prostitutes, 1142, 1143.
Phthisis and scrofula, 870.
Physical condition of Chinese, 14, 384, 643, 854.
labor, advantages of, 791.
Physicians, Chinese, 227, 228.
Physiological necessities of prostitution, 655, 656.
Pigeon English, 942, 943.
Pirates, Chinese, 25, 116.
adventure with, 345.
Pixley, Frank M., (representing the municipality of San Francisco,) argument against Chinese immigration, 11, 31; population of Chinese, 12, 26; religion, 13, 26, 27; system of marriage, 13, 22; diseases among the Chinese, 13. 14; manner of taking an oath, 13; prostitution, 14; manner of immigration, 15, 16; a Chinese competence, 16; superstition and custom of burial, 16; homesteads, 16; citizenship, 17; kind of labor performed by Chinese, 17; their character as laborers, 17, 18; learning trades, 18; rate of wages, 18; effect of immigration, 19, 20; modes of living, 19–21; sanitary condition of the Chinese, 20, 21; small-pox, 21; source of Chinese immigration, 21; number and character of Chinese women, 22; Chinese companies, 23; condition of Chinese before coming here, 24, 26; commerce between the United States and China, 28; power of a State to prevent introduction of prostitutes from foreign countries, 29, 30; views on Chinese immigration, 31; does not desire total exclusion of Chinese, 63; resolution of public meeting protecting Chinese, 64.
Pixley, Frank M., a witness, 366–378; effect of Chinese competition upon broom-making, 367; persecution of the Chinese, 367, 369, 370; Chinese and European civilization compared, 368; facility of Chinese immigration, 370, 371; comparison between China and Africa, 371, 372, 373, 375; feeling of the laboring classes against the Chinese, 373; Chinese labor servile, 376; character of the Chinese, 377, 378; Chinese as voters, 377.
Placer-mining, work of Chinese in, 691.
Poll-tax, collection of, from Chinese, 254–256, 483, 995–997.
Political and moral objections to the Chinese, 290, 291.
aspect of Chinese question, 578, 706, 707, 930.
Police, city, 653, 654.
court of San José, statistics of, 310.
testimony of judge of, 187.
officers, testimony of, 190–199, 219, 229.
Popular sentiment regarding the Chinese question, 54, 324, 325, 671, 701–703, 705, 745, 751, 752, 766, 773, 876, 904, 905, 908, 910, 917, 922–926, 954, 960, 961, 1012, 1016, 1029, 1030, 1091, 1097, 1102, 1130, 1131.
sentiment in Sonoma County on Chinese question, 797.
Population, capacity of the State of California for, 957.
character of, 977.
laws governing, 943, 944.
of China, 10, 26, 32, 57, 58, 74, 1124.
of Chinese in California, 10, 12. 32, 143, 162, 167, 180, 513, 527, 528, 632, 685.
of Chinese in California, (report of legislative committee,) 851, 1189–1195.
Pork, Chinese, 235, 236.
Ports, foreign residents of open, 830.
Portuguese labor, 628, 631.
Power to prevent Chinese prostitutes from coming, 15, 19.
Pox, China, 1063.

Prejudice against Chinese, 589, 952.
of race, 1033.
Press, attitude of the, on the Chinese question, 703–705, 750, 752.
Printing, method of, in China, 408.
Prison statistics, 402.
Problem, Chinese, 754, 755.
labor, 1215–1224.
Products originally brought from the East, 566, 567.
Profanity of Chinese, 115.
Property, assessed value of all, in the State, 10.
Chinese as insurers of, 969, 970.
explanation of, owned in Chinatown, 430, 431.
in Chinatown, 654, 655.
refusal of companies to insure, for Chinese, 662, 664.
tax paid by Chinese on personal, 480, 484.
value of, owned by Chinese, 10, 16, 254.
upon which Chinese pay taxes, 995.
Proscription of persons employing Chinese, 265.
Prostitution, Chinese, 10, 140, 142, 143, 181, 182, 199, 240, 1038, 1039, 1053.
contracts for, 145, 147.
holding of inmates of houses of, in bondage, 22.
how regarded in China, 67.
legitimized and recognized profession in China, 13, 22, 829, 830.
physiological necessity of, 655, 656.
sales for, 15, 195, 198, 229, 236, 237.
Prostitutes bought and sold, 22. (See Women, sale of, for prostitution.)
characteristics of Chinese, 1145, 1146.
Chinese, 96, 109–111, 117, 144, 148, 152, 159, 163, 192, 194, 197, 212, 452, 456, 457, 621, 638, 640, 652, 653
duties of the consul in regard to shipment of, 987.
number of, in San Francisco, 14, 22, 67, 142.
return of Chinese, 397.
value of, 22, 23.
white, 652, 653.
Protection of the Chinese, 1005, 1006.
Protestant influences upon the Chinese, 245, 248.
Punishment, modes of, 236–238.

Qualities, natural, of the Chinese, 1061.
Queue ordinance, 47, 48, 63.
text of, 1166, 1167.
Queues, effect of losing, 47, 479.
the wearing of, 487.
significance of the, 640, 641, 950, 951.

Race, communication on impurity of, as a cause of decay, 864–871.
deterioration of, produced by Chinese immigration, 866.
origin of Chinese, 1224–1241.
prejudice of, 1033.
Races, brain-capacity of different, 1052.
intermixture of, 508, 509, 586, 587, 590, 656–658.
origin of Chinese and Japanese, 944, 945.
views on the difference of, 1043–1049.
Railroad, construction of Southern Pacific, 599, 600, 604.
Railroads, injury of lateral, 596–598.
effect of construction of lateral, 600.
effect of, on the settlement of California, 776, 777.
Real estate, effect of Chinese upon, 255, 398.
effect of Chinese quarter upon, 799.
Reed, Rev. Hiram W., a witness, 878–883; conversion of Chinese to Christianity, 878–880; influence of the Chinese, 881; diet of Chinese, 882, 883.
Regulation of Chinese immigrants, 85, 86, 693, 696, 700.
Religion, Chinese, 16, 26, 27, 69, 298, 408, 455, 500–502, 512, 632, 640, 736, 737, 945, 1042.
Religious aspect of Chinese question, 582, 583.
Republican party, attitude of, on Chinese question, 1099.
Resolution of senate of California on Chinese immigration, 9.
Restricting Chinese immigration, modes suggested for, 497.
Restriction of Chinese desirable, 74, 1010.
Restrictive legislation, class opposed to, 951, 952, 954, 962.
petition for, of immigration, 324.

Return to China, inducement of Chinese to, 948.
intention of Chinese to, 16, 17, 385, 446, 636, 637, 839, 948.
Revue des Deux Mondes, extract from, 57, 58.
Rights of Americans in China, 72, 73.
Roach, Mr., State senator, 28.
Roberts, George D., a witness, 436–443; work accomplished by Tide-Land Reclamation Company, 436; employment of Chinese under contract, 436, 437, 442, 443; reliability of Chinese labor, 437, 438, 440; effect of Chinese upon white labor, 438, 439; value of tule-lands, 441; supposed effect of naturalization upon Chinamen, 442.
Rodgers, John, a witness, 1020–1028; rear-admiral in the Navy, 1020; Chinese in Java, 1021, 1025; danger of labor-class when of different race from capitalists, 1021, 1022; views on Burlingame treaty, 1023; injurious effect of competition with the East, 1024, 1025; character of the Chinese, 1023; California manufactures, 1026; possibility of dispensing with Chinese labor, 1027; condition of the white laboring classes, 1027; Chinese language, 1028.
Rogers, James R., a witness, 229–235; police-officer, 229; sale of Chinese women for prostitution, 229; Chinese quarter, 229–232; Hip-ye-tung Society, 230; crime protected by the Chinese, 230; outrages committed by Chinese, 232; hoodlums, 234; cubic-air ordinance, 234, 235; industrial pursuits monopolized by Chinese, 1167–1169.
Russell & Co., experience of, with compradors, 419.
Russell, Joel, a witness, 1090–1095; farmer, 1090; contradiction of Mr. Hollister's views, 1090, 1091; popular opinion in regard to Chinese immigration, 1091; effect of Chinese on white immigration, 1092; employment of Chinese labor, 1093; rate of wages, 1093, 1094; Chinese trick in pulling mustard, 1095.

Sailors, Chinese as, 243, 855.
Sanitary and social condition of the Chinese, 459, 460.
San José, Chinese in, 308, 309, 312.
prostitutes in, 311.
employment of, 553, 556.
petition of labor union of, 1172.
population of, 311.
Salinas Plains, opening up of, 734.
Sawyer, W. D., police-judge, 329.
Scholarship of Chinese, 407, 460.
School, report of industrial, 403.
Schools, Chinese, 401.
public, Chinese children refused admission to, 432, 433.
mission, 433.
Samshoo, a Chinese drink, 550.
Sam Yup dialect, 397.
San Francisco, population of, 851.
Sandwich Islands, absentee system of American inhabitants of the, 980, 982.
contract labor in, 976, 977, 979–981, 983.
wages paid to Chinese in, 986.
Santa Barbara, number of Chinese in, 1202, 1203.
Scott, Irving M., a witness, 1014–1016; manufacturer, 1014; employment of white labor, 1014, 1015; boys as apprentices, 1016; popular opinion on Chinese immigration, 1016.
Seaman, Vernon, a witness, 548–552, 568, 569; merchant, 548; exports from China and Japan, 549; silk trade of China, 549; statistics of exports and imports, 549; arrivals of Chinese in California 549, 551, 568, 569; character of the Chinese in China, 550; employment of Chinese in Southern and Eastern States, 550, 551; massacre at Tien-Tsin, 551,552,
Self-government, Chinese incapable of, 1058, 1059.
Servant-girls, scarcity of, in California, 595.
experience with, 621–623.
Servants, domestic, Chinese as, 249, 505, 733, 845, 846, 852, 853, 898, 1013, 1014.
white girls as, 572, 573, 773, 774, 811, 812, 853.
Servile labor, the effect of, 81.
Servility of Chinese labor, 376, 590, 591, 596.
Sessions, Colonel, employment of Chinese by, in Arkansas, 550.
Seward, George F., minister to China, 551.
William H., summary of Chinese civilization by, 413.
Se-Yup Company, 24.
dialect, 397.
Shanghai, condition of, in 1862, 416.
description of, 240, 243.
municipal court of, 242.

Shaw, William J., 13, 14, 20, 22, 26.
Shearer, Rev. Frederic E., a witness, 631–643; number of Chinese in California, 632; religion of the Chinese, 632, 640; Christian influences upon the Chinese, 633, 634, 639; treatment of the Chinese, 635; intention of Chinese to return, 636, 637; Chinese prostitutes, 638–640; significance of the queue, 640, 641; assimilation of the Chinese, 642, 643.
Sherk, Jacob B., a witness, 624–631; hop-culture, 624, 625; employment of Chinese, 624–626, 628; character of white labor, 626, 627; Portuguese labor, 628, 631.
Ships, burning of, in middle passage, 25.
Shirts, wages paid for making, 381, 382.
Shoemakers, comparative efficiency of Chinese as, 334, 336.
effect of Chinese labor upon immigration of white, 341.
wages of, 332.
Shoe-factories, Chinese, 342.
Shoes, former prices of making, 342.
Shorb, Dr., 14.
Sick, treatment of, by Chinese, 213, 326, 327, 329, 385, 646, 648.
Silk-trade with China, 549.
Silverberg, Henry, a witness, 378–382; foreman in shirt-factory, 378; comparison between white and Chinese labor, 379; character of the Chinese, 379, 380; wages paid for making shirts, 381, 382.
Singapore, 1128.
Slavery, Chinese females sold in, 10, 22, 33.
unknown in China, 428.
Sleeping apartments, Chinese, 11.
Small-footed Chinese women, 124.
Small-pox among the Chinese, 21, 61, 62, 96, 105, 107, 127–129, 133–135, 138, 139, 141, 143, 645.
introduction of, into San Francisco, 940, 941, 1095–1097.
Smith, Mrs. Anna F., a witness, 897–901; Chinese as domestic servants, 898; petition of workingwomen of San Francisco, 899; competition of Chinese labor, 900.
Smith, Michael A., a witness, 190–199, 1142–1146; police officer, 190; Chinese quarter, 191, 195, 196; gambling among the Chinese, 191, 192, 196; Chinese prostitutes, 192, 194, 197; Chinese hospitals, 192, 193; Chinese tribunals, 193; weapons used by Chinese, 193; sales of Chinese women for prostitution, 195, 198; enterprise of Chinese merchants, 198; identification of photographs of Chinese prostitutes, 1142, 1143; enforcement of cubic-air ordinance, 1143–1145; characteristics of Chinese prostitutes, 1145, 1146.
Smuggling by Chinese, 475, 476.
Sneath, Richard G., a witness, 542–548; banker, 542; character of Chinese merchants, 542–544; views on Chinese immigration, 543–545; effect of Chinese upon immigration from the East, 543, 544; industry of the Chinese, 544; dairy-labor, 545; Chinese as miners, 545, 546; Jersey cattle, 546; manufacture of cheese, 547, 548.
Social and sanitary condition of Chinese, 459, 460.
Sodomy, 239.
Sonntag, Charles, a witness, 893–897; deputy in license department, 893; licenses collected from Chinese, 893–897.
Southern Pacific Railroad, construction of, 599, 600, 604.
Spreckles, Father, 27.
Stanley, Judge, decision on cubic-air ordinance, 235.
opinion of, regarding perjury, 404.
Statistics of exports and imports, 549.
in regard to Chinese manufactories, 930.
Stein, Fritz, a witness, 345; reporter, 345; adventure with Chinese pirates, 345.
Stock, Ernest C., a witness, 325–331; police reporter, 325; treatment of their sick by Chinese, 326, 327, 329; filthiness of the Chinese quarter, 327; Chinese paupers, 331.
Stone-women, 23.
Stout, Arthur B., a witness, 643–660, 862–878; member of State board of health, 643; physical condition of the Chinese, 643; fires in Chinese quarter, 644; health of the Chinese, 644; ablutions, 645; mortality, 645; origin of small-pox in California, 645; leprosy, 646; Chinese hospitals, 646, 647; treatment of sick, 647, 648; condition of Chinese quarters, 648, 649; action of city authorities, 649; assaults upon Chinese, 649–651; syphilis, 651; Chinese prostitutes, 652; white prostitutes, 652, 653; city police, 653, 654; property in Chinatown, 654, 655; explanation of cubic-air law, 655, 659, 660; views on prostitution, 655, 656; assimilation by intermarriage, 656–658; letter of Dr. Logan, 863, 864; communication on impurity of race as a cause of decay, 864–871; modified views, 872–875; Chinese as citizens, 875; immigration of criminals, 875, 876; feeling against the Chinese, 876; Chinese standard of living, 877, 878.

Stowaways, 887, 888.
Stowe, Mr., 39.
Strike, labor, of the Chinese, 669.
Strikes, advantage of Chinese in preventing, 609.
Strobridge, James H., a witness, 723–728; construction of Central Pacific, 723–725; character of Chinese labor, 726, 727; comparison between white and Chinese labor, 728.
Structure of Chinese government, 417, 418, 502, 503.
Stuart, John, a witness, 763–765; Pacific Mail Steamship Company, 763; character of Chinese merchants, 763; trade with China, 764; arrivals and departures of Chinese, 764, 765.
Suffrage among Chinese, 1126.
Superstition of Chinese, 16, 26.
Supreme Court of the United States, decision of, in regard to return of Chinese women, 1164–1166.
Swedes, 1102.
Swift, John F., a witness, 951–968; views on Chinese immigration, 951, 958, 961; class opposed to restrictive legislation, 951, 952, 954, 962; prejudice against the Chinese, 952; effect of Chinese labor, 953, 966, 967; Chinese labor compared with negro slavery, 953, 955, 956; popular opinion on the Chinese question, 954, 960, 961; naturalization-laws, 954, 964, 965, 968; Chinese as land-owners, 955; Chinese competition, 956; capacity of the State for population, 957; character of the Chinese, 958, 965; best interests of the State, 959 960; effect of currency question, 962, 963; Chinese an alien population, 963, 964; effect of Chinese on eastern immigration, 967; treaty relations with China, 968.
Swift, Mrs. Sophronia, a witness, 244–252; female industries of San Francisco, 244, 245, 247, 251; Protestant influences upon the Chinese, 245, 248; condition of white children in San Francisco, 246, 250; Chinese as domestic servants, 249; California women, 251.
Syphilis, disease of, among white children, 14, 651, 870, 1097, 1098.

Tablets, worshiping, of ancestors, 2627.
Tailors, wages formerly paid to, 352, 355.
Tak, Lang & Co., cigar-manufactory for Chinese apprentices, 317.
Tan, how played, 196, 197, 222.
Tauists, 69. (See Chinese Religion.)
Tax, law imposing miners', on foreigners, 477, 482, 478.
poll, 483.
receipts, fraudulent, 997.
Taxes, value of property upon which Chinese pay, 995.
paid by Chinese, 452.
Tea tasters, 419.
Temperate condition of Chinese, 61.
Tenements, Chinese, 126, 129, 130, 137.
Tide-land Reclamation Company, work accomplished by, 436.
Tien-Tsin, reign of, (Chinese tablets,) 26.
Tien-Tsin, massacre of missionaries at, 551, 552, 858.
Tobin, John T., a witness, 235–244; police detective in China, 235; character of Chinese in China, 235; Chinese pork, 235, 236; sale of children for prostitution, 236, 237; morals of China, 236; modes of punishment, 236–238; mode of swearing witnesses, 239; regard for human life among the Chinese, 239; sodomy, 239; gambling, 240; prostitution, 240; purchase of wives, 240; description of Shanghai, 240–243; municipal court of Shanghai, 242; Chinese as sailors, 243.
Toland, Dr., testimony of, before legislative committee, 14, 15, 651, 652.
Trade of California, tabular statements, 1203, 1206.
Trade with China, 35, 36, 41, 42, 75, 87, 88, 100, 129, 474, 549, 619, 715, 716, 763, 764, 853, 854, 861, 948, 1055.
Trades-unions, 81, 283, 322, 348, 363, 364.
Tradesmen, Chinese as, 519.
effect of Chinese competition upon immigration of white, 355.
Traffic, cooly, 95–97, 101, 102, 109, 121–124, 383, 384, 757, 758–761, 939, 943.
Trial of American citizens in China, 1085.
Tribunals, Chinese, secret, 165, 181, 193, 1080–1085.
Treatment of Americans in China, 497, 858.
Chinese in California, 37, 300, 460, 461, 471, 473, 483, 635, 649–651, 736, 739, 740, 820, 821, 911, 912.
the merchant class, 490.
Treaty with China, 284, 285, 456, 461, 482, 968.
Tschudi, views on blending of races, by, 867.

Tucker, George W., a witness, 936–939; ship-master, 936; character of Chinese merchants, 937; character of Chinese passengers, 937; business of Captain King, 938; incident of a Dutch ship picked up at sea, 938; cooly-traffic, 939.
Tule-lands reclaimed by Chinese, 48.
value of, 441.
Ty Yung, testimony of, before legislative committee, 27.

Underground railroad, 674.
Union Pacific Railroad, by what labor constructed, 79.
character of the laborers on the, 88, 89, 949, 950.
punishment of crime along the route of, 92.
settlement on the line of the, 946, 947, 949.

Vale, William, a witness, 1100–1102; importation of European laborers, 1101, 1102; popular opinion on Chinese immigration, 1102; Swedes, 1102.
Venereal diseases, 97.
Vessel, number of Chinese on each, 887.
Vinton, William, a witness, 308–312; tailor, 308; anti-Chinese organizations in San José, 308; Chinese in San José, 308, 309–312; gambling dens, 309; lottery-drawings, 309–311; idleness of the Chinese, 309; injurious effect of Chinese immigration on white labor, 309, 312; statistics of police court of San José, 310; Chinese prostitutes in San José, 311; population of San José, 311.
Visalia Consolidated Tobacco Company, 39.
Voluntary immigration of Chinese, 15, 404, 405.
Voters, Chinese as, 377, 492, 593, 679.
Vreeland, Ezekiel B., a witness, 173–180; deputy commissioner of immigration, 173; immigration of Chinese, 173–178; Chinamen as debtors not allowed to return, 178, 179; leprosy, 180.

Wages in California, 84, 182, 183, 185.
in Canton, 67.
of factory hands, 808, 809.
formerly paid to tailors, 352.
of Chinese compared with white labor, 356, 357.
of Chinese labor, 322, 346, 347.
of cigar-makers, 313, 314, 573, 574.
of journeymen tailors, 355.
of shoemakers, 332.
of white labor, 522.
paid for making shirts, 381, 382.
paid to labor in California and the East compared, 557.
rate of, for labor in California, 276–278, 282, 283, 302, 304–306, 553, 768, 778, 779, 800, 1073, 1074, 1093, 1094.
reduction of, 342, 343, 398, 399,
Ward, Thomas, broom manufacturer, employment of Chinese by, 356.
Warfare, Chinese, 124.
Wealth of California, contribution of Chinese labor to, 31.
Weapons used by Chinese, 193.
Westine, Erric, a witness, 354–356; tailor, 354; effect of Chinese competition upon immigration of white tradesmen, 355; wages of journeymen tailors, 355.
Wheat, exports of, 777.
Wheeler, Alfred, a witness, 512–529; attorney at law, 512; number of Chinese in California, 513, 527, 528, 795, 796; immigration of Chinese governed by demand for labor, 514, 516, 519; ebb and flow of Chinese immigration, 515; benefits of Chinese labor, 515, 517, 524, 529; character of the Chinese, 517; views on Chinese immigration, 518; effect of citizenship upon the Chinese, 518; Chinese as tradesmen, 519; arrivals of whites and Chinese, 518, 519; cost of passage from China, 520; possibility of increased immigration, 520, 521; wages of white labor, 522; employment of Chinese in construction of Central Pacific Railroad, 522, 523, 528; competition between white and Chinese labor, 524, 527, 529; Chinese death-rate, 795; table of arrivals and departures of Chinese, 1196.
Wheeler, Edward D., a witness, 1016–1020; district judge, 1016; non-assimilation of the Chinese, 1017, 1018; Chinese immigration, 1018, 1019; apprehension of an influx of Chinese, 1019; effect of naturalization upon the Chinese, 1020.
White boys, bad effect of Chinese prostitutes on, 1062, 1063.
experience with, 553, 554.
White labor, bribery of a foreman by Chinese to drive out, 315.
Chinese labor and, comparison in the mines, 365.

White labor, effect of Chinese employment on, 275, 535, 741, 742, 971, 972, 1061, 1062, 1064.
efficiency of, compared with Chinese, 363, 365, 379, 681, 682, 720–722, 758, 1066.
employment of, 765, 1014, 1015, 1060, 1061, 1064–1066, 1109–1111.
lack of employment for, 988.
superiority of, 301.
wages of, 522.
wages of Chinese compared with wages of, 356, 357.
White laboring class, character of, 51, 272, 281, 282, 626, 627, 719, 775, 781, 811, 834–836, 838, 839.
condition of the, 1027.
White tradesmen, effect of Chinese competition upon immigration of, 355.
Whites, employment of, in San Francisco; tabular statements, 1206–1215.
Whites and Chinese, arrivals of, 518, 519.
Williams, S. Wells, letter of, on Chinese question, 1243–1253.
Winn, Albert M., a witness, 321–325; president of Mechanics' State Council, 321; Chinese labor a national question, 321; want of assimilation of the Chinese, 321; resources of China in regard to population, 321; trades-unions, 322; degrading tendency of Chinese labor, 322, 323; immigration of white labor prevented by Chinese, 322, 323; wages of Chinese labor, 322; petition for restrictive legislation against Chinese immigration, with 26,000 signatures, 324; public sentiment against the Chinese, 324, 325; attempt to christianize Chinese a failure, 325.
Witnesses, Chinese, mode of swearing, 239.
character of Chinese as, 272, 274, 478, 699.
Wives, Chinese, 22, 31, 841, 842.
plurality of, in China, 499.
purchase of, 13, 240.
secondary and concubine, 13.
Wo Hang, Chinese merchant, 841.
Wolfram, Mr., foreman in Gilroy Cigar Factory, 316.
Women, character of Chinese, who arrive here, 67, 986, 987.
head-money for Chinese, 149.
importation of Chinese, 388–392, 396, 599.
influence of, 871.
lack of employment for white, 343, 344.
number of Chinese, in California, 14, 22.
sale of, for prostitution, 15, 195, 198, 229.
small-footed Chinese, 124.
working, of San Francisco, petition of, 899.
Woods, David C., a witness, 1062, 1063; superintendent industrial school, 1062; bad effect of Chinese prostitutes on white boys, 1062, 1063; China pox, 1063.
Working-women of San Francisco, petition of, 899.

Yung Wing, views of, as to treatment of Chinese, 461.

81 C 1